

TERMINAL EVALUATION TERMS OF REFERENCE

INTRODUCTION

In accordance with UNDP and GEF M&E policies and procedures, all full and medium-sized UNDP support GEF financed projects are required to undergo a terminal evaluation upon completion of implementation. These terms of reference (TOR) sets out the expectations for a Terminal Evaluation (TE) of the project *Improving coverage and management effectiveness of the Protected Area System of Moldova* (PIMS 4016)

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

PROJECT SUMMARY TABLE

Project Title:	Improving coverage and management effectiveness of the Protected Area System of Moldova			
GEF Project ID: UNDP-GEF PIMS:	3675 4016		<i>at endorsement (US\$)</i>	<i>at completion (US\$)</i>
UNDP proj. num.: Atlas Project ID: Atlas Output ID:	50699 62742	GEF financing:	950,000	950,000
Country:	Republic of Moldova	IA/EA own:	22,850	45,000
Region:	Europe and CIS	Government:	882,820	935,620
Focal Area:	Biodiversity	Other (Local Public Authorities):	130,000	130,000
FA Objectives, (OP/SP):	SP1	Total co-financing:	1,035,670	1,110,620
Executing Agency:	Ministry of Environment	Total Project Cost:	1,985,670	2,060,620
Other Partners involved:	"Moldsilva" Forest Agency, Local public Authorities	ProDoc Signature (date project began):		14.04.2009
		(Operational) Closing Date:	Proposed: 31 May 2013	Actual: 31 December 2013

OBJECTIVE AND SCOPE

The project was designed to: build the capacity of protected area institutions in Moldova to more effectively establish and administer a representative system of protected areas in Moldova. It will seek to achieve this by: (i) reviewing, revising and reforming the conservation management tenure of the current protected areas; (ii) developing a strategic and operational decision-support tool to support the ongoing consolidation and expansion of the national protected area system; (iii) piloting the establishment of a national park, the first in Moldova, in the Orhei district as a mechanism to rationalize and expand existing, but spatially and institutionally fragmented, protected areas; (iv) reforming and restructuring the governance of, and institutional arrangements for, protected areas; (v) developing national norms and standards, operational guidelines and financing mechanisms for the PAS; (vi) developing protected area planning and management competence and skills of professional and

technical staff in the protected area institutions; (vii) designing a national strategic framework for coordinating the implementation of conservation education and awareness programmes; and (viii) implementation of a focused outreach program in and around Orhei to support the piloted establishment of the National Park in the Orhei district.

The globally significant biodiversity of Moldova is only partially protected through a system of protected areas covering 4.65% of the territory. Under current conditions, the Protected Area System (PAS) of Moldova is not effectively safeguarding the country's unique biodiversity: a number of natural ecosystem processes, habitats and species are not adequately represented in the existing PAS; the capacity of the institutions responsible for the management of the PAS is generally weak; and the value of the PAS to the socio-economic well-being of society is poorly understood and demonstrated.

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 method¹ for conducting project terminal evaluations of UNDP supported GEF financed projects have 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 assist International evaluator in amending, completing and submitting 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 assist International evaluator in conducting a field mission to *Chisinau, Republic of Moldova*, including the following project sites: *Orhei National Park area and other major protected areas (as required)*. Interviews will be held with the following organizations and individuals at a minimum:

- *UNDP Moldova CO*
- *Ministry of Environment*

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

- “Moldsilva” Forest Agency
- Academy of Science
- Local Public Authorities from Orhei Region at the District and Local levels
- NGO “Ecological Movement of Moldova” and/or other NGO’s
- Administration of one of the major protected areas (e.g. Codrii Reserve)

Upon request by the International evaluator the national 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 International evaluator considers useful for this evidence-based assessment. A list of documents that the project team will provide to the evaluators 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 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.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 the UNDP CO in the Republic of Moldova. 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 DELIVERABLES

The evaluation team is expected to deliver the following:

²A 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](#)

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

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

TEAM COMPOSITION

The evaluation team will be composed of one international and one national evaluators. The consultants shall have prior experience in evaluating similar projects. Experience with GEF financed projects is an advantage. The international evaluator will be designated as the team leader and will be responsible for finalizing the evaluation report. The evaluators selected should not have participated in the project preparation and/or implementation and should not have conflict of interest with project related activities.

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'](#)

DUTIES, SKILLS AND QUALIFICATIONS OF EVALUATION TEAM

International Expert

Duties and Responsibilities:

- Desk review of documents, development of draft methodology, detailed work plan and TE outline;
- Debriefing with UNDP CO, agreement on the methodology, scope and outline of the TE report;
- Interviews with project implementing partner (executing agency), relevant Government, NGO and donor representatives and UNDP/GEF Regional Technical Advisor;
- Field visit to the pilot project site (Orhei National Park) and interviews with local stakeholders from Orhei region;

- Elaboration of a summary matrix of the project implementation key findings based on interviews and site visits performed;
- Debriefing with UNDP and project implementing partner;
- Development and submission of the first TE report draft. The draft will be shared with the UNDP CO, UNDP/GEF (UNDP/GEF RCU Bratislava) and key project stakeholders for review and commenting;
- Finalization and submission of the Response Grid;
- Finalization and submission of the final TE report through incorporating suggestions received on the draft report;
- Supervision of the work of the national expert (during entire evaluation period).

National Experts

Duties and Responsibilities

- Collection of background materials upon request by International Expert/ TE Team Leader;
- Provision of important inputs in developing methodologies, work plans and MTE report outlines upon request by International Expert/ TE Team Leader;
- Assistance to the International Expert/ TE Team Leader in desk review of materials;
- Assistance to the International Expert/ TE Team Leader in developing the mission agenda and establishing meeting with relevant stakeholders;
- Participation in debriefings with UNDP CO representatives;
- Assistance to the International Expert/ TE Team Leader in conducting interviews with relevant stakeholders;
- Field visit and assistance to the International Expert/ TE Team Leader in interviewing local stakeholders at project sites;
- Assist the International Expert/ TE Team Leader in elaboration of a summary matrix of the project implementation key findings based on interviews and site visits performed;
- Participation in debriefing with UNDP and project implementing partners;
- Assistance to the International Expert/ TE Team Leader in developing the first draft of the TE report. The draft will be shared with the UNDP CO, UNDP/GEF (UNDP/GEF RCU Bratislava) and key project stakeholders for review and commenting;
- Elaboration of the Draft Response Grid based on comments made by UNDP CO, UNDP/GEF (UNDP/GEF RCU Bratislava) and key project stakeholders;
- Assistance to the International Expert/ TE Team Leader in finalization of the Final Terminal Evaluation Report;

DELIVERABLES

The National Expert must present to the International Expert/ TE Team Leader the following deliverables:

Deliverables	Due dates
Inputs to the Inception Report providing clarifications on timing and	1 September, 2013

method to be used	
Inputs to the Presentation of the Initial Findings	19 September, 2013
Inputs to the Draft Final Report	03 October, 2013
Inputs to the Final Report , revised and coordinated with the UNDP CO, UNDP/GEF (UNDP/GEF RCU Bratislava) and key project stakeholders	28 October, 2013

TIMEFRAME

The National Consultant shall complete the deliverables stated above in 25 days according to the following schedule:

Activity	Timing
Preparation	<i>9 days</i>
Evaluation Mission	<i>6 days</i>
Draft Evaluation Report	<i>8 days</i>
Final Report	<i>2 days</i>

PAYMENT MODALITIES AND SPECIFICATIONS

The consultant will be hired under Individual Contract (IC) modality. Fee payments will be made based on following milestones:

%	Milestone
50%	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

REQUIRED QUALIFICATIONS AND COMPETENCIES

The National Evaluator must present the following qualifications:

- University degree in Biodiversity Conservation, Natural Resource Management, Environmental management, Biology or other related areas;
- Minimum 5 years of professional experience/technical knowledge in providing management or consultancy services to the biodiversity conservation and protected areas projects, preferably in protected areas planning and management;
- To be acquainted with the Moldovan Protected Areas System;
- Previous experience with results-based monitoring and evaluation methodologies;
- Experience in monitoring and evaluating protected areas and/or biodiversity conservation projects for UN or other international development agencies in the region will be an asset;
- Experience in GEF biodiversity project design, technical consultancy or evaluation will be an asset;
- Fluent in English and Romanian both written and spoken.

Competencies:

- Strong analytical skills;
- Excellent team working skills;

CV and/or P11 should provide evidence on the above mentioned qualifications and competencies.

APPLICATION PROCESS

Applicants are requested to apply online (<http://jobs.undp.org> and http://www.undp.md/jobs/current_jobs) by August 11. 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. The 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

Project Strategy and purpose	Objectively verifiable indicators				
	Indicator	Baseline	Target by EOP	Sources of verification	Risks and Assumptions
Goal:	To build the capacity of protected area institutions in Moldova to establish and administer a more representative system of protected areas				
Objective: To develop an enabling framework for the expansion of the protected area system to include under-represented ecosystems	Financial sustainability scorecard for national systems of protected areas	21	>30	Annual Financial Sustainability Scorecard	Assumptions: The <i>National Programme for Establishing the NEN</i> for the period 2008-2015 is developed, adopted and implemented The government commits to an incremental growth in the grant funding allocation for the protected area system Risks: National economic priorities shift away from support for the strengthening of the national ecological network, and the associated protected area activities Other ministries and public agencies do not cooperate to align strategies, plans and projects The Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources does not have adequate capacity and resources to provide support to, and monitor the performance of, the PAS and PA institutions
	Total operational budget (including HR and capital budget) allocation (US\$) for protected area management	<US\$1.5m/ annum	>US\$2m/ annum	Annual Financial Report of the Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources Annual Financial Report of MoldSilva Annual Financial Reports of Local Authorities	
	Capacity development indicator score for protected area system	24	>32	Annual Capacity Development Indicator Scorecard	
	Coverage (ha) of the protected area system	157,227ha	176,000ha	Protected area register National State of	

Project Strategy and purpose	Objectively verifiable indicators				
	Indicator	Baseline	Target by EOP	Sources of verification	Risks and Assumptions
				Environment Report	
Outcome 1: The representivity and coverage of the protected area system is improved	Number of IUCN Category I – VI protected areas whose classification, and management objectives, are aligned with their biodiversity significance	8	289	Protected area register National State of Environment Report	Assumptions: All current PAs retain some biodiversity or heritage conservation potential, albeit with rationalized boundaries, formal management designation and conservation status Sufficient areas of native habitats remain available for protected area expansion The Law on Natural Areas Protected by the State, and other complementary legislation, provides the enabling regulatory framework for the expansion of the protected area estate Risks: Some protected areas are so degraded that they no longer make a contribution to national biodiversity conservation targets Conflicts arise during the validation and national park establishment processes that are irreconcilable
	Extent (ha) of additional areas of under-represented habitat types incorporated into the formally proclaimed protected area network Forest Steppe (including meadows)	 59,495ha 1,187ha	 72,495ha 1,450ha	Botanical Institute Monitoring reports National State of Environment Report	
	Extent (ha) of formally proclaimed IUCN Category II National Park	0ha	20,000 ha	Protected Area register National State of Environment Report	

Project Strategy and purpose	Objectively verifiable indicators				
	Indicator	Baseline	Target by EOP	Sources of verification	Risks and Assumptions
Outcome 2: The capacity to effectively manage a representative protected area system is strengthened	Number of protected areas with a formally delegated management authority	4	289	Protected Area register National State of Environment Report	Assumptions: Institutional restructuring processes are actively supported by the Government of Moldova The Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources maintains a clear mandate and authority to fulfil oversight obligations for the protected area system Stakeholder institutions constructively engage in the identification of the most cost-effective institutional arrangements for the protected area system The research and educational institutes have the capacity to offer the training and skills development courses developed by the project Risks: Appropriate, and capacitated, institutions cannot be identified as the responsible management entity for some PAs Legal conflicts arise where public institutions lose management authority for protected areas as a result of the restructuring outcomes Training and skills development programs do not receive formal certification
	Number of protected areas with a capacitated management institution	5	>6	National Register of protected areas Annual Report of the Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources	
	Number of protected areas exceeding a METT score of 30	1	>15	METT Annual Review	
	Number of operational protected area management staff completing specialised training and/or skills development programs	0	30	Annual Report of the Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources	

Project Strategy and purpose	Objectively verifiable indicators				
	Indicator	Baseline	Target by EOP	Sources of verification	Risks and Assumptions
	Number of residents in and around Orhei that are directly involved in the outreach activities	0	>1000	Project reports	Assumptions: The Orhei District Administration supports the local education and awareness programme Risks: Conflicts arise between the MENR and the service provider (i.e. NGO/s) that are irreconcilable
	Number of residents in and around Orhei that are directly involved in experiential learning activities	0	200	Project reports	

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

1. Project document and its annexes;
2. MTE report
3. Project Inception Report;
4. Annual/Quarter work plans;
5. Project financial work plans and expenditure reports;
6. Annual/Quarter operational and progress reports;
7. 2010, 2011 and 2012 UNDP/GEF Project Implementation Reviews (PIR);
8. Minutes of the PSC meetings;
9. Minutes of the stakeholder meetings;
10. 2011 and 2012 Mission reports of the RTS on BD, UNDP RBEC;
11. Mission Reports of International Experts;
12. Reports of International and National Experts
13. Media information;
14. Research results, Maps;
15. Protected area legislation
16. METT and Financial scores for initially assessed PAs
17. GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policies;
18. Handbook on planning, monitoring and evaluating for development results;
19. Other upon request.

ANNEX C: EVALUATION QUESTIONS

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 relevant to UNCBD and GEF objectives?	•	•	•
• Is the Project relevant to UNDP objectives?	•	•	•
• Is the Project relevant to Moldova's environmental objectives, policies and strategic documents?	•	•	•
• Does the Project address the needs of target beneficiaries?	•	•	•
• Is the Project internally coherent in its design?	•	•	•
• How is the Project complementary to activities of other stakeholders and donors activity in the region?	•	•	•
• How could the Project better target and address the priorities and development challenges of targeted beneficiaries?	•	•	•
Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved?			
• To what extent are the outputs and activities of the project consistent with the intended project objective and goal?	•	•	•
• To what extent have implemented outputs produced or contributed to attaining the expected outcomes?	•	•	•
• How was risk and risk mitigation being managed?	•	•	•
• What lessons have been learnt for the Project to achieve its outcomes?	•	•	•
• What changes could have been made (if any) to the design of the Project in order to improve the achievement of the Project' expected results?		•	•

• How could the Project be more effective in achieving its results?		•	•
Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards?			
• Was adaptive management used or needed to ensure efficient resource use?	•	•	•
• Were the accounting and financial systems in place adequate for Project management and producing accurate and timely financial information?	•	•	•
• Were progress reports produced accurately, timely and respond to reporting requirements including adaptive management changes?	•	•	•
• Was Project implementation as cost effective as originally proposed (planned vs. actual)?	•	•	•
• Was the leveraging of funds (co-financing) happening as planned?	•	•	•
• Were the findings, lessons learned and recommendations shared among Project stakeholders, UNDP and GEF Staff and other relevant organizations for ongoing Project adjustment and improvement?	•	•	•
• Did the Project mainstream gender considerations into its implementation?	•	•	•
• Which partnerships/linkages were facilitated? Can be considered sustainable?	•	•	•
• Did the Project take into account local capacity in design and implementation of the Project?	•	•	•
Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, social-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?			
• Are sustainability issues adequately integrated in Project design?	•	•	•
• Did the Project adequately address financial and economic sustainability issues?	•	•	•
• Is there evidence that Project partners will continue their activities beyond Project support?	•	•	•
• Are laws, policies and frameworks being addressed through the Project, in order to address sustainability of key initiatives and reforms?	•	•	•

• Is the capacity in place at the national and local levels adequate to ensure sustainability of the results achieved to date?	•	•	•
• Are Project activities and results being replicated elsewhere and/or scaled up?	•	•	•
• What are the main challenges that may hinder sustainability of results?	•	•	•
Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward, reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status?			
• Will the project achieve its long-term goal to improve the coverage and management effectiveness of protected area system in Moldova?	•	•	•
• What is the level of sensitization and awareness about the protected area management approach?	•	•	•
• What is the impact of the demonstrated approach in private, public and/or at individual levels?	•	•	•
• Were cross-cutting issues identified and reflected during the project implementation?	•	•	•
• How could the Project build on its apparent successes and learn from its weaknesses in order to enhance the potential for impact of ongoing and future initiatives?	•	•	•
•	•	•	•

ANNEX D: RATING SCALES

<i>Ratings for Outcomes, Effectiveness, Efficiency, M&E, I&E Execution</i> 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	<i>Sustainability ratings:</i> 4. Likely (L): negligible risks to sustainability 3. Moderately Likely (ML): moderate risks 2. Moderately Unlikely (MU): significant risks 1. Unlikely (U): severe risks	<i>Relevance ratings</i> 2. Relevant (R) 1.. Not relevant (NR) <i>Impact Ratings:</i> 3. Significant (S) 2. Minimal (M) 1. Negligible (N)
<i>Additional ratings where relevant:</i> 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 Form³

Agreement to abide by the Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN System

Name of Consultant: _____

Name of Consultancy Organization (where relevant): _____

³www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct

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 OUTLINE⁴

- 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 Manual⁵)
- 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 rated⁶)
- 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

⁴The Report length should not exceed 50 pages in total (not including annexes).

⁵ UNDP Style Manual, Office of Communications, Partnerships Bureau, updated November 2008

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.

- 3.2** Project Implementation
- Adaptive management (changes to the project design and project outputs during implementation)
 - Partnership arrangements (with relevant stakeholders involved in the country/region)
 - Feedback from M&E activities used for adaptive management
 - Project Finance:
 - Monitoring and evaluation: design at entry and implementation (*)
 - UNDP and Implementing Partner implementation / execution (*) coordination, and operational issues
- 3.3** Project Results
- Overall results (attainment of objectives) (*)
 - Relevance(*)
 - Effectiveness & Efficiency (*)
 - Country ownership
 - Mainstreaming
 - Sustainability (*)
 - Impact
- 4.** Conclusions, Recommendations & Lessons
- Corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project
 - Actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the project
 - Proposals for future directions underlining main objectives
 - Best and worst practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance and success
- 5.** Annexes
- ToR
 - Itinerary
 - List of persons interviewed
 - Summary of field visits
 - List of documents reviewed
 - Evaluation Question Matrix
 - Questionnaire used and summary of results
 - Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form

ANNEX G: EVALUATION REPORT CLEARANCE FORM

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

Evaluation Report Reviewed and Cleared by

UNDP Country Office

Name: _____

Signature: _____ Date: _____

UNDP GEF RTA

Name: _Johan Robinson_____

Signature: _____ Date: _____