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Executive Summary

Background

1. In September 2006 the Evaluation and Oversight Unit (EOU) completed a special study called “Internal and External needs for Evaluative Studies in a Multilateral agency: Matching Supply with Demand in UNEP”. This study was intended to help UNEP establish a demand-driven orientation to the evaluation function by exploring the demand for and the utility of different types of accountability and ‘learning-oriented’ evaluative products for different stakeholders. To this end, the study explored how evaluations are used within the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) and, to a limited extent how they influence donor funding decisions.

2. The findings, which were based on a survey of the Committee of Permanent Representatives of the UNEP Governing Council, UNEP’s donor agencies and UNEP project and programme managers, demonstrated that while respondents recognized the importance of current evaluation activities, additional demand for studies that demonstrate uptake of proven technologies, policies, new knowledge and/or management practices and evaluations of impact was considered important. In the same vein, the study found that respondents placed importance on indicators of impact and that UNEP projects need to be evaluated more specifically in terms of ‘reduced risk’ and ‘vulnerability’; ‘influence on international environmental policy processes’; ‘changes in human capacities and/or levels of empowerment’; ‘uptake and use of project/assessment outputs’ and ‘economic valuation of changes in environmental factors’.

3. The affirmed need to use indicators and document impact by both UNEP donors and staff within UNEP, coupled with the multiple requests for information on how to conduct evaluations that the Evaluation and Oversight Unit receive, prompted the Unit to reflect on how more guidance for evaluating for results could be provided. This manual is intended to clarify the purpose of evaluation activities within the UNEP project cycle. It is also intended to clarify roles and responsibilities for evaluation activities and the use of associated tools and methods.

4. This manual aims to document procedures and guidelines on evaluation of UNEP projects, however, evaluations of projects where no monitoring or poor quality of monitoring have taken place are likely to suffer. In UNEP, the Quality Assurance Section (QAS) are responsible for monitoring of sub-programmes. Monitoring of projects is regarded as a project management function. Monitoring and evaluation are intrinsically linked and monitoring provides much of the evidence needed for rigorous and credible evaluations. Throughout this manual monitoring is therefore discussed where it is relevant to evaluation. The document reflects current monitoring and evaluation norms and standards in the UN system.¹

5. The primary audience for this manual is UNEP staff but it is also expected that the manual will provide valuable insights to UNEP partners and consultants as they evaluate UNEP projects. The focus of this guide is on evaluating projects but many of the same principles will be applicable to evaluation of sub programmes and UNEP’s work programme in general.

¹ See Annex 1, Norms and Standards for Evaluation, United Nations Evaluation Group, 2005.
6. The ideas presented in this manual are not all mandatory. Monitoring and evaluation (M&E) tools and approaches are not intended to be ‘fixed’. UNEP project activities are directed at solving complex problems in a changing world; therefore, project interventions must be adapted to changing conditions as required. M&E systems must accommodate such adaptation. Nevertheless, good M&E does need to meet a minimum set of requirements and standards. This manual will discuss these requirements and standards, while indicating where options are possible.

7. This manual will be periodically updated to reflect changes in ‘best practice’ or changing priorities and interests of key stakeholder groups.
Part 1  The monitoring and evaluation framework

The Purpose and Scope of Monitoring & Evaluation

9. Monitoring and evaluation (M&E) of development activities can provide funding agencies, project managers, implementing/executing agencies and civil society with better means for learning from past experience, improving service delivery, planning and allocating resources, and demonstrating results as part of accountability to key stakeholders. The objective of M&E is to support management at both project and portfolio levels by bringing appropriate, structured information to decision-making and management processes.

10. M&E within UNEP encompasses an array of activities that help to:

- develop projects that emphasize UNEP's comparative advantage and institutional values;
- design projects that have the maximum possible potential for impact consistent with UNEP's mission;
- monitor the progress of activities towards the delivery or achievement of outputs, results and impacts and;
- evaluate the success of project design and implementation and assess the significance of results and impacts;

11. Evaluations in UNEP are guided by a number of principles. Three core principles are key to UNEP's evaluation policy:

Accountability

12. Accountability through evaluation requires a strong element of disclosure of evaluation findings and the determination of the impact of the organization's programme activities to inform donors and the general public. All terminal evaluations are made available to the public through EOU's webpage.

Independence

13. To avoid conflict of interest, evaluators must not have been involved in the process of development, implementation or supervision of the programmes, projects or policies being evaluated. EOU has the authority to develop Terms of Reference for evaluations, select evaluators and manage the resources allocated for evaluations within the organization without undue interference.

Learning

14. The learning function involves identification and dissemination of lessons from programme and project implementation through evaluations and the development of recommendations based on evaluation findings to improve operational performance of projects and programmes. EOU, based on the lessons identified in the reports, ensures that a process is set up for collecting and integrating lessons into design, implementation and management activities.

---

**Project Monitoring**

15. Monitoring – the “regular collection and analysis and distribution of information for the surveillance of progress of the project’s implementation”\(^3\). Project monitoring is the collection of data prior to, and during, the project. These data, when analyzed, pinpoint progress or constraints as early as possible, allowing project managers to adjust project activities as needed. Monitoring is a continuing process throughout project implementation and often extends beyond project completion.

16. **Functions of monitoring:**
   - document the process of implementation (providing information for later evaluation)
   - facilitate decision-making by project management e.g. to take remedial action
   - facilitate learning from experience and provide feedback to planning

17. **Reasons for monitoring:**
   To provide management with accurate and timely information in order to take decisions. This is in order to control time, human resources, material resources, quality, and finances with the aim of ensuring that the focus of project implementation efforts is geared towards the achievement of results and impacts.

   Monitoring is a project/programme management function and therefore not a primary responsibility of evaluation.

**Project Evaluation**

18. Evaluation – ‘an assessment, as systematic and objective as possible of ongoing or completed aid activities, their design, implementation and results’\(^4\).

19. **Evaluation has two primary purposes:**
   - To provide evidence of results to meet accountability requirements and
   - To promote learning, feedback, and knowledge sharing through results and lessons learned among UNEP and its partners

20. The main reasons for conducting evaluations of projects and programmes in UNEP are to enable policy-makers or project/programme managers to demonstrate and measure performance, identify where improvements can be made to design or delivery methods, identify good practices and lessons for the future, and in general provide a tool for adaptive management and positive learning. Another key purpose for evaluations is to determine how UNEP activities have impacted environmental policy-making and management at the national, regional and global level. Evaluations in UNEP serve as a basis for substantive accountability to the organisation’s governing bodies and other stakeholders.

21. While there can be multiple purposes for conducting an evaluation, what is important is that before an evaluation exercise is embarked upon the purpose has been determined, and that this purpose is kept clear at all stages of the evaluation from planning and implementation to presentation and dissemination of findings. In this way, resources available for the evaluation will be utilised in the most efficient and effective way possible.

---

\(^{3}\) Notes taken from the Course “Project Planning and Programme Administration” (July 1998), by: Management for Development Foundation (MDF) Ede – The Netherlands

22. Evaluative studies often focus on several key stages in the ‘life’ of a project, e.g.

- During project preparation to assess the quality and relevance of the proposal.
- During project implementation to review progress and identify the best future course of action (Mid Term Review or Evaluation).
- After or at project completion to assess the project implementation phase, quality of outputs and nature and significance of project results against initial objectives (Terminal Evaluations).
- Some years after project completion to assess sustainability of project and the magnitude and distribution of benefits derived from them (outcome assessments, adoption studies and impact assessments).

23. Baselines are critical if a project’s true impact is to be assessed. *Baseline studies* are required to establish the status and trends in relation to key indicators at outcome and objective level before, or very shortly after, project inception. Thus, planning for baseline data collection is an important aspect during project design. Once this information is obtained by the project/programme the evaluation will be better placed to measure progress against the baseline and make a comparison. This is because impact assessment hinges on answering three key questions with respect to initial trends and baselines.

   a) What happened? *with* the project / programme intervention
   
   b) What would have happened anyway? *i.e. without* the intervention - the ‘counterfactual’
   
   c) What is the difference? *(between ‘1’ and ‘2’)*

**Evaluating Performance**

24. Every evaluation involves one or several criteria by which the merit or worth of the evaluated intervention is assessed, explicitly or implicitly. UNEP evaluations commonly address a range of criteria that are designed to capture a wide spectrum of project/programme performance measures. These are generally applicable analytical measures that can be used for most types of evaluation. The importance of evaluation criteria used in UNEP was reaffirmed recently by both staff and UNEP’s donors and hence these parameters will continue to form the basis for future evaluations⁵. The criteria are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Achievement of objectives and planned results: Have the overall and immediate project objectives and results been achieved? How or why not?</td>
<td>How or why not?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impacts: Has the project contributed towards e.g. reduced environmental vulnerability/risk, poverty reduction (or other long-term objectives)? How or why not? What unanticipated positive or negative consequences do the projects have? How did they arise?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attainment of outputs and activities: Have the direct products or services planned by the project been achieved? How or why not?</td>
<td>How or why not?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost-effectiveness: Were resources used in the best possible way? How or why not? What could be done differently to improve implementation, thereby maximizing impact at an acceptable and sustainable cost.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country ownership: What is the relevance of the project to national development and environmental agendas, recipient country commitment, and regional and international agreements? Is it dealing with the priorities of the target groups? How or why not?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial planning and management: What were the actual project costs by activity, financial management (including disbursement issues), and co-financing. Has a financial audit been conducted?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Implementation (approach and processes used): Have the plans (purposes, outputs and activities) been achieved? Is the intervention logic correct? What steps have been taken to adapt to changing conditions (adaptive management), partnerships in implementation arrangements, project management?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Monitoring and evaluation: What was the quality of the M&E design? How well was the M&E plan implemented? Was proper funding and budgeting for M&E activities made? How or why not?

Replicability: What examples are there of replication and catalytic outcomes that suggest larger scale effects and/or increased likelihood of sustainability? For example lessons and experiences coming out of the project that are replicated or scaled up in the design and implementation of other projects.

Stakeholder participation: Did the project involve the relevant stakeholders through information sharing, consultation and by seeking their participation in project’s design, implementation, and monitoring and evaluation?

Sustainability: Will there be continued positive impacts as a result of the project after the project funds run out? How or why not?

25. The reasons for using evaluation criteria are to provide comprehensive information in order to allow the evaluator to form an overall opinion of an intervention’s value, and to provide common parameters that will allow greater possibilities for comparison across projects or at portfolio level. Some of the criteria will assist in providing information related to operational aspects of implementing a project while others will provide information related to strategic issues.

26. Some of these criteria may overlap at several points. For example, when studying ‘sustainability’, we might encounter some of the same effects as we have already dealt with under ‘country ownership’ or ‘achievement of outcomes and objectives’. However, this rarely presents a problem. Although the criteria mentioned above have been accorded a special status, we are not prevented from using additional criteria to suit the specific conditions of certain evaluations.

27. These same criteria should, ideally, have formed part of project design discussions and should therefore not be new to the project managers at the evaluation stage.

Indicators

28. Performance indicators are tools that can assist in measuring processes, outputs, outcomes, and impacts for development projects, programmes, or strategies. When supported with sound data collection—perhaps involving formal surveys—analysis and reporting, indicators enable managers to track progress, demonstrate results, and take corrective action to improve service delivery. Participation of key stakeholders in defining indicators is important because they are then more likely to understand and use indicators for management decision-making.

29. While a fixed set of indicators would be inappropriate to address the variety of projects in UNEP there is a need to place greater emphasis on impact and ‘influence’ indicators such as those that relate to ‘reduced risk and vulnerability’, ‘influence on international environmental policy processes’, ‘changes in human capacities and/or levels of empowerment’, ‘uptake and use of project/assessment outputs’ and ‘economic valuation of changes in environmental factors’. Indicators relating to production of quantitative outputs should be regarded as being of lower importance in assessing the performance of UNEP projects / programmes.

30. In order to properly monitor and evaluate a project it is important that indicators are unambiguously specified so that all parties agree on what they cover and that there are practical ways to measure them. Indicators at the impact and result level are particularly important for M&E purposes but are, if poorly defined, poor measures of success. The risks lie in defining too many indicators, or those without accessible data sources making them costly, impractical and likely to be underutilized.

---

Example of indicators:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objectives and outcomes</th>
<th>Key Performance Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Development objective:**  
To develop and practically demonstrate a mechanism for encouraging company-level actions to increase the efficiency of energy use in their production processes, thereby reducing associated emissions, especially of greenhouse gases | Demonstrated green house gas emission reduction (CO2) from 300 industrial plants by 50% from \( \ldots X \ldots \) tons to \( \ldots Y \ldots \) tons of carbon dioxide per year |
Part 2  Types of evaluation in UNEP

The following are the key types of evaluations undertaken in UNEP

a)  Project Evaluations

31.  *Project evaluations* seek to examine relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact of a particular project. They can be *mid-term* or *terminal*.

- *Mid-term evaluations* are undertaken approximately half way through project implementation (ideally just before the mid-point). These evaluations analyze whether the project is on-track, what problems and challenges the project is encountering, and which corrective actions are required. For large projects (with budgets greater than $5 million) of relatively long duration (over 4 years), mid-term evaluations may be conducted by EOU on a selective basis. Additionally, EOU will, on a case by case basis, undertake mid-term evaluations for medium-size projects upon the request of the project manager7 where it may be deemed useful. For most medium-sized (between $1-4 million budget) and small (below $1 million) projects, the exercise is viewed as an internal project management tool and is referred to as a *mid-term review*. The responsibility for mid-term reviews rests with the project/programme manager.

- *Terminal Evaluations* are undertaken at the end of the project with the goal of assessing project performance and determining the outcomes and impacts stemming from the project. They provide judgments on actual and potential project impacts, their sustainability and the operational efficiency of implementation. Terminal evaluations also identify lessons of operational relevance for future project formulation and implementation.

- *Self-evaluations* are assessments of project activities carried out by staff who manage the implementation of these activities. These evaluations monitor the extent of achievement of results, status of and challenges in project implementation, budget management issues, gender issues, sustainability arrangements, impact and risks. Self-evaluation reports are completed annually for ongoing projects which have been operational for more than six months.

32.  In *addition* to project evaluations the Evaluation and Oversight Unit (EOU) undertakes the following types of evaluations:

b)  Sub-programme Evaluations

33.  A sub-programme consists of activities within a programme aimed at achieving one or a few closely related objectives as set out in the Medium–Term Plan. Historically, the sub-programme structure corresponded to an organizational unit, normally at the divisional level8 however, recent decisions specify that sub-programmes may cut across organizational units9. *Sub-programme evaluations* are conducted every 4-5 years and examine the relevance, impact, sustainability, efficiency and effectiveness of the delivery of the programme of work of the various sub-programmes. The findings of sub-programme evaluations often have corporate implications and are discussed at the sub-programme and senior management level where recommendations are accepted or rejected.

---

7 Or in the case of GEF projects, at the request of the Portfolio Manager.
9 Memo from UNEP ED to Divisional Directors dated 1st November 2007 entitled “Preparation of the Strategic Framework (biennial Programme Plan) for 2010-2011”.
c) Self Assessment

34. Self Assessments of sub-programmes are obligatory exercises which are framed by the logical frameworks in the approved biennial programme budget documents. Results of the self-assessment exercise are presented to senior management and used for various purposes, including management decision-making and the preparation of the biennial Programme Performance Report. Self-assessments, by their very nature, are monitoring devices. While EOU will provide support to the self-assessment process through assistance in developing self-assessment plans, the responsibility for conducting the self-assessment is that of the sub-programmes.

d) Management Studies

35. Management studies examine issues of particular relevance to the entire organization. They focus on processes and improvements in management practices, tools and internal dynamics. The specific areas of study, which may cover policies, strategies, partnerships, and networks, are identified by management and/or Governments.

e) Joint Evaluations

36. Joint evaluations assess a common outcome or result to which various partners are subscribed and engage all relevant partners in the evaluation process. Joint evaluations can avoid duplication and the need for attribution among organizations in joint initiatives. UNEP conducts joint evaluations of selected projects and partnership programmes with specific donors.

f) Cross Cutting and Thematic Studies

37. Crosscutting and thematic studies cover interventions which are common to several sectors, countries or regions. This includes areas such as capacity building, participation, policies, and gender mainstreaming.

g) Impact Evaluations

38. Impact evaluations attempt to determine the entire range of effects of the programme / project activity, including unforeseen and longer-term effects as well as effects on people or environments outside the immediate target group/area. They attempt to establish the amount of such change that is attributable to the intervention. The focus is on evaluating progress towards high-level goals and providing estimates of development impact. They are particularly useful in assessing the overall performance of the project in achieving long-term improvement in the quality of the environment and for assessing the sustainability of the impact against stated objectives. Impact evaluations are expensive and are conducted on a case by case basis with the objective of learning lessons, or demonstrating significant benefits in line with UNEP’s mission.

---

Part 3  Linking project design, planning, implementation and monitoring to evaluation.

Minimum requirements for monitoring and evaluation

39. The UN Evaluation Group adopted professional norms and standards for evaluation in 2005\textsuperscript{12}. These norms and standards build on the latest experience in the bilateral community (in the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development’s Development Assistance Committee – OECD DAC- Evaluation network) and in the evaluation Coordination Group of the Banks. These norms and standards have significantly inspired the UNEP evaluation policy.

40. No professional norms and standards have been formulated on monitoring in the bilateral, UN or Bank communities. This is in part because it is recognised that monitoring systems are project-specific. Nevertheless, it is common to formulate minimum requirements for monitoring systems. For example; that projects shall have them that the M&E system needs to be adequately resourced, that the system needs to tie into the logical framework and that there should be a focus on results and follow up.

41. The Global Environment Facility (GEF) has identified three minimum requirements for M&E which have been adapted to the UNEP context and which shall be applied for monitoring and evaluation at the project level\textsuperscript{13}.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minimum Requirement 1: Project Design of M&amp;E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All projects will include a concrete and fully budgeted monitoring and evaluation plan prior to formal project approval. This monitoring and evaluation plan will contain as a minimum:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Indicators for results and impacts or if no indicators are identified, an alternative plan for monitoring that will deliver reliable and valid information to management;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Baseline for the project, with a description of the problem to be addressed, with key indicator data or if major baseline indicators are not identified, an alternative plan for addressing this within one year;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Identification of reviews and evaluations that will be undertaken, such as mid-term reviews or terminal evaluations; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Organisational arrangements and budgets for monitoring and evaluation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minimum Requirement 2: Application of Project M&amp;E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project monitoring and supervision will include implementation of the M&amp;E plan, comprising:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Indicators for implementation are actively used, or if not a reasonable explanation is provided;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The baseline for the project is fully established and data compiled to review progress reports, and evaluations are undertaken as planned; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The organisational set-up for M&amp;E is operational and budgets are spent as planned.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{12} See Annex 1.
Minimum requirement 3: Project Evaluation

All projects with a budget over 500,000 USD will be evaluated at the end of implementation. This terminal evaluation will have the following minimum requirements:

- The evaluation will be undertaken independent of project management
- The evaluation will apply the norms and standards of United Nations Evaluation Group
- The evaluation will make use of the standard UNEP evaluation performance criteria
- The report of the evaluation will contain as a minimum:
  - basic data on the evaluation:
  - when the evaluation took place
  - who was involved
  - the key questions, and
  - methodology
  - basic data of the project, including actual UNEP expenditures
  - lessons of broader applicability; and
  - the TOR of the evaluation (in an annex)
- The lessons stemming from the report will be discussed with the project manager and if feasible other stakeholders. If applicable a plan of implementation for the recommendations will be discussed with the project manager.

42. Good project design and planning are key to complying with the three minimum requirements. Initial project design influences M&E in a number of ways. These include: a) the logic and feasibility of the project strategy; b) the resources allocated to M&E (funding, time, expertise); c) the degree of inbuilt flexibility; d) the operational guidelines for M&E; e) the commitment of the involved stakeholders\(^{14}\).

Early Design Phase

43. By applying good practices in the design and start up process and when any revisions of the project are undertaken, such as during mid-term reviews, the likelihood of success of the project can be significantly improved. The International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD)\(^ {15}\) has identified a number of good practices that are applicable in the UNEP context.

44. Good practices for project design:

- Involve all relevant stakeholders in participatory processes of project design. In UNEP this implies identifying the environmental problems to be addressed and the needs and interests of possible beneficiaries and stakeholders and then setting up a process to ensure their engagement in the project.
- Undertake a thorough situation analysis, together with primary stakeholders, to learn as much as possible about the project context as a basis for designing a project strategy and implementation process that are relevant. In UNEP this typically means analysing an environmental situation and understanding the causes and linkages between existing problems and the needed actions\(^ {16}\).


\(^{16}\) For more information on situation analysis see Annex 6.
• Develop a logical and feasible project strategy that clearly expresses what will be achieved (objectives) and how it will be achieved (outputs and activities), and the ‘paths of causality’ from activities and outputs to achieve the desired outcomes and impacts.\textsuperscript{17}

• Plan for long term capacity development and sustainability to ensure that the project contributes to the empowerment and self-reliance of local people and institutions. Using participatory methods while designing the project can help ensure ownership by the beneficiaries.

• Build in opportunities that support learning and enable adaptation of the project strategy during implementation. For example by learning from annual steering committee meetings where implementation to date is reviewed and any reasons for deviations discussed.

45. A broad M&E plan should be developed during project formulation and included in the project document. The M&E plan complements the highly summarised M&E information that is the log-frame. The M&E plan developed will need to be revised and adapted during project start-up. The plan should include:

• The logical framework
• Indicators
• Outcome and impact monitoring
• Baseline information (or plans for obtaining baseline information)\textsuperscript{18} and the methodology
• Operational monitoring, (progress monitoring) including risk and ‘quality control measures
• Financial monitoring, monitoring of project expenditure, co-financing contributions and expenditure, contributions in-kind and financial auditing
• M&E roles and responsibilities
• Mid-term reviews and Terminal Evaluations
• A fully-costed budget for M&E

Preparing the logical framework

46. The logical framework approach (LFA) is required for all UNEP projects and can be very useful for guiding project design and implementation. Nevertheless, the LFA also has some limitations. For example, it can be rigid and bureaucratic. For this reason, the most important part of the LFA is actually the planning process that is used to improve the clarity and quality of the project design. The written output of the LFA is the logframe matrix. The basic ideas behind the LFA are simple and common sense for any design process.

a) Be as clear as possible about what you are trying to achieve and how it will be achieved.

b) Decide how you will know if you are achieving your objectives and put in place a monitoring system.

c) Make explicit the conditions (assumptions) outside the direct control of the project that are critical for the project to succeed and assess the risk for the project if these conditions fail to arise or change.\textsuperscript{19}

---

\textsuperscript{17} See Annex 6.

\textsuperscript{18} PDF A and B implementation need to ensure baseline data will be collected and M&E issues will be addressed in the resulting MSP or FS project document. If baseline data is not completed at work program submission a plan specifying how this will be addressed in the first year of project implementation should be included.

47. The first step in effective project design is to identify the problem to be resolved\textsuperscript{20}. The next step is to articulate the means by which the problem will be addressed. What will the project do, and what will be the direct and indirect consequences of the project interventions? This is called the ‘intervention logic’ of the project.

48. In this context, the Logframe approach is a tool – or rather an open set of tools – for project design and management. It encompasses an iterative analytical process and a format for presenting the results of this process, which sets out systematically and logically the project or programme’s objectives and the causal relationships between them, to indicate whether these objectives have been achieved and to establish what external factors outside the scope of the project or programme may influence its success\textsuperscript{21}.

49. Different cooperating agencies, supporting organisations and donors, such as the European Commission, the Global Environment Facility and some United Nations funds and programmes, use different versions of the logical framework matrix. UNEP has adopted a simplified logical framework matrix. The primary components in UNEP logical frameworks are defined in the table below\textsuperscript{22}.

\begin{itemize}
\item[22] UNEP Project Manual: Formulation, Approval, Monitoring and Evaluation, 2005
\end{itemize}
### Levels of objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objectives</th>
<th>Why do the project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Project Impact.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Benefit for beneficiaries derived from results (e.g. farmers livelihood improved and conservation of forest achieved)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Results</th>
<th>Key components of the project objective.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Changes in development conditions because of the output strategy and key assumptions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Results should lead to the fulfillment of the stated objectives (e.g. extent to which those trained are effectively using new skills)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outputs</th>
<th>What the project will produce</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Goods and services provided by the project (e.g. number of people trained)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Actual deliverables. Direct result of inputs /activities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>The actions required for the delivery of the outputs (e.g. Project secretariat formed, stakeholder meeting organised etc.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Main activities that must occur for the outputs to be achieved</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional information on developing logical frameworks and an example are presented in Annex 6.

50. The standard practice of problem identification followed by the development of the intervention logic, most commonly captured in logical frameworks, often lacks an articulation of precisely how project activities, outputs or delivery mechanisms will generate intended outcomes and impacts.

51. UNEP encourages all projects to develop detailed and comprehensive ‘impact pathways’ or ‘outcome mapping’ to describe the project intervention logic. Impact pathways and outcome mapping techniques help identify and specify the key intervention processes, the users of any project outputs and describe how the project intervention results in the desired outcomes. Any given project will have a range of potential or intended outcomes and some of these may require several things to happen to achieve them, implying a variety of ‘pathways’ to the desired impact. Some ‘pathways’ to the intended benefits will be direct, some less so. ‘Impact pathway’ and ‘outcome mapping’ frameworks provide a useful monitoring and evaluation tool. If such tools are developed as a part of the project planning process, they can be frequently reviewed and used to inform a constantly evolving ‘strategy for impact’.

52. What does this mean in practice?

Within the life of the project the transition from outputs to the full extent of outcomes and impact will be incomplete. However, performance monitoring will require: identification of key users or target groups in specific terms (who will use the outputs?); specification of user or target group requirements e.g. preferences regarding form and content of project products, (how will the target groups use outputs? - or how will their behaviors change?)

Monitoring the implementation process
- production of outputs
- dissemination of outputs
- analysis of ‘uptake’, influence or user satisfaction
- evaluation of the direct benefits

---

Determine key performance indicators, plus associated monitoring mechanisms

53. One of the key steps in the logframe approach is developing the indicators. This involves determining what information is needed to properly measure whether your objectives and results are being achieved. For complex objectives a number of different types of indicators might be necessary to properly address whether the objective has been met.

54. While there are many different types of indicators ranging from simple quantitative indicators (e.g. person days of training in x subject conducted) to more complex indicators (e.g. increase in the proportion of people with access to water and sanitation services) and qualitative indicators (e.g. increased leadership demonstrated by local authorities) most project staff acknowledge that determining clear indicators is often difficult. For example, if your intended result is to improve inter ministerial cooperation to ensure integration and coherence of environmental policies with national development and poverty reduction strategy papers (PRSPs) your indicator might be the level of inter ministerial cooperation reflected in PRSPs. But what exactly does inter ministerial cooperation mean?

55. By asking yourself a number of questions such as “if the project is headed for failure, how will I know?” and wording these indicators of failure in the positive you will get a good sense of the change you want to see.

56. Example of a negative formulated indicator: If there is no inter ministerial cooperation what will happen?

Narrow sectoral focus of development planning and programmes and weak framework of incentives encouraging the integration of poverty and environment

57. Examples of positive formulated indicators:

- Number of non environmental sectoral policies which integrate environment and poverty considerations (e.g. health, education, agriculture, transportation etc.)
- Level of resources allocated by different line ministries to environmental issues.
- Number of ministries and districts establishing effective environmental units.

58. In addition, the above indicators can be further refined by including appropriate verifiers and qualifiers which are also complemented by targets and baselines to assist the performance measurement function. An effective indicator package should include:

- **Verifier:** Variable or parameter that retains the essential meaning of the objective and that can be measured on the ground
- **Qualifiers:** Contribute to describe the verifier allowing to respond to: what, when, where, who
- **Targets/baselines:** Values associated to the verifiers that define how much the objective is planned/expected to be achieved compared to the situation prior to project start. Intermediate targets (milestones) allow assessment of progress.

**Example:**

**Objective indicator: Conservation of keystone species**
At the end of the fifth year (**qualifier: when**)
the population sizes (**qualifier: what**) of species A, B and C (**verifier**)
within the boundaries of the park (**qualifier: where**)
have remained constant *(target)* compared to a number at project start level *(baseline)*\(^{24}\)

59. Some indicators are straightforward while others are more complex. The table below provides examples of common categories of indicators (with examples) in environmental projects\(^{25}\).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environment</th>
<th>Poverty</th>
<th>Empowerment of institutions</th>
<th>Empowerment of women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>risk/vulnerability reduced to human health/environment e.g. the average mortality rate for children under 5, due to malaria in communities covered by the vector control project, reduced from the baseline of 90 deaths per 1000 births to 35 deaths per 1000 births by the end of the project.</td>
<td>change in human livelihood status</td>
<td>changes in human capacities</td>
<td>• Change in women’s participation in decision-making at project/local level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>changes in environmental factors (erosion rates, diversity of species, greenhouse gas emissions) e.g.</td>
<td>change in access to natural resources</td>
<td>uptake and use of project assessment outputs by governments</td>
<td>• change in number of women’s groups formed in project area</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Baseline Information**

60. The baseline is used to learn about current or recent levels of accomplishments and provides project managers with the evidence to measure project performance. The baseline provides you with the means to compare what has changed over a period of time and whether this can be attributed to the project. \*The baseline is used as a starting point, or guide by which to monitor future performance. Baselines are the first critical measurement of the indicators*\(^{26}\).

**Example:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Results</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Baselines</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The conservation of large endangered mammals is included in forest policies in 80% of all relevant countries by year xx.</td>
<td>National and international forest policies contain positive references and actions for large endangered mammal conservation.</td>
<td>A document evaluating existing forest policies and management procedures in the relevant countries has been prepared. Currently 10% of the countries make positive references to large endangered mammals, conservation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

61. Establishing adequate baseline information on each of the performance indicators can quickly turn into a complex process and indicators need to be selected carefully. Equally, it is important that the indicators selected are not too exhaustive, because all indicators will need data collection, analysis, and reporting systems to inform them.

62. While the resources for establishing baselines may vary from project to project, it can generally be said that most projects struggle with determining the baselines. The problems often relate to the timing of the baseline studies (i.e. they are made too late; they are excessively detailed; or too general to be relevant).

---

\(^{24}\) Deutsche Stiftung für Internationale Entwicklung: “Introduction to the logical framework approach (LFA) for GEF financed projects”.

\(^{25}\) For more information on indicators see annex 6.

63. A number of issues need to be considered when developing baselines: Only collect what you are going to use. As a rule of thumb, only collect baseline information that relates directly to indicators that you have identified. Do not spend time collecting other information.

64. Organise the collection of baseline information like any other survey including:

- identifying existing sources of information
- identifying data collection methods
- delegating responsibilities and regularity of data collection and analysis
- estimating the costs of data collection

65. Keep it realistic and use it. No baseline is “ever perfect”. It is more important to have a simple baseline that is used than an extensive one which collects dust on a shelf.²⁷

66. Not all projects will have the resources available to conduct a proper baseline survey before project start up. One way of addressing this issue is by working with existing data that does not require field data collection. Other options include using the documentation from your first year of monitoring to compare against your target as illustrated in the example below.²⁸

**Operation monitoring (progress monitoring)**

67. In order to collect analyse and distribute information for the surveillance of project/programme progress on a continuous basis a number of mechanism may be applied.

68. Monitoring may be carried out through meetings or field visits or through written reports. The table below provides some of the different monitoring mechanisms.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reporting and analysis</th>
<th>Validation</th>
<th>Participation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• annual project report</td>
<td>• field visits</td>
<td>• steering committees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• progress reports</td>
<td>• spot check visits</td>
<td>• stakeholder meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• work plans</td>
<td>• external review</td>
<td>• annual reviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• self-evaluations</td>
<td>• evaluations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• substantive project documentation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Learning takes place through all monitoring tools or mechanisms

69. The UNEP project manual provides simplified guidelines and the necessary formats required for the different types of written reporting. However, while compliance with the monitoring requirements is good, it is not enough in itself. As we have seen in previous sections M&E heavily relies on good project design and proper use and analysis of data and information gathered. UNEP has, through its evaluations, learned that while many projects comply with the monitoring requirements the quality of the progress reports, final reports etc. is poor and difficult to use for evaluation or other management purposes.

70. A number of good practices have been universally identified for effective monitoring of projects:

- Focus on progress against workplans and how activities and outputs feed into results (the bigger picture) including follow up;
- Good project design is a prerequisite for monitoring; a well set out logical framework matrix should help ensure that monitoring reports are concise and focus on indicators, and description of baselines and results anticipated;

²⁸ For more information on baselines see Annex 6.
• Pay attention to tracking the behaviour of the important risks and assumptions identified in the logframe;
• Good monitoring relies on regular visits and communication to verify and validate results as well as analysing problem areas. The project manager should ensure continuous documentation of the achievements and challenges as they occur and not wait until the last moment to try and recall the events at some later point in time;
• Monitoring data should be properly analysed on a regular basis and generation of lessons learned should be integrated and discussed with stakeholders in order to ensure learning, adaptation strategies and to avoid repeating mistakes;
• Use of participatory monitoring helps ensure commitment, ownership, follow-up and feedback on performance29;

71. UNEP distinguishes between internally and externally executed projects and the reporting requirements differ accordingly. Common to both categories of projects is the requirement that progress reports, final reports and self evaluations are submitted. For externally executed projects additional reporting is required as illustrated by the table below30.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Report type</th>
<th>Prepared by</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Preparation frequency/period</th>
<th>Submission</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Activity report</td>
<td>Cooperating agencies/Supporting organizations</td>
<td>(UNEP) Project manager</td>
<td>Annually for Jan-June/Due by 31 July (or as per Reporting cycle agreed with the donor)</td>
<td>To Project manager cc: CCS and QAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progress report</td>
<td>Project coordinator/Cooperating agencies/Supporting organizations</td>
<td>(UNEP) Project coordinator's supervisor/Project manager</td>
<td>Annually for Jan-Dec/ Due by 31 Jan. (or as per Reporting cycle agreed With the donor)</td>
<td>To division director cc: QAS and CCS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final report</td>
<td>Project coordinator/Cooperating agencies/Supporting organizations</td>
<td>(UNEP) Project coordinator's supervisor/Project manager</td>
<td>End of the project/Due within 60 days of completion</td>
<td>To division director cc: QAS and CCS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-evaluation fact sheets (EFS)</td>
<td>Project managers</td>
<td>(UNEP) Project manager</td>
<td>Annually on each current or completed project/by the end of January</td>
<td>To EOU cc: project manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quarterly financial report and cash advance statement</td>
<td>Cooperating agencies /Supporting organizations</td>
<td>(UNEP) Project manager</td>
<td>Quarterly report Due by 30 April, 31 July, 31 Oct, and 31 Jan.</td>
<td>To project manager cc: CCS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audited financial report</td>
<td>Supporting organizations</td>
<td>(UNEP) Project manager</td>
<td>Biannually by 30 June/ within 180 days of the completion of the project</td>
<td>To project manager cc: CCS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final statement of account</td>
<td>Cooperating agencies</td>
<td>(UNEP) Project manager</td>
<td>Annually by 15 February/ within 60 Days of the completion of the project</td>
<td>To project manager cc: CCS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inventory of non-expendable equipment (items over $1,500)</td>
<td>Project coordinator/Cooperating agencies/Supporting organizations</td>
<td>(UNEP) Project manager</td>
<td>Annually by 31 January and within 60 days of the completion of the project/ to be attached to the progress report</td>
<td>To project manager cc: CCS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

30 A full description of the different types of reports and their formats can be found in the UNEP project manual http://www.unep.org/pcmu/project_manual/Manual_chapters/monitoring_reporting.pdf
Financial monitoring

72. Quarterly financial reports should assess financial management and should be submitted by the cooperating agencies or supporting organisations to the Chief of the Corporate Services Section (CSS) UNEP. These reports should show the amount budgeted for the year against actual expenditures since the beginning of the year and separately, the unliquidated obligations.

73. In addition a statement of expenditures on cash provided by UNEP should be submitted to the Chief of CSS quarterly together with the project expenditure statement.

74. Financial management problems should be flagged by the fund management officers and reflected in mandatory project revisions at the end of the UNEP fiscal year. Biennial audited financial statements are a requirement for all externally executed projects.

75. Reports should present project expenditures in connection with implementation progress. In kind contributions should be systematically documented.

M&E roles and responsibilities – Institutional arrangements

76. The main responsibility for monitoring lies with the project coordinator. However, the executing agency also plays a vital role because it typically collects the necessary data in the countries of project execution. In UNEP, the Quality Assurance Section (QAS) is responsible for providing guidelines and overseeing the monitoring process. The Evaluation and Oversight Unit share the responsibility of carrying out terminal evaluations with the project managers and can, if requested and certain criteria are met, undertake mid-term evaluations\(^31\). In addition, EOU provides an analysis of the self evaluations through the Annual Evaluation Report. Projects can only be closed once all the reporting requirements have been met.

77. While the M&E responsibilities may vary from project to project some general guidelines can be provided as illustrated in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responsibilities of Major Players in Project M&amp;E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Executing Agency(ies)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Coordination of monitoring activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Coordinating training in collection and analysis of monitoring data for data collectors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• M&amp;E data collection and analysis (and periodic progress reports to project managers / project governance structures)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Maintenance of information management systems, including baseline data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Implementation of modifications as necessary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall Executing Agency (if different from local executing agency)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Coordination of M&amp;E if more than one local executing agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Preparation of progress reports, mid-term and final reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Supervision of M&amp;E personnel including recruitment and training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Statement of project expenditures by activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Recording of project co-financing and associated expenditures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Recording of in-kind contributions to project implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Disbursement records</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Procurement records</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Financial and technical audits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Ensuring feedback into project management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Dissemination of information and lessons learned to all other interest groups, both local and global</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{31}\) Criteria for determining whether EOU would undertake a mid-term evaluation are presented in Annex 2.
Responsibilities of Major Players in Project M&E

**UNEPE**
1. Supervision of project
5. Informal advisor to Executing Agency(ies)
6. Annual evaluation through (self assessment)
7. Decide on the nature and focus of the Mid-Term Review
8. Overall fiduciary responsibility - verify disbursement / procurement
9. Confirm accuracy and adequacy of reporting mechanisms
10. Preparation and oversight of independent Terminal Evaluations

UNEP has responsibility for all the above for internally executed projects.

**Establish an indicative M&E budget and plan**

78. An effective M&E system requires a specific and adequately financed M&E plan. The plan needs to identify what data is available from existing reliable sources and which data will be collected. It further needs to identify who needs to collect the data, at which locations, at what times, using which methods. UNEP projects should incorporate the full costs of M&E activities, including operational monitoring and the assessment of baselines. The budget for M&E should include the full costs of mid-term reviews and terminal evaluations. As a rough estimate, budget 2%–5% of total project costs for an independent terminal evaluation, a similar additional budget may be required where an independent mid-term review is anticipated (see table below). The cost of evaluations varies with the complexity of the project — a large complex multi-country project requiring more resources for evaluation than the norm.

79. The following guidelines are based on experience with evaluations in UNEP where one consultant is adequate:

- $15,000-20,000 desk evaluation;
- $20,000-30,000 in-depth evaluation (where a consultant will visit one or more countries with in a region);
- $30,000-40,000 per consultant for and in-depth evaluation with multi regional visits, and;
- $75,000-100,000 impact evaluation.

80. Approximate Evaluation costs in relation to the size/complexity of a project (larger projects may use a small evaluation team rather than a single evaluator).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total budget of project</th>
<th>Indicative evaluation cost</th>
<th>Evaluation cost as a % of total budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than $500,000</td>
<td>$15,000 - $20,000 (Desk)</td>
<td>3 to 4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$500,000 to $1,000,000</td>
<td>$20,000 – 30,000</td>
<td>2.5 to 6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,000,000 to 2,000,000</td>
<td>$30,000 – 40,000</td>
<td>1.5 % to 4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$2,000,000 – 4,000,000</td>
<td>$70,000 – 100,000</td>
<td>1.1 to 3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over $4,000,000</td>
<td>$140,000</td>
<td>Less than 3.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Since many projects are extended beyond the original time frame, the Evaluation and Oversight Unit recommends that evaluations be resourced generously at the time of the project design, as experience has shown that the costs of evaluations are likely to increase during the implementation—a budget that seemed generous at project start-up might not be adequate by the time of the evaluation, often due to inflationary increases in consulting fees, and operational costs (airfares and DSA). Best practice in project design would require an estimate based on current costs that is projected forward to the planned time of the evaluation activity, assuming annual inflationary cost increases of 4%.

---

**For the terminal evaluation of the project “Improved Health Outcomes Through Community-based Ecosystem Management: Building Capacity and Creating Local Knowledge in Communities” only 15,000 USD were budgeted for the evaluation. The project was multi-regional and covering countries in Asia, West-Africa, Middle East and Latin America and executed by an organisation in Canada. The project was designed between 2000 and 2001 and implemented between the end of 2001 and 2006. The Terminal Evaluation took place during the first half of 2007. Based on the minimum requirements for terminal evaluations in UNEP, it was very difficult to find a consultant who was willing to do the job and complete the necessary travel within the available budget. EOU requested the task manager to seek additional funding from unspent project funds in order to conduct this evaluation. The total cost of this evaluation was $22,100.**

---

### Type of M&E activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of M&amp;E activity</th>
<th>Responsible parties</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Inception workshop   | - Project Coordinator  
                        - UNEP |
| Inception report     | - Project Coordinator  
                        - UNEP |
| Collection of baseline information - Measurement of means of verification for project purpose indicators (ideally this should be completed prior to project inception) | - Project coordinator will oversee the hiring of specific studies and institutions, and delegate responsibilities to relevant team members |
| Measurement of Means of Verification for project Progress and Performance (measured on an annual basis) | - Oversight by Project Technical Advisor and Project Coordinator  
                                                                 - measurement by regional field officers and local implementing agency |
| Quarterly progress reports | - project team  
                              - UNEP Programme Officer |
| Steering committee meetings | - Project coordinator  
                              - UNEP Programme Officer |
| Technical reports    | - project team  
                        - hired consultants as needed |
| Mid-term review      | - UNEP Programme Officer  
                        - Project team  
                        - evaluation team |
| Final Report         | - Project team |
| Terminal evaluation  | UNEP Programme Officer  
                        - Evaluation and Oversight Unit  
                        - Project team  
                        - External consultants |
**Project Start Up**

82. During this phase, project staff are recruited and the project is inaugurated, often by a start up-workshop during which project management, monitoring and reporting requirements are clarified for all parties concerned. It is also common practice to review and update the logical framework matrix as well as to prepare an annual work plan. A logical extension of this work is to review and operationalise the M&E plan by, for example, consulting partner agencies and stakeholders.

83. In practice, this means that the project team identifies the information needed to guide the project strategy, ensure effective operations and meet reporting requirements.

84. The next step involves deciding what information to gather and analyse and how to include this in an M&E system. By making use of participatory methods the chances of creating a learning environment are increased. In connection to this it is important to note that participatory does not solely refer to direct beneficiaries but also encompasses donors and other key stakeholders.

85. Once all performance indicators have been agreed, data sources and methods to use for reporting on progress or lack hereof also need to be specified. A common problem for many projects is that they focus on data collection rather than knowledge generation.

**The following steps provide useful guidance for this process.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Steps</th>
<th>Key question to answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Data sample selection</td>
<td>Will a sample be necessary?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data collection</td>
<td>How are you going to find your information : by measuring, interviewing, group discussions, observing?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data recording</td>
<td>Who will use which formats to write visualise, record data and impressions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data storing</td>
<td>Where will data (raw and analysed) be stored, how and by whom?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Collation</td>
<td>Who will use what methods to group data into a logically ordered overview?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data analysis</td>
<td>Who will examine the data using what method to give them meaning and synthesise them into a coherent explanation of what happened and what needs to now be undertaken?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information feedback and dissemination</td>
<td>At what stages and using what means will information be shared with project and partner staff, preliminary stakeholders, steering committees and funding agencies?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


86. For M&E purposes a wide range of methods exists for gathering and analysing information. In many cases there will be a need to make use of a combination of methods and adapt them to the particular context. While it is beyond the scope of this manual to discuss data collection methods the example below provides a framework for organising your information.

| Overall objective | Conserve biodiversity in the productive Southern flank of the High Atlas through the sustainable use and revival of transhumance |

---

32 A more comprehensive description can be found at http://www.ifad.org/evaluation/guide/6/index.htm.
### Objectives Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specific Objective</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Participatory methods for data collection</th>
<th>When the data needs to be collected Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>incentives for sustaining biodiversity conservation and transhumance, demonstrated and applied</td>
<td>User fees collected on key sites (wells, revegetated pastures) through locally controlled collective system</td>
<td>Surveys of pastoralists conducted, semi-structured interviews/Focus groups, record keeping</td>
<td>During and at the end of project period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shepards applying conservation principles competitions</td>
<td>Semi-structured interviews/ focus group discussions</td>
<td>Beginning, during and at the end of project implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Diaries kept by pastoralists</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ballot boxes, evaluation wheel, record keeping, transect walks and maps</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

87. Projects are not static and as a consequence information needs and indicators might change during project implementation. However, changes to performance indicators at objective level are not normally permitted without prior approval from funding agencies.

88. Indicators can be reassessed by asking a simple question “Who will use the information”? If the answer is ‘nobody’ you should consider changing them. Likewise if you notice information gaps they should be filled.

### Implementing the M&E Plan

89. During this phase the project should start benefiting from a good M&E process which leads to adjustment of the project strategy, via reflection, steering committee meetings and supervision missions.

90. Special consideration should be given to communicating M&E results to different audiences such as steering committees, project and partner staff, and primary stakeholders. The purpose of communicating findings is to motivate stakeholders to action and to ensure accountability.
Stages of the evaluation process

91. The evaluation process can be categorised into three main stages namely (1) planning, (2) carrying out and (3) using the evaluation outcomes. The following section provides guidance for UNEP staff by documenting the key aspects of the evaluation process.

Planning the Evaluation

**Step one... Thinking through the focus of the evaluation**

92. EOU professional staff discusses the details of the evaluation with the project / task manager.

- What is the purpose of the planned evaluation?
- What are the key questions the evaluation should answer?
- Who should be involved in the evaluation? - other UNEP staff, partner institutions, other donor representatives, the direct beneficiaries of the project / programme?
- The timing of the evaluation? Mid-term evaluations should, ideally, be undertaken before the mid point of project implementation while Terminal evaluations should be conducted within six month of project completion. Impact evaluations will typically take place two or more years after project completion. Other considerations related to timing might include when key people will be available to be interviewed or to take part in the evaluation.
- What resources are available? - this may determine the scope of the evaluation.
- The scope and scale of the evaluation? - a desk study of the data produced by the project only? A desk study and interviews with key stakeholders? Visits to the field consulting a sample of stakeholders/or a full participatory evaluation involving meetings and interviews with direct beneficiaries at a number of different sites?
- What types of qualifications are required by the evaluator to undertake the evaluation? - technical/managerial, someone who knows the country context, someone who knows about UNEP policies and procedures, a gender specialist?
- Who are the target audiences? How can target audiences best be reached? What are the main messages?

**Step two.....Drafting the Terms of Reference**

93. It is the responsibility of the EOU, in consultation with the project / task manager and organisations involved with the project, to draft the Terms of Reference (ToRs) for the evaluation. The terms of reference lay down the expectations and requirements from the evaluation and represent the basis of the contract with the evaluators.

94. When drafting the ToR the focus should be on what is feasible to expect from the evaluator/evaluators within the given timeframe in order to avoid exceedingly ambitious evaluations. Evaluations can point to problems and make certain recommendations but it is unrealistic to expect that evaluations can solve all issues within a project. This is particularly important for impact evaluations where the evaluator will seek to attribute impact on the environment or poverty reduction to UNEP. Standard terms of reference include:
Check list for drafting Terms of Reference

1. Project Background and Overview: that summarises the broad intention background and context of the project.

2. Terms of Reference for the Evaluation
   1. Objectives and Scope of the Evaluation: principle level of focus (operational, impact, policy). The objective is formulated by asking questions pertaining to relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and performance. In addition, performance indicators can assist in establishing the evaluation questions (e.g. "has the project promoted installation of more than 750 photovoltaic solar home systems in the targeted districts?").
   2. Methods: normally, the evaluators are responsible for the research methods to be applied. It is however, advisable to describe the minimum expectations with respect to methods, for example interviews (who should be consulted), desk evaluation of project document (what documents are available) etc.

3. Project Evaluation Criteria
   For standard evaluations a number of evaluation criteria will be applied such as: attainment of objectives and planned results; assessment of sustainability of project results; catalytic role/replication; achievement of outputs and activities; assessment of monitoring and evaluation systems; assessment of processes that affected attainment of project results (preparation and readiness, country ownership/driverness, stakeholder involvement, financial planning, UNEP supervision and backstopping, co-financing and delays)

4. Evaluation Report Format and Review Procedures: structure and main contents of the evaluation report including how the evaluation will be reviewed. Submission of Final Evaluation Reports: who the final report will be sent to?

5. Resources and Schedule of the Evaluation: Deadlines are established for submission of draft and final reports that clarify the cost projections based on activities, time, numbers of people, professional fees, travel and other related costs. This section also specifies if field visits are required and the qualifications of the evaluator (education, experience, skills and abilities required to conduct the evaluations)

6. Schedule of payment

95. The ToRs for a terminal evaluation should specify that the evaluator assess the project / programme's compliance with any recommendations made in an independent mid-term evaluation or a project / programme-managed mid-term review.

96. Clearly written ToRs can prevent misunderstandings between the evaluator / evaluation team and UNEP EOU. It is therefore recommended that the ToR should be as tightly specified as possible at the start of the evaluation. EOU reviews any comments made on the draft ToRs and produces the final version.

   *Step three...Initial cost estimates — Is there sufficient money available to commission the evaluation?*

97. Projects should ordinarily have a budget allocation for evaluation. Where this is not the case the task/project manager should secure access to the financial resources required if the evaluation is to proceed. Budgeting for an evaluation depends upon the complexity of the project to be evaluated and the purpose of the exercise. These factors dictate the time frame and the number of evaluators needed.

98. Most projects, with a planned duration of over three years should, as a minimum, have budgeted for both a Mid-Term Review and a Terminal Evaluation.
99. The following elements are considered when developing the evaluation budget:

- Consultant’s fees: Duration of the evaluation and the required level of qualifications and experience of the consultant. An estimate of the number of consulting days required and the consultants’ daily remuneration rate is made. In certain complex evaluations, or in Joint Evaluations, one evaluator may not suffice.
- Travel: Distance to locations and number of sites to be visited, mode of transport and Daily Subsistence Allowance (DSA). For an initial budget estimate, the point of origin for consultant’s travel is assumed and indicative airfares estimated.
- Communication and dissemination: Editing, printing, postage, telephone calls, interpreters for field missions and translation services.
- The initial evaluation cost estimate is calculated and compared to the available financial resources. Where the available funds fall short, following actions are usually considered:
  - The task / project manager may attempt to secure additional financial resources
  - The scope of the evaluation / field visits conducted / consultancy fees offered may be reconsidered to bring the cost estimates in-line with available resources.

**Step four ....Selecting the Evaluator/Evaluation Team**

100. When the terms of reference and the budget are agreed, three or more suitable consultants for the evaluation will have to be identified.

101. EOU screens and makes the final decision on the selection of the evaluators. However, it is general practice for EOU to ask the project / task manager and other UNEP colleagues and institutions to make suggestions regarding possible candidate evaluators.

102. When selecting evaluation consultants it is important to ensure that:

i. the evaluators have not been involved with the project/programme design or its implementation; the evaluator has the technical and language skills required; and;

ii. the consultant has the required country/ regional and evaluation experience.

103. For complex evaluations where more than one evaluator is needed a team leader will normally be recruited in order to ensure that the primary responsibility for the evaluation is clear. The team leader will:

- work closely with the Evaluation and Oversight Unit and the project manager throughout the process to ensure the expectations are met
- manage the team to ensure all aspects of the ToRs are met
- oversee the preparation of the evaluation work plan
- oversee the data collection phase, in compliance with the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) norms and standards
- facilitate agreement amongst the team on the findings, conclusions and recommendations
- draw together the draft report and present it
- present the report at any workshop required and facilitate feedback

---

For further guidance please refer to the UNON interoffice Memorandum, new remuneration scale for consultants and individual contractors, 8th August 2005
• produce the final report, amended in response to comments

104. The duties of the team leader require a combination of technical skill in the area of evaluation and good interpersonal, management, writing and presentational skills.

105. UNEP EOU gives due consideration to local consultants and gender balance in its consultant evaluator selection processes. Once the selection process has been completed by EOU, the project / task manager and other stakeholders (as appropriate) are informed.

**Step five ...Preparing a final detailed evaluation cost estimate**

106. Once the evaluation team is selected the agreed consulting fee rates and travel costs can be finalised, DSA costs calculated and the final evaluation cost estimate prepared.

Example of a detailed evaluation cost estimate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consultant name</th>
<th>Daily rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>XXXXX</td>
<td>$450</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### A. Professional honorarium

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>days</th>
<th>rate</th>
<th>Total amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phase 1 - Preparation and Planning</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document Review and preparations</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$450</td>
<td>$1,350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phase 2 - Field Missions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bahamas</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$450</td>
<td>$2,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamaica</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$450</td>
<td>$2,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominican Republic</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$450</td>
<td>$2,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK Cambridge</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$450</td>
<td>$450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International travel</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$450</td>
<td>$1,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phase 3 - Report Writing</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft Reports</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$450</td>
<td>$2,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Report</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$450</td>
<td>$900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities Total</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td>$14,400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### B. Reimbursable Expenses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reimbursable Expenses</th>
<th>number</th>
<th>cost</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>International airfares</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bahamas</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamaica</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominican Republic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terminal fees</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>$100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home base</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>$150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local transport (field missions)</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To be taken care of by project in the field</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per diem (meals, accommodation and incidentals) UN rates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bahamas</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>$1,370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamaica</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>$990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominican Republic</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>$1,116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK Cambridge</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>396</td>
<td>$396</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Communications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communication (telephone, printing, photocopies, courier, internet access)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Visas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Visas</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Expenses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total activities and expenses</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total expenses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$24,822</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

107. The final cost estimate is reflected in the terms and conditions specified in the Special Services Agreement (SSA), prepared by UNON, which forms the contract between UNEP and the evaluation consultant.

**Step six …Organising the Logistics**

108. The Evaluation and Oversight Unit facilitates, in collaboration with the project / task manager and the executing organisation, the organisation of the actual logistics. It is important to bear in mind that organising the logistics, including UNON’s preparation of the contract for the consultant/consultants, can be very time consuming and should be prepared 2-3 months in advance of the start up of the evaluation.

109. It is the responsibility of the project / programme manager and the fund management officer (as appropriate) to:

- inform the project staff and key stakeholders about the evaluation scope, focus and schedule;
- assemble key documents for the consultants to review e.g. progress reports financial reports, technical outputs etc.;
- provide contact details to the evaluation consultant for key project staff and stakeholders;
- coordinate with the executing agency to make logistical arrangements for any evaluation field visits e.g. local transportation to access any field sites, and / or set up meetings with key project stakeholders;
- prepare any letters of invitation that may be required for the evaluator to obtain a visa / required travel authority.

**Step seven….. Briefing the Evaluation Team**

110. The Evaluation and Oversight Unit carefully plans an initial briefing session with the consultant/consultants. When possible the project manager participates in this briefing. At this briefing session the Evaluation and Oversight Unit as the contractor will clarify their expectations to the evaluation and point out areas that need special attention. This will typically include the sections related to attainment of objectives and immediate impact, sustainability, recommendations and lessons learned. EOU stresses that the evaluation report be ‘evidence-based’ and that key judgements on project performance, findings and recommendations should be supported by verifiable sources of information.
111. The contact points for communication on key issues during the evaluation will also be clarified during this briefing, these are summarised in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Contact point</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project finances</td>
<td>Project staff / UNEP Fund management Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical/substantive</td>
<td>Project staff / UNEP Project / Task Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logistical Issues</td>
<td>Project staff, Project/Programme Manager, UNEP EOU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation ToRs</td>
<td>UNEP EOU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation/submission of evaluation reports</td>
<td>UNEP EOU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractual Issues</td>
<td>UNEP EOU</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Carrying Out the Evaluation**

112. EOU and the project / task manager normally remain in contact with the evaluator at regular intervals during the evaluation field work and write-up.

**Step eight...Receiving the draft and providing comments**

113. For bigger and more complex evaluations the evaluator/evaluators may prepare interim reports at the end of a particular phase of the evaluation exercise. These may include presentations to stakeholder’s workshops to present the findings and receive feedback. Interim reporting is particularly valuable in preparing stakeholders for the presentation of any “unwelcome” findings and for encouraging interest in the final reports.

114. The evaluator reports primarily to EOU. The draft report should, therefore, always be sent to EOU first for an initial reading and discussion of the findings and conclusions. EOU provides guidance regarding the soundness of the methodology, substantiation of findings and conclusions, substantiation of ratings, the logic of the report write-up, assesses the level of feasibility and usefulness of the recommendations and lessons learnt presented. For terminal and mid-term evaluations, EOU rates the reports against specific criteria to ensure that the terms of reference have indeed been fulfilled and that the performance ratings are substantiated. The draft is then shared with the project manager and key project stakeholders who provide comments on factual mistakes and, if applicable, verify that the recommendations are feasible to implement. EOU provides consolidated comments to the report and guides the evaluator(s) in cases where the project manager or executing agency is in disagreement with the findings. EOU also processes the initial payment of the evaluator’s fee.

115. The deadline for the receipt of the draft evaluation report is laid out in the terms of reference and should allow for the draft report to be circulated to all the key project stakeholders for comment.

---

34 See Annex 4 for a detailed description of the quality assessment of the evaluation reports.
Step nine.....Receiving the Final Report

116. Once EOU is satisfied with the quality and the report conforms with the terms of reference the final payment is authorised. A good evaluation report communicates findings, lessons learned and recommendations clearly, accurately and appropriately, and while being an objective presentation of the project, ensures that the concerns and comments of the involved parties are correctly reflected.

117. The report elements presented below are standard and, except for self-evaluations, are applicable to all evaluations:

1. *Executive summary*: the executive summary is the essential part of the report for most stakeholders. It should be short and easily digestible and provide a brief overview of the main conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned of the evaluation e.g. purpose, context and coverage of the evaluation (1 paragraph), methods (1 paragraph), the main findings, lessons and recommendations in the the paragraphs to follow.

2. *Introduction or background*: gives a brief overview of the evaluated project for example, project logic and assumptions, status of activities, objective of the evaluation and questions to be addressed.

3. *Methods*: phases in the data collection (desk study, field visits etc.)
   a) reasons for selection of time in the life of the project, countries or case studies chosen for detailed examination
   b) how information is collected (use of questionnaires, official data, interviews, focus groups and workshops)
   c) limitations to the method and problems encountered such as key people not available for interview or documents not available

4. *Findings*: reports on the data (what happened and why, what actual results were achieved in relation to those intended, what positive or negative intended or unintended impact, what were the effects on target groups and others). All findings should, as far as possible, be supported by evidence.

5. *Conclusions*: gives the evaluator's concluding assessments of the project against evaluation criteria and standards of performance. The conclusion provides answers to questions about whether the project is considered successful or not.

6. *Lessons*: presents general conclusions, based on established good practices that have the potential for wider application and use. Lessons may also be derived from problems and mistakes. The context in which the lessons may be applied should be clearly specified, and lessons should always state or imply some prescriptive action. A lesson should be written such that experiences derived from the project could be applied in other projects.

7. *Recommendations*: suggest actionable proposals for stakeholders to rectify poor existing situations as well as recommendations concerning projects of similar nature. Prior to each recommendation, the issue(s) or problem(s) to be addressed by the recommendation should be clearly stated.

A high quality recommendation is an actionable proposal that is:

i. Feasible to implement within the timeframe and resources available
ii. Commensurate with the available capacities of project team and partners
iii. Specific in terms of who would do what and when
iv. Contains results-based language (i.e. a measurable performance target)
v. Includes a trade-off analysis, when its implementation may require utilizing significant resources that would otherwise be used for other project purposes.

8. **Annexes**: include Terms of Reference, list of interviewees, documents reviewed etc. Dissident views or management responses to the evaluation findings may later be appended in an annex.

**Follow up and Use of the Evaluation**

*Step ten...Responding to Recommendations and Reflecting on Lessons Learned*

118. EOU will, if applicable\(^{35}\) prepare an implementation plan for the recommendations. These plans represent the programme or project manager's commitment to ensure that the recommendations are implemented. For project evaluations, these plans are most relevant for mid term evaluations where there is still money and time left to implement the recommendations. There are five steps in the implementation and follow up:

- Evaluation and Oversight Unit prepares the project implementation plan indicating the findings and recommendations stated in the evaluation reports and sends it to the programme or project manager for completion;
- The programme or project manager indicates whether the recommendation is accepted or not, whether any action has already been taken to implement it, what actions will be taken and the corresponding deadline as well as the responsibility for implementation. The programme/project manager's reply constitutes a formal management response;
- Evaluation and Oversight Unit reviews the implementation plan and checks whether the recommendations have been addressed comprehensively and sends comments back, if needed;
- Evaluation and Oversight Unit monitors the progress made in completing the implementation plan every six months and reports to the Deputy Executive Director. Additionally, EOU reports on the implementation rate of recommendations through its Annual Evaluation Report

119. For terminal evaluations EOU encourages the evaluators to capture lessons learned.

120. EOU screens the lessons applying minimum quality standards based on lessons definitions and classifies the lessons in a problem tree framework.

**What constitutes a lesson**

121. A quality lesson must:

- concisely capture the context from which it is derived
- be applicable in a different context (generic), have a clear 'application domain' and identify target users
- should suggest a prescription and should guide action

122. The problem tree framework, which is set up as a database, is used as a tool for enhancing uptake, dissemination and access to UNEP evaluation lessons. However, it does not provide a definitive statement on causality and the categorisation of lessons in the framework is much less important than the process of discussion and debate with the project manager about such categorisation. The process of classifying lessons within the framework with the project managers provides an interactive means of promoting the uptake or influence as new lessons are examined within the context of all others.

\(^{35}\) In some cases where a project is coming to an end and there is no intention to continue the project it may not be appropriate to include recommendations that will be difficult to follow up on.
Step eleven.... Disseminating/publishing the report

123. All UNEP project evaluations that the Evaluation and Oversight Unit are involved in are published on the EOU web-page. In addition, the report is shared with all relevant stakeholder as identified by the project manager. A list of intended recipients of the evaluation is included in the annexes to the terms of reference.

124. Some evaluations of particular interest are also translated into other languages.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary of Evaluation roles and responsibilities</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UNEP programme or project manager</td>
<td>• Ensures that there is an adequate budget for M&amp;E;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Suggests potential candidates to undertake the evaluation;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Assists in the arrangement of the evaluation process by providing contact details of key stakeholders and facilitating any field missions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Liaises with the evaluators during the evaluation process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Collects and provides evaluator/evaluation team with relevant documents;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Reviews evaluation report, consulting with government and project team, ensuring accuracy of facts and technical quality and that recommendations are implementable;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• prepares management responses and convenes processes to follow up on recommendations and lessons learned.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation and Oversight Unit</td>
<td>• Determines the scope of the evaluation;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Drafts terms of reference for evaluation team;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Prepares annual evaluation work plan;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Conducts project/programme evaluations and special evaluation studies;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Finalizes terms of reference for evaluation team;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Selects consultants and handles recruitment and mission logistics;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Reviews evaluation report, consulting with the evaluator and the UNEP Programme or project manager, ensuring that the report meets the required minimum quality standards;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Determines the final performance ratings for project / programme evaluations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Provides guidance on evaluation management responses and assesses compliance with recommendations at regular intervals;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Based on lessons learned and recommendations provides analysis for management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Promotes uptake of evaluation findings, lessons and recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Disseminates evaluations reports and publicly discloses evaluations on the internet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluator/Evaluation Team</td>
<td>• Reviews TORs and asks for clarifications where there is doubt about what is expected;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Reviews documents and determines what methods to use to best address evaluation questions and ToRs;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Liaises with project-related personnel and project stakeholders and end-users to obtain information regarding project real/factual outcomes and impacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Plans and conducts any field missions required with the support of the project related personnel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Drafts evaluation report and awaits feedback;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Amends the draft and ensures satisfactory final evaluation report is delivered on time.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Annex 1. Criteria for a UNEP project or programme to be considered for an independent mid term evaluation.

The project must have a budget larger than $200,000 per annum and a minimum duration of three years.

CRITERIA FOR A GEF PROJECT TO BE CONSIDERED FOR AN INDEPENDENT MID TERM EVALUATION.

Currently, the GEF Portfolio Manager decides whether a project undergo a mid-term review or mid term evaluation.

Criteria

EOU suggest that for a project to be considered for an independent mid-term evaluation the answer to the first question or second question and at least one of the remaining three questions should be ‘yes’.

1. Has the project been rated by the PIR system as being ‘at risk’.

2. Is the project a ‘high profile’ project of key strategic importance to UNEP where potential ‘operational improvements’ stemming from the MTE can be captured by UNEP?

3. Is the project internally executed by UNEP?

4. Is the project being jointly implemented by two or more IA’s, or implemented by UNEP and executed by another GEF Agency?

5. Are there known conflicts (and serious differences of opinion) between the Task Manager and the Project Manager with respect to the workplan and focus of the project, the progress achieved and / or the rating of project performance.
Annex 2. Evaluation principles and procedures for jointly implemented GEF projects

Background

The Global Environment Facility Evaluation Office has set Guidelines for Terminal Evaluation of GEF-funded projects\(^\text{36}\). However, these guidelines do not provide detail on how evaluation processes are to be handled when projects are implemented jointly by one or more GEF Agencies. This document proposes guiding principles that may be generally applicable for the GEF and suggests a procedure that UNEP intends to follow in conducting independent Mid-Term and Terminal Evaluations of jointly implemented GEF projects.

The Principles and Procedures comply with the GEF M&E policy\(^\text{37}\) and the UNEG Norms and Standards\(^\text{38}\) for Evaluation and also take into account the fact that the evaluation functions (offices) of the GEF Agencies are organized differently, with different mandates and procedures.

Core Principles

1. The evaluation process / deliverables should be jointly planned, managed and reviewed by all GEF Agencies involved in project implementation. Representatives of each GEF Agency evaluation function will work together for this purpose. For ease of description, this small team is termed the Evaluation Coordination Team (ECT).

2. Where a project is jointly implemented by two or more GEF Agencies, the evaluation should be led, wherever possible, by a GEF Agency evaluation function that is mandated to undertake project evaluations, that works independently of project implementation, and has adequate project evaluation quality control processes in place. If more than one GEF Agency involved with the project has similar standing in this regard, then the GEF Agency evaluation functions concerned will agree on one agency to lead the evaluation.

3. Where a project has a GEF Agency acting as the executing agency for the project but another GEF agency has the project oversight mandate, then the evaluation function of this latter GEF agency will normally lead the evaluation. In no circumstance should the responsibility for management of a joint evaluation be delegated to an executing partner.

4. GEF Agency evaluation functions will independently and separately rate the performance of the joint GEF project on the basis of the evidence presented in the evaluation report.

5. GEF Agency Evaluation functions will independently and separately rate the quality of the evaluation report of the joint GEF project.

6. The Heads of the Evaluation Functions (or their nominated representatives) of all GEF Agencies involved in the joint GEF project will sign-off on the final evaluation report and its quality and project ratings assessment before onward transmission to the GEF Evaluation Office (Terminal Evaluations) or the GEF Secretariat (Mid-Term Evaluations).


7. Findings from joint evaluations will be fully disclosed.

**Evaluation Process Inception**

The ECT composition is defined by the GEF Agencies involved with the project. The financial resources available for the evaluation from the project, or from the GEF Agencies, are clarified. The desired scope and timing for the evaluation is established.

**TOR Development**

- The ECT jointly develops TORs for the evaluation. The agency leading the evaluation process would make a proposal by providing a set of draft TORs tailored to the specific details of the project to be evaluated.
- The proposal is sent to ECT members for comments and suggested revisions. An ECT teleconference is convened to reach a consensus on the draft TORs.
- Draft TORs are circulated to Executing Agencies / key project staff (and shared with the evaluation professionals of the executing agency(ies), where these exist), for technical inputs to the TORs.
- The ECT members consider comments and suggested revisions to the TORs. A teleconference is convened among ECT members to reach a consensus on the final TORs.
- Final TORs are circulated to GEF Agency and EA staff, the EA evaluation professionals (where applicable) and the GEF National Operational Focal point(s) for the country(ies) concerned.

**Budget agreement**

- An evaluation budget is prepared by the agency leading the evaluation using the details of the number of evaluators required, their likely fee rates, all mission-related travel costs, and operational expenses, in-line with the available resources. The budget is shared among the ECT and agreed.
- The ECT agrees on which Agency will contract the independent evaluator(s). Unless there are reasons to do otherwise, the lead evaluation function will contract the evaluator(s).

**Selection of Independent Evaluators**

- Technical staff of the Implementing and Executing Agencies of the project are encouraged to suggest possible evaluation candidates that match the skills and experience specified for the evaluator(s) in the final TORs.
- The ECT members also suggest evaluators drawn from their respective rosters of experts.
- The ECT members agree on the key selection criteria and identify the preferred candidate(s).
- The agreed GEF Agency contracts the independent evaluator(s).

**The Evaluation Process**

The independent evaluator(s) would, as a minimum, have an initial teleconference with the ECT. The evaluator(s) conduct their work in consultation with ECT members as necessary. The draft report is submitted as specified in the TORs. The ECT members then supply feedback for finalisation of the evaluation report (see review procedures below). The lead evaluator assesses the feedback received from the ECT reviews of the draft evaluation report and revises the report as necessary.

**Review of the draft Evaluation Report**

- The TORs specify that the draft evaluation report is delivered to all ECT members.
- The GEF Agency evaluation function leading the evaluation will forward the draft evaluation report to the technical EA and GEF Agency staff for their comment on matters of factual error or conclusions drawn that are based on factual errors. Comments from technical staff are sent to all ECT members only.
• The ECT agree on a sequence of reviews before feedback is provided to the evaluator so that the ECT comments are cumulative rather than duplicative. Each ECT member, in turn, provides suggested edits and comments on the draft evaluation report. In addition, they annotate the comments received from technical staff and provide guidance on them to the independent lead evaluator. Each GEF Agency completes their section of a consolidated 'Evaluation commentary' that rates the project based on the evidence presented in the draft evaluation report, and separately rates the quality of the draft evaluation report. The views of each GEF Agency evaluation function on project rating and report quality are recorded separately.

• An ECT teleconference is held to agree on the suggested edits to the report and the guidance to be given to the lead evaluator on the comments received from the technical IA and EA staff. The GEF Agency evaluation function leading the evaluation will consolidate the feedback provided by ECT members.

• The draft report with suggested edits, the comments from technical staff with ECT guidance to the lead evaluator, and the evaluation commentary are send by the lead evaluation function to the lead independent evaluator.

Review of the final Evaluation Report

• The ECT will agree on a sequence of review so that any comments are cumulative rather than duplicative. Each responsible ECT member, in turn, provides comments on the final evaluation report. Each GEF Agency updates their section a consolidated 'evaluation commentary' that rates the project based on the contents of the final evaluation report, and separately rates the quality of the final evaluation report. The views of each GEF Agency evaluation function on project rating and report quality are recorded separately.

• A final ECT teleconference is convened to finalise the report and the 'evaluation commentary' that represents the views of each GEF Agency on the project performance and quality of the evaluation report.

• The Heads of Evaluation for each GEF Agency (or their nominated representatives) sign-off on the final joint evaluation report and joint evaluation commentary.

Submission of the final Evaluation Report to the GEF

The agency leading the evaluation process will forward the final evaluation report to the GEF EO with a copy to the ECT members, the technical staff of the GEF Agencies involved with the project and the relevant GEF National Operational Focal points. The final evaluation report will be made publicly available.

Response and follow up to Recommendations

The TORs for joint evaluations will require that each recommendation made in an evaluation report must clearly identify the problem / issue it addresses and specify which actors/ agencies are required to respond and how. Recommendations should suggest a measurable performance target and a timeframe.

Where the actor(s) specified in the recommendation are directly involved in execution or oversight of the project the following will apply:

• A formal response to each evaluation recommendation will be required from the specified actors. Recommendations made in the final report will be either accepted or rejected by the agency / actor concerned. If a recommendation is accepted a plan to achieve compliance with the suggested action by a specified date is required.

• If a recommendation is rejected then a clear explanation must be given and an alternative proposal to deal with the problem /issue defined in the recommendation must be given. The alternative proposed action should define actors, timeframes and performance targets

• Where a recommendation requires joint action / response, agencies / actors will jointly agree on, or reject, a recommendation. All parties must be in agreement for a recommendation to be accepted.
The plan to achieve compliance must specify performance indicators and timeframes. Unless a performance target is shared, a separate performance target must be specified for each actor.

• If a recommendation for joint action is rejected by any of the actors then a clear explanation must be given and an alternative proposal for joint action to deal with the problem / issue, which is acceptable to all actors specified in the recommendation, must be given. The alternative proposed action should define timeframes and performance targets as above.

Where recommendations identify the GEF Secretariat, the GEF Evaluation Office might consider such recommendations and forward those consolidated from project evaluations as appropriate. Compliance with these recommendations would, perhaps, form part of the APR process.

Recommendation follow-up and reporting on compliance

When the ECT convenes to finalise the evaluation report, the responsibility for tracking compliance with each evaluation recommendation among the GEF Agency evaluation functions will be agreed upon. The compliance procedures used by each GEF Agency will then be followed. The ECT will determine the most appropriate GEF Agency to follow-up on compliance with recommendations requiring joint action.

Lessons Learned

When the ECT convenes to finalise the evaluation report the lessons learned from the evaluation will be discussed. Each GEF Agency evaluation function will be responsible for the further promotion and dissemination of lessons to their intended target audiences. Opportunities for synergism in this regard will be actively sought.
Annex 3. Sample terms of reference

Terminal Evaluation of the
UNEP GEF project “Building Sustainable Commercial Dissemination Networks for Household PV Systems in Eastern Africa”
Project Number GF/4040-04-22

PROJECT BACKGROUND AND OVERVIEW

Project rationale from the project document

Among companies, consumers, decision-makers and other stakeholders, a lack of understanding of the role solar PV in rural electrification and the dynamics required for a successful commercial market are major barriers to the development of the industry. The project seeks to demonstrate how properly developed linkages between companies, consumers and communities can result in self-perpetuating markets for solar technology. This will be achieved by strengthening private sector ability to supply PV systems through increased consumer awareness and by sharing experiences between commercial markets and projects in the region.

The project will build linkages between regional and country businesses, consumers and institutions as well as facilitate the increased involvement of international PV companies in the region by building awareness of potential markets, linking them with local players. Through promotion and training activities focused in target regions, the project will assist stakeholders to develop sustainable commercial supply chains linking major cities and rural consumers. Most critically, the project will leverage the much needed investment using new and existing financing avenues to growing companies to enable them to become sustainable enterprises.

The overall objective of the project was stated as ‘stimulate increased rural sales of PV by increasing consumer awareness and by sharing experiences between commercial markets and projects in region.’ For more information please refer to the projects’ website: www.esda.co.ke/gef-pvproject/index.html

Relevance to GEF Programmes

The project falls under GEF Operational Program 6: Removing barriers and Reducing Implementation Costs to adoption of Renewable Energy. The project will share successful commercial experiences and experiences of GEF PV projects (including UPPPRE Uganda, ERT World Bank Uganda, PVMTI Kenya, UNDP-GEF Tanzania and WB-GEF Ethiopia).’

Executing Arrangements

Energy for Sustainable Development, Africa implemented the project in conjunction with selected local consultants in each country. A project steering committee was formed to guide the project. It included representatives of Triodos Renewable Energy Development Fund, country representatives from the PV private sector, project management and Government officials. The steering committee received quarterly reports of project progress and was copied all monitoring and evaluation outputs. A full-time manager based at ESDA in Nairobi carried out day-to-day project management. This manager delegated work to consultants in each country. Consultants in each country were chosen based on competitive tender.
**Project Activities**

The project duration was initially 20 months starting October 2004 and ending June 2006, which was later revised and extended to be completed in December 2006, making a total duration of 26 months.

The project had a number of components and activities including:

- Management and Technical Support PV SHS Trade Fair and Project Kick Off Meeting
- Market Assessment in Target Regions of each Country
- Business Opportunity Awareness Raising, Business Assistance and Investments in Companies
- Technician and Sales Training
- Country PV Trade Fairs and Seminars
- Inter-Country Exchange Visits & Information Exchange
- Region-Based Awareness Raising and Promotional Campaigns
- Policy Workshops
- Finance Workshops
- Monitoring and Evaluation

**Budget**

The total budget was US$ 1,233,230 with US$ 693,600 funded by the GEF Trust Fund and in-kind co-funding from; Triodos Renewable Energy for Development Fund US$449,450 University of Hawaii US$ 75,000, Company contributions US$ 90,180.

**TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR THE EVALUATION**

**Objective and Scope of the Evaluation**

The objective of this terminal evaluation is to examine the extent and magnitude of any project impacts to date and determine the likelihood of future impacts. The evaluation will also assess project performance and the implementation of planned project activities and planned outputs against actual results.

The evaluation will focus on the following main questions:

- Has the project:
  - Helped establish an operational commercial delivery route between the capital city and one rural district of each country? - including:
    - at least one national importer?,
    - several dealers in the target district?,
    - at least ten technicians and sales agents in the target district?,
    - interested community development NGOs?
    - interested micro-finance groups? and
    - hundreds of potential PV customers?
  - Educated PV businesses in cities of each countries that are actively seeking to develop commercial rural markets?
  - Created a network of influential policy makers who are aware of the necessity of including PV in rural electrification plans and will actively lobby for such plans.
  - Increased participation by international PV companies in the PV markets of Uganda, Tanzania, Eritrea and Ethiopia?
  - Promoted, as a direct result of project activities, installation of more than 750 PV solar home systems in the targeted districts, and a measurable growth in the rural PV sales in Uganda, Tanzania, Eritrea and Ethiopia. Five years after the project, we expect that 3000 systems will have been installed in the 5 districts?
Methods

This terminal evaluation will be conducted as an in-depth evaluation using a participatory approach whereby the UNEP/DGEF Task Manager, key representatives of the executing agencies and other relevant staff are kept informed and regularly consulted throughout the evaluation. The consultant will liaise with the UNEP/EOU and the UNEP/DGEF Task Manager on any logistic and/or methodological issues to properly conduct the review in as independent a way as possible, given the circumstances and resources offered. The draft report will be circulated to UNEP/DGEF Task Manager, key representatives of the executing agencies and the UNEP/EOU. Any comments or responses to the draft report will be sent to UNEP / EOU for collation and the consultant will be advised of any necessary revisions.

The findings of the evaluation will be based on the following:

- A desk review of project documents including, but not limited to:
  - The project documents, outputs, monitoring reports (such as progress and financial reports to UNEP and GEF annual Project Implementation Review reports) and relevant correspondence.
  - Review of specific products including the final reports from country executing agencies, workshop proceedings, etc.
  - Notes from the Steering Group meetings.
  - Other project-related material produced by the project staff or partners.

- Interviews with project management and technical support staff. Field visits to Jimma (Ethiopia), Rakai (Uganda), Iringa (Tanzania) will be undertaken in this connection.

- Interviews and Telephone interviews with intended users for the project outputs and other stakeholders involved with this project, including in the participating countries and international bodies. As appropriate, these interviews could be combined with an email questionnaire.

- The Consultant shall seek additional information and opinions from representatives of National Standards Bureaus, National and/or local Micro Finance Institutions, relevant (rural electrification) Government agencies by e-mail, through telephone communication, or by actual meetings.

- Interviews with the UNEP/DGEF project task manager and Fund Management Officer, and other relevant staff in UNEP dealing with Climate Change related activities as necessary. The Consultant shall also gain broader perspectives from discussions with relevant GEF Secretariat staff.

Key Evaluation principles

In attempting to evaluate any outcomes and impacts that the project may have achieved, evaluators should remember that the project’s performance should be assessed by considering the difference between the answers to two simple questions “what happened?” and “what would have happened anyway?”. These questions imply that there should be consideration of the baseline conditions and trends in relation to the intended project outcomes and impacts. In addition it implies that there should be plausible evidence to attribute such outcomes and impacts to the actions of the project.

Sometimes, adequate information on baseline conditions and trends is lacking. In such cases this should be clearly highlighted by the evaluator, along with any simplifying assumptions that were taken to enable the evaluator to make informed judgements about project performance.

Project Evaluation Parameters

Attainment of objectives and planned results. The assessment of project results seeks to determine the extent to which the project objectives were achieved, or are expected to be achieved, and assess if the project has led to any other positive or negative consequences. While assessing a project’s out-
comes the evaluation will seek to determine the extent of achievement and shortcomings in reaching the project’s objectives as stated in the project document and also indicate if there were any changes and whether those changes were approved. As the project did not establish an elaborate baseline (initial conditions), the evaluator should seek to estimate the baseline condition so that achievements and results can be properly established (or simplifying assumptions used). Since most GEF projects can be expected to achieve the anticipated outcomes by project closing, assessment of project outcomes should be a priority. Outcomes are the likely or achieved short-term and medium-term effects of an intervention’s outputs. Examples of outcomes could include but are not restricted to stronger institutional capacities, higher public awareness (when leading to changes of behaviour), and transformed policy frameworks or markets. The evaluation should assess the extent to which the project’s major relevant objectives were effectively and efficiently achieved or are expected to be achieved and their relevance.

- **Effectiveness**: Evaluate how, and to what extent, the stated project objectives have been met, taking into account the “achievement indicators” specified in the project document and logical framework. In particular, the analysis of outcomes achieved should include, inter alia, an assessment of whether and to what extent the results of this project have informed national, regional or international processes such as greenhouse gas inventories, the IPCC or others.

- **Relevance**: In retrospect, were the project’s outcomes consistent with the focal areas/operational program strategies and country priorities? The evaluation should also assess the whether outcomes specified in the project document and or logical framework are actually outcomes and not outputs or inputs.

- **Efficiency**: Cost-effectiveness assesses the achievement of the environmental and developmental objectives as well as the project’s outputs in relation to the inputs, costs, and implementing time. Include an assessment of outcomes in relation to inputs, costs, and implementation times based on the following questions: Was the project cost-effective? Was the project the least cost option? Was the project implementation delayed and if it was then did that affect cost-effectiveness? The evaluation should assess the contribution of cash and in-kind co-financing to project implementation and to what extent the project leveraged additional resources. Comparisons of the cost-time vs. outcomes relationship of the project with that of other similar projects should be made if feasible.

**Assessment of Sustainability of project outcomes:**

Sustainability is understood as the probability of continued long-term project-derived outcomes and impacts after the GEF project funding ends. The evaluation will identify and assess the key conditions or factors that are likely to contribute or undermine the persistence of benefits after the project ends. Some of these factors might be outcomes of the project, e.g. stronger institutional capacities or better informed decision-making. Other factors will include contextual circumstances or developments that are not outcomes of the project but that are relevant to the sustainability of outcomes. The evaluation should ascertain to what extent follow-up work has been initiated and how project outcomes will be sustained and enhanced over time. In this case, sustainability will be linked to the continued use and influence of scientific models and scientific findings, produced by the project.

Four aspects of sustainability should be addressed: financial, socio-political, institutional frameworks and governance, and ecological (if applicable) The following questions provide guidance on the assessment of these aspects:

- **Financial resources.** To what extent are the outcomes of the project dependent on continued financial support? What is the likelihood that any required financial resources will be available to sus-

---

39 In case in the original or modified expected outcomes are merely outputs/inputs then the evaluators should assess if there were any real outcomes of the project and if yes then whether these are commensurate with the realistic expectations from such projects.
tain the project outcomes/benefits once the GEF assistance ends (resources can be from multiple sources, such as the public and private sectors, income generating activities, and market trends that support the project’s objectives)? Was the project was successful in identifying and leveraging co-financing?

- **Socio-political:** To what extent are the outcomes of the project dependent on socio-political factors? What is the likelihood that the level of stakeholder ownership will allow for the project outcomes/benefits to be sustained? Is there sufficient public/stakeholder awareness in support of the long term objectives of the project?

- **Institutional framework and governance.** To what extent are the outcomes of the project dependent on issues relating to institutional frameworks and governance? What is the likelihood that institutional and technical achievements, legal frameworks, policies and governance structures and processes will allow for, the project outcomes/benefits to be sustained? While responding to these questions consider if the required systems for accountability and transparency and the required technical know-how are in place.

- **Ecological.** Are there any environmental risks that can undermine the future flow of project environmental benefits? The TE should assess whether certain activities in the project area will pose a threat to the sustainability of the project outcomes.

As far as possible, also assess the potential longer-term impacts considering that the evaluation is taking place upon completion of the project and that longer term impact is expected to be seen in a few years time. Frame any recommendations to enhance future project impact in this context. Which will be the major ‘channels’ for longer term impact from the project at the national and international scales? The evaluation should formulate recommendations that outline possible approaches and necessary actions to facilitate an impact assessment study in a few years time.

**Catalytic role.** The terminal evaluation will also describe any catalytic or replication effect of the project. What examples are there of replication and catalytic outcomes that suggest increased likelihood of sustainability? Replication approach, in the context of GEF projects, is defined as lessons and experiences coming out of the project that are replicated or scaled up in the design and implementation of other projects. Replication can have two aspects, replication proper (lessons and experiences are replicated in different geographic area) or scaling up (lessons and experiences are replicated within the same geographic area but funded by other sources). If no effects are identified, the evaluation will describe the catalytic or replication actions that the project carried out. No ratings are requested for the catalytic role.

**Achievement of outputs and activities:**

- Delivered outputs: Assessment of the project’s success in producing each of the programmed outputs, both in quantity and quality as well as usefulness and timeliness.
- Assess the soundness and effectiveness of the methods and approached used by the project.

**Assessment of Monitoring and Evaluation Systems:**

- **M&E design.** Did the project have a sound M&E plan to monitor results and track progress towards achieving project objectives? The Terminal Evaluation will assess whether the project met the minimum requirements for project design of M&E and the application of the Project M&E plan (Minimum requirements are specified in Annex 4). The evaluation shall include an assessment of the quality, application and effectiveness of project monitoring and evaluation plans and tools, including an

---

40 For example, construction of dam in a protected area could inundate a sizable area and thereby neutralizing the biodiversity related gains made by the project or, a newly established pulp mill might jeopardise the viability of nearby protected forest areas by increasing logging pressures.
assessment of risk management based on the assumptions and risks identified in the project document. The M&E plan should include a baseline (including data, methodology, etc.), SMART (see Annex 4) indicators and data analysis systems, and evaluation studies at specific times to assess results. The time frame for various M&E activities and standards for outputs should have been specified.

- **M&E plan implementation.** Was an M&E system in place and did it facilitate tracking of results and progress towards projects objectives throughout the project implementation period. Were Annual project reports complete, accurate and with well justified ratings? Was the information provided by the M&E system used during the project to improve project performance and to adapt to changing needs? Did the Projects have an M&E system in place with proper training for parties responsible for M&E activities to ensure data will continue to be collected and used after project closure?

- **Budgeting and Funding for M&E activities.** Were adequate budget provisions made for M&E made and were such resources made available in a timely fashion during implementation?

- **Long-term Monitoring.** Is long-term monitoring envisaged as an outcome of the project? If so, comment specifically on the relevance of such monitoring systems to sustaining project outcomes and how the monitoring effort will be sustained.

- **Assessment of processes that affected attainment of project results.**

  The evaluation will consider, but need not be limited to, consideration of the following issues that may have affected project implementation and attainment of project results:

  - **Preparation and readiness.** Were the project’s objectives and components clear, practicable and feasible within its timeframe? Were capacities of the executing institutions and counterparts properly considered when the project was designed? Were lessons from other relevant projects properly incorporated in design? Were the partnership arrangements properly identified and the roles and responsibilities negotiated prior to implementation? Was availability of counterpart resources (funding, staff, and facilities), passage of enabling legislation, and adequate project management arrangements in place at project entry?

  - Ascertain to what extent the project implementation mechanisms outlined in the project document have been closely followed. In particular, assess the role of the various committees established and whether the project document was clear and realistic to enable effective and efficient implementation, whether the project was executed according to the plan and how well the management was able to adapt to changes during the life of the project to enable the implementation of the project.

  - Evaluate the effectiveness and efficiency and adaptability of project management and the supervision of project activities/project execution arrangements at all levels (1) policy decisions: Steering Group; (2) day to day project management: (3) GEF guidance: UNEP DGEF.

- **Country ownership/Drivenness.** This is the relevance of the project to national development and environmental agendas, recipient country commitment, and regional and international agreements. Examples of possible evaluative questions include: Was the project design in-line with the national sectoral and development priorities and plans? Are project outcomes contributing to national development priorities and plans? Were the relevant country representatives, from government and civil society, involved in the project? Did the recipient government maintain its financial commitment to the project? Have the government approved policies or regulatory frameworks been in-line with the project’s objectives? Specifically the evaluation will:

  - Assess the level of country ownership, and whether the project was effective in providing and communicating information and tools that assisted governments in promoting household PV systems.

  - Assess the level of country commitment to promoting the use of household PV systems.
**Stakeholder involvement.** Did the project involve the relevant stakeholders through information sharing, consultation and by seeking their participation in project’s design, implementation, and monitoring and evaluation? For example, did the project implement appropriate outreach and public awareness campaigns? Did the project consult and make use of the skills, experience and knowledge of the appropriate government entities, NGOs, community groups, private sector, local governments and academic institutions in the design, implementation and evaluation of project activities? Were perspectives of those that would be affected by decisions, those that could affect the outcomes and those that could contribute information or other resources to the process taken into account while taking decisions? Were the relevant vulnerable groups and the powerful, the supporters and the opponents, of the processes properly involved? Specifically the evaluation will:

- Assess the mechanisms put in place by the project for identification and engagement of stakeholders in each participating country and establish, in consultation with the stakeholders, whether this mechanism was successful, and identify its strengths and weaknesses.
- Assess the degree and effectiveness of collaboration/interactions between the various project partners and institutions during the course of implementation of the project.
- Assess the degree and effectiveness of any various public awareness activities that were undertaken during the course of implementation of the project.

**Financial planning.** Did the project have the appropriate financial controls, including reporting and planning, that allowed management to make informed decisions regarding the budget and allowed for timely flow of funds. Specifically, the evaluation should:

- Assess the strength and utility of financial controls, including reporting, and planning to allow the project management to make informed decisions regarding the budget and allow for a proper and timely flow of funds for the payment of satisfactory project deliverables throughout the project’s lifetime.
- Present the major findings from the financial audit if one has been conducted.
- Did promised co-financing materialize? Identify and verify the sources of co-financing as well as leveraged and associated financing (in co-operation with the IA and EA).
- Assess whether the project has applied appropriate standards of due diligence in the management of funds and financial audits.
- The evaluation should also include a breakdown of final actual project costs by activities compared to budget (variances), financial management (including disbursement issues), and co-financing. This information will be prepared by the relevant DGEF Fund Management Officer of the project for scrutiny by the evaluator (table attached in Annex 1 Co-financing and leveraged resources).

**UNEP Supervision and backstopping.** Did UNEP Agency staff identify problems in a timely fashion and accurately estimate its seriousness? Did UNEP staff provide quality support and advice to the project, approved modifications in time and restructure the project when needed? Did UNEP and Executing Agencies provide the right staffing levels, continuity, skill mix, frequency of field visits?

**Co-financing and Project Outcomes & Sustainability.** If there was a difference in the level of expected co-financing and actual co-financing, then what were the reasons for this? Did the extent of materialization of co-financing affect the project’s outcomes and/or sustainability, and if it did affect outcomes and sustainability then in what ways and through what causal linkages?

**Delays and Project Outcomes & Sustainability.** If there were delays in project implementation and completion, the evaluation will summarise the reasons for them. Did delays affect the project’s outcomes and/or sustainability, and if so in what ways and through what causal linkages?

The **ratings will be presented in the form of a table** with each of the categories rated separately and with **brief justifications for the rating** based on the findings of the main analysis. An overall rating for the project should also be given. The rating system to be applied is specified in Annex 1:
**Evaluation report format and review procedures**

The report should be brief, to the point and easy to understand. It must explain the purpose of the evaluation, exactly what was evaluated and the methods used. The report must highlight any methodological limitations, identify key concerns and present evidence-based findings, consequent conclusions, recommendations and lessons. The report should provide information on when the evaluation took place, the places visited, who was involved and be presented in a way that makes the information accessible and comprehensible. The report should include an executive summary that encapsulates the essence of the information contained in the report to facilitate dissemination and distillation of lessons.

Evidence, findings, conclusions and recommendations should be presented in a complete and balanced manner. The evaluation report shall be written in English, be of no more than 50 pages (excluding annexes), use numbered paragraphs and include:

- **An executive summary** (no more than 3 pages) providing a brief overview of the main conclusions and recommendations of the evaluation;
- **Introduction and background** giving a brief overview of the evaluated project, for example, the objective and status of activities;
- **Scope, objective and methods** presenting the evaluation’s purpose, the evaluation criteria used and questions to be addressed;
- **Project Performance and Impact** providing factual evidence relevant to the questions asked by the evaluator and interpretations of such evidence. This is the main substantive section of the report and should provide a commentary on all evaluation aspects (A – F above).
- **Conclusions and rating** of project implementation success giving the evaluator’s concluding assessments and ratings of the project against given evaluation criteria and standards of performance. The conclusions should provide answers to questions about whether the project is considered good or bad, and whether the results are considered positive or negative;
- **Lessons learned** presenting general conclusions, based on established good practices that have the potential for wider application and use. Lessons may also be derived from problems and mistakes. The context in which lessons may be applied should be clearly specified, and lessons should always state or imply some prescriptive action. A lesson should be written such that experiences derived from the project could be applied in other projects or at portfolio level;
- **Recommendations** suggesting actionable proposals for stakeholders to rectify poor existing situations as well as recommendations concerning projects of similar nature. In general, Terminal Evaluations are likely to have very few (only two or three) actionable recommendations;
- **Annexes** include Terms of Reference, list of interviewees, documents reviewed, brief summary of the expertise of the evaluator / evaluation team, a summary of co-finance information etc. Dissident views or management responses to the evaluation findings may later be appended in an appendix.

Examples of UNEP GEF Terminal Evaluation Reports are available at [www.unep.org/eou](http://www.unep.org/eou)

**Review of the Draft Evaluation Report**

Draft reports submitted to UNEP EOU are shared with the corresponding Programme or Project Officer and his or her supervisor for initial review and consultation. The DGEF staff and senior Executing Agency staff are allowed to comment on the draft evaluation report. They may provide feedback on any errors of fact and may highlight the significance of such errors in any conclusions. The consultation also seeks agreement on the findings and recommendations. UNEP EOU collates the review comments and provides them to the evaluators for their consideration in preparing the final version of the report.

All UNEP GEF Evaluation Reports are subject to quality assessments by UNEP EOU. These incorporate GEF Office of Evaluation quality assessment criteria and are used as a tool for providing structured feedback to the evaluator (see Annex 3).
Submission of Final Terminal Evaluation Reports.

The final report shall be submitted in electronic form in MS Word format and should be sent to the following persons:

Segbedzi Norgbey, Chief, Evaluation and Oversight Unit
UNEP, P.O. Box 30552-00100
Nairobi, Kenya
Tel.: (254-20) 7624181
Fax: (254-20) 7623158
Email: segbedzi.norgbey@unep.org

With a copy to:

Shafqat Kakakhel, Officer-in-Charge
UNEP/Division of GEF Coordination
P.O. Box 30552-00100
Nairobi, Kenya
Tel: + 254-20-7624686
Fax: + 254-20-7624041/4042

Peerke De Bakker
Task Manager, Climate Change
United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP)
Division of GEF Coordination (DGEF)
PO Box 30552-00100
Nairobi, Kenya
Tel: 254 20 7623967
Fax: 254 20 7624041/2
Email: Peerke.Debakker@unep.org

Catherine Vallee
UNEP/GEF SPO Climate Change
United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP)
Division of GEF Coordination (DGEF)
PO Box 30552-00100
Nairobi, Kenya
Tel: 254 20 7625076
Fax: 254 20 7624041/2
Email: catherine.vallee@unep.org

The final evaluation report will be printed in hard copy and published on the Evaluation and Oversight Unit’s web-site www.unep.org/eou. Subsequently, the report will be sent to the GEF Office of Evaluation for their review, appraisal and inclusion on the GEF website.

Resources and schedule of the evaluation

This final evaluation will be undertaken by an international evaluator contracted by the Evaluation and Oversight Unit, UNEP. The contract for the evaluator will begin on May 1 2007 and end on July 31 2007 (30 days spread over 13 weeks (22 days of travel, to Ethiopia – 5 days, Uganda – 5 days, Tanzania – 5 days, Nairobi – 2 days briefing and 2 days debriefing, 3 days of travel and 8 days desk study). The evaluator will submit a draft report on July 15 2007 to UNEP/EOU, the UNEP/DGEF Task Manager, and key representatives of the executing agencies. Any comments or responses to the draft report will be sent to UNEP / EOU for collation and the consultant will be advised of any necessary revisions. Comments to the final draft
report will be sent to the consultant by July 22, 2007 after which, the consultant will submit the final report no later than July 31, 2007.

The evaluator will after an initial telephone briefing with EOU and UNEP/GEF travel to Nairobi, Kenya and meet with UNEP DGEF Task Manager and project staff of the Executing Agency at the beginning of the evaluation. Furthermore, the evaluator is expected to travel capitals and project areas in Ethiopia (Addis Ababa), Uganda (Kampala) and Tanzania (Dar-es-Salam) and meet with representatives of the national project executing agencies, PV dealers (in the capital and project areas) as well as end users.

In accordance with UNEP/GEF policy, all GEF projects are evaluated by independent evaluators contracted as consultants by the EOU. The evaluators should have the following qualifications:

The evaluator should not have been associated with the design and implementation of the project. The evaluator will work under the overall supervision of the Chief, Evaluation and Oversight Unit, UNEP. The evaluator should be an international expert with extensive experience in PV Solar Home System Project management, PV SHS system component quality standards and system design, codes of practice for PV installations, Financial Assessment of SHS end user financing as well as project financial administration.

Knowledge of UNEP programmes and GEF activities is desirable. Fluency in oral and written English is a must.

Schedule of Payment

The consultant shall select one of the following two contract options:

Lump-Sum Option

The evaluator will receive an initial payment of 30% of the total amount due upon signature of the contract. A further 30% will be paid upon submission of the draft report. A final payment of 40% will be made upon satisfactory completion of work. The fee is payable under the individual Special Service Agreement (SSA) of the evaluator and is inclusive of all expenses such as travel, accommodation and incidental expenses.

Fee-only Option

The evaluator will receive an initial payment of 40% of the total amount due upon signature of the contract. Final payment of 60% will be made upon satisfactory completion of work. The fee is payable under the individual SSAs of the evaluator and is NOT inclusive of all expenses such as travel, accommodation and incidental expenses. Ticket and DSA will be paid separately.

In case the evaluator cannot provide the products in accordance with the TORs, the timeframe agreed, or his products are substandard, the payment to the evaluator could be withheld, until such a time the products are modified to meet UNEP’s standard. In case the evaluator fails to submit a satisfactory final product to UNEP, the product prepared by the evaluator may not constitute the evaluation report.
Annex 1. OVERALL RATINGS TABLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Evaluator’s Summary Comments</th>
<th>Evaluator’s Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attainment of project objectives and results (overall rating)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub criteria (below)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficiency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability of Project outcomes (overall rating)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub criteria (below)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socio Political</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional framework and governance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecological</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement of outputs and activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring and Evaluation (overall rating)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub criteria (below)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M&amp;E Design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M&amp;E Plan Implementation (use for adaptive management)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budgeting and Funding for M&amp;E activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catalytic Role</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation and readiness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country ownership/driveness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholders involvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNEP Supervision and backstopping</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Overall Rating**

**RATING OF PROJECT OBJECTIVES AND RESULTS**

Highly Satisfactory (HS): The project had no shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives, in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency.

Satisfactory (S): The project had minor shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives, in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency.

Moderately Satisfactory (MS): The project had moderate shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives, in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency.

Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): The project had significant shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives, in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency.

Unsatisfactory (U): The project had major shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives, in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency.

Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): The project had severe shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives, in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency.

**Please note:** Relevance and effectiveness will be considered as critical criteria. The overall rating of the project for achievement of objectives and results may not be higher than the lowest rating on either of these two criteria. Thus, to have an overall satisfactory rating for outcomes a project must have at least satisfactory ratings on both relevance and effectiveness.
RATINGS ON SUSTAINABILITY

• Sustainability will be understood as the probability of continued long-term outcomes and impacts after the GEF project funding ends. The Terminal evaluation will identify and assess the key conditions or factors that are likely to contribute or undermine the persistence of benefits after the project ends. Some of these factors might be outcomes of the project, i.e. stronger institutional capacities, legal frameworks, socio-economic incentives /or public awareness. Other factors will include contextual circumstances or developments that are not outcomes of the project but that are relevant to the sustainability of outcomes.

Rating system for sustainability sub-criteria
On each of the dimensions of sustainability of the project outcomes will be rated as follows.
Likely (L): There are no risks affecting this dimension of sustainability.
Moderately Likely (ML): There are moderate risks that affect this dimension of sustainability.
Moderately Unlikely (MU): There are significant risks that affect this dimension of sustainability.
Unlikely (U): There are severe risks that affect this dimension of sustainability.

All the risk dimensions of sustainability are critical. Therefore, overall rating for sustainability will not be higher than the rating of the dimension with lowest ratings. For example, if a project has an Unlikely rating in either of the dimensions then its overall rating cannot be higher than Unlikely, regardless of whether higher ratings in other dimensions of sustainability produce a higher average.

RATINGS OF PROJECT M&E

Monitoring is a continuing function that uses systematic collection of data on specified indicators to provide management and the main stakeholders of an ongoing project with indications of the extent of progress and achievement of objectives and progress in the use of allocated funds. Evaluation is the systematic and objective assessment of an on-going or completed project, its design, implementation and results. Project evaluation may involve the definition of appropriate standards, the examination of performance against those standards, and an assessment of actual and expected results.

The Project monitoring and evaluation system will be rated on ‘M&E Design’, ‘M&E Plan Implementation’ and ‘Budgeting and Funding for M&E activities’ as follows:

Highly Satisfactory (HS): There were no shortcomings in the project M&E system.
Satisfactory(S): There were minor shortcomings in the project M&E system.
Moderately Satisfactory (MS): There were moderate shortcomings in the project M&E system.
Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): There were significant shortcomings in the project M&E system.
Unsatisfactory (U): There were major shortcomings in the project M&E system.
Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): The Project had no M&E system.

“M&E plan implementation” will be considered a critical parameter for the overall assessment of the M&E system. The overall rating for the M&E systems will not be higher than the rating on “M&E plan implementation.”
All other ratings will be on the GEF six point scale.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GEF Performance Description</th>
<th>Alternative description on the same scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HS = Highly Satisfactory</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S = Satisfactory</td>
<td>Well above average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS = Moderately Satisfactory</td>
<td>Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MU = Moderately Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>Below Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U = Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HU = Highly Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>Very poor (Appalling)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Annex 2. Co-financing and Leveraged Resources

Co-financing (basic data to be supplied to the consultant for verification)

* Other is referred to contributions mobilized for the project from other multilateral agencies, bilateral development cooperation agencies, NGOs, the private sector and beneficiaries.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Co financing (Type/Source)</th>
<th>IA own Financing (mill US$)</th>
<th>Government (mill US$)</th>
<th>Other* (mill US$)</th>
<th>Total (mill US$)</th>
<th>Total Disbursement (mill US$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Planned</td>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>Planned</td>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>Planned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loans/Concessional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(compared to market rate)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equity investments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-kind support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (*)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Leveraged Resources

Leveraged resources are additional resources—beyond those committed to the project itself at the time of approval—that are mobilized later as a direct result of the project. Leveraged resources can be financial or in-kind and they may be from other donors, NGO’s, foundations, governments, communities or the private sector. Please briefly describe the resources the project has leveraged since inception and indicate how these resources are contributing to the project’s ultimate objective.

Table showing final actual project expenditure by activity to be supplied by the UNEP Fund management Officer and included as a part of annex II.

Annex 3

Review of the Draft Report

Draft reports submitted to UNEP EOU are shared with the corresponding Programme or Project Officer and his or her supervisor for initial review and consultation. The DGEF staff and senior Executing Agency
staff provide comments on the draft evaluation report. They may provide feedback on any errors of fact and may highlight the significance of such errors in any conclusions. The consultation also seeks agreement on the findings and recommendations. UNEP EOU collates the review comments and provides them to the evaluators for their consideration in preparing the final version of the report. General comments on the draft report with respect to compliance with these TOR are shared with the reviewer.

Quality Assessment of the Evaluation Report

All UNEP GEF Mid Term Reports are subject to quality assessments by UNEP EOU. These apply GEF Office of Evaluation quality assessment and are used as a tool for providing structured feedback to the evaluator.

The quality of the draft evaluation report is assessed and rated against the following criteria:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GEF Report Quality Criteria</th>
<th>UNEP EOU Assessment</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Did the report present an assessment of relevant outcomes and achievement of project objectives in the context of the focal area program indicators if applicable?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Was the report consistent and the evidence complete and convincing and were the ratings substantiated when used?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Did the report present a sound assessment of sustainability of outcomes?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Were the lessons and recommendations supported by the evidence presented?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Did the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Did the report include an assessment of the quality of the project M&amp;E system and its use for project management?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNEP EOU additional Report Quality Criteria</th>
<th>UNEP EOU Assessment</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G. Quality of the lessons: Were lessons readily applicable in other contexts? Did they suggest prescriptive action?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Quality of the recommendations: Did recommendations specify the actions necessary to correct existing conditions or improve operations (‘who?’ ‘what?’ ‘where?’ ‘when?’). Can they be implemented? Did the recommendations specify a goal and an associated performance indicator?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Was the report well written? (clear English language and grammar)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Did the report structure follow EOU guidelines, were all requested Annexes included?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K. Were all evaluation aspects specified in the TORs adequately addressed?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. Was the report delivered in a timely manner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GEF Quality of the MTE report = 0.3*(A + B) + 0.1*(C+D+E+F)

EOU assessment of MTE report = 0.3*(G + H) + 0.1*(I+J+K+L)

Combined quality Rating = (2* ‘GEF EO’ rating + EOU rating)/3

The Totals are rounded and converted to the scale of HS to HU

Rating system for quality of terminal evaluation reports

- A number rating 1-6 is used for each criterion: Highly Satisfactory = 6, Satisfactory = 5, Moderately Satisfactory = 4, Moderately Unsatisfactory = 3, Unsatisfactory = 2, Highly Unsatisfactory = 1, and unable to assess = 0.
Annex 4 GEF Minimum requirements for M&E

Minimum Requirement 1: Project Design of M&E

All projects must include a concrete and fully budgeted monitoring and evaluation plan by the time of Work Program entry (full-sized projects) or CEO approval (medium-sized projects). This plan must contain at a minimum:

- SMART (see below) indicators for project implementation, or, if no indicators are identified, an alternative plan for monitoring that will deliver reliable and valid information to management
- SMART indicators for results (outcomes and, if applicable, impacts), and, where appropriate, corporate-level indicators
- A project baseline, with:
  - a description of the problem to address
  - indicator data
  - or, if major baseline indicators are not identified, an alternative plan for addressing this within one year of implementation
- An M&E Plan with identification of reviews and evaluations which will be undertaken, such as mid-term reviews or evaluations of activities
- An organizational setup and budgets for monitoring and evaluation.

Minimum Requirement 2: Application of Project M&E

- Project monitoring and supervision will include implementation of the M&E plan, comprising:
  - Use of SMART indicators for implementation (or provision of a reasonable explanation if not used)
  - Use of SMART indicators for results (or provision of a reasonable explanation if not used)
  - Fully established baseline for the project and data compiled to review progress
  - Evaluations are undertaken as planned
  - Operational organizational setup for M&E and budgets spent as planned.

SMART INDICATORS GEF projects and programs should monitor using relevant performance indicators. The monitoring system should be “SMART”:

- Specific: The system captures the essence of the desired result by clearly and directly relating to achieving an objective, and only that objective.
- Measurable: The monitoring system and its indicators are unambiguously specified so that all parties agree on what the system covers and there are practical ways to measure the indicators and results.
- Achievable and Attributable: The system identifies what changes are anticipated as a result of the intervention and whether the result(s) are realistic. Attribution requires that changes in the targeted developmental issue can be linked to the intervention.
- Relevant and Realistic: The system establishes levels of performance that are likely to be achieved in a practical manner, and that reflect the expectations of stakeholders.

Time-bound, Timely, Trackable, and Targeted: The system allows progress to be tracked in a cost-effective manner at desired frequency for a set period, with clear identification of the particular stakeholder group to be impacted by the project or program.

41 http://gefweb.org/MonitoringandEvaluation/MEPoliciesProcedures/MEPTools/meptstandards.html
## Annex 5: List of intended additional recipients for the Terminal Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
<th>Email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Government Officials</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getahun Moges</td>
<td>General Director Ethiopian Electrical Agency</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Electric.agency@telecom.net.et">Electric.agency@telecom.net.et</a>, <a href="mailto:getahunmoges@yahoo.co.uk">getahunmoges@yahoo.co.uk</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gosaye Mengistie</td>
<td>Head, Energy Dev’t Dept, Min of Mines and Energy, Ethiopia</td>
<td><a href="mailto:gosayem@yahoo.com">gosayem@yahoo.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samuel Baire</td>
<td>Director General, Dep’t of Energy, Eritrea</td>
<td><a href="mailto:baireog@yahoo.com">baireog@yahoo.com</a>, <a href="mailto:samuelbaire@yahoo.com">samuelbaire@yahoo.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Okumu</td>
<td>Standards Officer, Uganda Nat Bureau of Standards</td>
<td><a href="mailto:John.okumu@unbs.go.ug">John.okumu@unbs.go.ug</a>, <a href="mailto:john_okumu2003@yahoo.com">john_okumu2003@yahoo.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albert Rugumayo</td>
<td>Manager Energy for Rural Transformation Programme</td>
<td><a href="mailto:rugumayo@energy.go.ug">rugumayo@energy.go.ug</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rachel Mijumbi</td>
<td>Project Officer BUDS ERT (WB)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:rmijumbi@psfuganda.org">rmijumbi@psfuganda.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Kimambo</td>
<td>Chairman TSEA (Tz Solar Energy Association)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:info@tasea.org">info@tasea.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mzumbe Musa</td>
<td>Coordinator Transf of Rural PV Markwet in Mwanza (UNDP/GEF/MEM)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Musa_mzumbe@yahoo.com">Musa_mzumbe@yahoo.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Mnunguli</td>
<td>Head Electrical Section Tz Bureau of Standards</td>
<td><a href="mailto:tmnunguli@hotmail.com">tmnunguli@hotmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GEF Focal Point (s)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Executing Agency</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Annex 4: Indicative example of a costed M&E plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective/Outcome</th>
<th>Outcome/objective level indicator</th>
<th>Baseline Conditions</th>
<th>Mid point Target</th>
<th>End of Project Target</th>
<th>Means of Verification</th>
<th>Monitoring/sampling (frequency/size)</th>
<th>Location/Group</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Time frame</th>
<th>Budget (Object of expenditure &amp; cost)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To reduce the negative effects of DDT in public health and the global environment through the introduction of sustainable, cost effective and environment friendly alternative interventions.</td>
<td>DDT concentrations in blood and milk.</td>
<td>2006% of DDT concentrations found in blood, milk, etc in sample populations</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>WHO statistics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No of country requests to the Secretariat of the Stockholm Convention for exemption to use DDT</td>
<td>X number of countries have requested exemption for DDT use for health purposes (2 among project target countries)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>POPs convention reports to the COP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Viability, availability, sustainability and cost effectiveness of the alternatives to the use of DDT demonstrated.</td>
<td>X number of recorded deaths due to vector borne diseases in the 8 participating countries while DDT has not been applied</td>
<td>80% reduction of deaths due to vector borne disease in the 8 participating countries (supra-national level)</td>
<td>60% reduction of deaths due to vector borne illness across the 8 countries (demonstration site level)</td>
<td>Health records maintained by local health officials (demonstration site level) National-level health records (verified by WHO)</td>
<td>8 District health records to be checked yearly Review of national health records once in the lifetime of project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2. Tons of DDT used each year in the health sector</td>
<td>300 tons of DDT used per year estimated for all 8 countries (see description of stocks per country) (supra-national level)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0 tons of DDT used per year</td>
<td>Independent check of DDT stocks in each country</td>
<td>Yearly inventory until stock piles are disposed of (see outcome 3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1. Number of deaths as a result of vector borne diseases in the 8 participating countries while DDT has not been applied</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2. Tons of DDT used each year in the health sector</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Viability, availability, sustainability and cost effectiveness of the alternatives to the use of DDT demonstrated.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Budget: US$ 100 per district (travel, DSA and staff costs) per year (100X8X5 years = $4,000) $2,000 for collating and verifying data (consultant costs)
### Objective/Outcome

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective/Outcome</th>
<th>Outcome/objective level indicator</th>
<th>Baseline Conditions</th>
<th>Mid point Target (as relevant)</th>
<th>End of Project Target</th>
<th>Means of Verification</th>
<th>Monitoring/sampling (frequency/size)</th>
<th>Location/Group</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Time frame</th>
<th>Budget (Object of expenditure &amp; cost)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Capacity in each country to plan, implement and evaluate the application of alternatives to DDT based on the principles of IVM</td>
<td>Existence of institutional structures to plan, implement and evaluate IVM at the national level</td>
<td>No institutional structure for IVM</td>
<td>IVM applied in 1 demo site per country</td>
<td>8 countries have restructured vector control units operating on the basis of IVM</td>
<td>Organigram of Health Ministry</td>
<td>End of project for 8 countries</td>
<td>Health Ministries of countries</td>
<td>WHO Team</td>
<td>Year 5</td>
<td>Included in project management costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Existence of an enabling policy framework for IVM</td>
<td>No alternatives to DDT being attempted in participating countries therefore no experience of health officials in IVM</td>
<td>8 protocols completed by year 2 and mechanisms in place for their implementation by year 3</td>
<td>8 countries with an IVM policy framework and IVM legal arrangements in place</td>
<td>Project terminal report and Terminal Evaluation verification</td>
<td>End of project field verification for 8 countries</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Terminal Evaluation Team</td>
<td>3 months after project completion</td>
<td>8 local consultants X 3 days X travel costs = $5,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Financial resources to implement IVM</td>
<td>No IVM policy framework or IVM legal arrangements in place</td>
<td>National Government enactment documents</td>
<td>National Budget</td>
<td>End of project verification</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Terminal Evaluation Team</td>
<td>3 months after project completion</td>
<td>Included in TE costs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| 3. Collection, repackaging and disposal of POPs used in public health and agriculture completed. | Stocks of DDT available in participating countries (Tons) | Estimated (at project design stage) 400 tons across all 8 countries. | Inventory of all POPs in the 8 participating countries completed | Collection, repackaging and disposal of at least 100 tons POPs in 4 countries not covered under the Africa Stockpiles Program | See indicator 1.2 above. | See indicator 1.2 above + verification at end of project by evaluation team | See indicator 1.2 above. | See indicator 1.2 above + terminal evaluation team | See indicator 1.2 above + TE 3 months after project completion | $1,500 X 12 sites = $18,000 |
| | Imports of DDT (Tons) | | | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective/Offercome</th>
<th>Outcome/objective level indicator</th>
<th>Baseline Conditions</th>
<th>Mid point Target* (as relevant)</th>
<th>End of Project Target</th>
<th>Means of Verification*</th>
<th>Monitoring/sampling (frequency/size)*</th>
<th>Location/Group</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
<th>Budget (Object of expenditure &amp; cost)*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Good practices and demonstrated sustainable scientifically validated and documented for wider dissemination</td>
<td>Publication of findings from IVM demonstrations in reputable peer-reviewed medical scientific journals Level of awareness of key target groups on project findings</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Fully documented process and early results of IVM demos</td>
<td>At least 3 scientific papers published</td>
<td>Table of contents of specified journals</td>
<td>End of project survey</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Terminal Evaluation Team</td>
<td>Year 5</td>
<td>Included in TE cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Cost of Inception Workshop: $15,000</td>
<td>3. Cost of Mid-Term Review: $55,000</td>
<td>4. Supervision costs to be incurred by project executing team9: $40,000</td>
<td>5. Any additional M&amp;E costs 10: N/A</td>
<td>6. Total costs (this figure should be included in the consolidated project budget): $273,600</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* All project outcomes as presented in the project logframe should be included in this column. The objective here is to provide the means to monitor progress in achieving the results set for the life of the project. Goals and long term impact indicators should not be included in this section, but may be discussed in other sections of the project document.

* Only key indicators should be included (not more than 2 or 3 per outcome). Appropriate selection of outcome indicators is essential to assess progress in achieving project results.

* Please note that if no baseline information for a particular indicator exists it is difficult to justify the targets. Also, please note that the time frame for collecting essential baseline data is the end of the first year of project implementation. The plan for the collection of such baseline data should be added in the next section along with its associated cost.

* The mid point target will be reviewed at the Mid-Term Review along with validation of other focal area Tracking Tools. It is acknowledged that mid-point targets may not be relevant to all projects. Flexibility will be applied.

* The means of verification is the source of data that the project team will use to track the indicator (e.g., if the indicator is "forest cover diversity," the means of verification would be "field survey data" and "satellite imagery"). Reviewing of project reports alone is insufficient.

* This column should describe for each indicator the size (e.g., whether entire protected area or only a fraction, or, for example, in the case of a survey, how many people would be covered). The frequency (e.g., once in the lifetime of the project, quarterly during the first year, monthly, etc.)

* Expected date (month/year) in which the monitoring activity will take place.

* For example, 15 satellite images @ $1,000 each = $15,000, or 4 field sampling trips by 2 staff @ $300 each = $1,200.

* This includes Steering Committee meetings. Do not include here any supervision costs to be incurred by the GEF Implementing Agency.

* Please describe the activity and include the expected cost. Additional M&E costs could be related to the following: (i) Additional reviews and evaluation processes for phased and tranched projects; (ii) application & validation of tracking tools; (iii) acquisition of essential baseline data in the first year of the project.
Annex 5: More on project identification and design

Situation Analysis
1. Define the boundaries of the area to be included in the analysis.
2. Research and describe the current state and condition of people and ecosystems in the geographic or thematic area.
3. Identify the trends in conditions, the pressures being exerted on the people and the environment, the underlying forces driving the pressures and the responses to the pressures at the international and local levels (or the level most appropriate for the project).
4. Identify the major significant issues or areas requiring attention.
5. Use the IUCN criteria to identify the most important issues for to address.
6. Identify key stakeholders, including key institutions working on or involved with the selected issues and/or areas requiring change.
7. Assess stakeholder interest, potential impact, power and influence.
8. Design the stakeholders' participation strategy.


Problem Tree Analysis
This method seeks to establish the core problem that the project seeks to address. It then establishes other related problems as causes or effects in order to determine the key objectives that the project should set for itself.

Step 1: Analysing the problem and developing cause effect model
Keeping in mind the situation analysis, the first step is to brainstorm and create a list of all the negative statements related to the thematic or geographic issue/area of interest. Next, discuss the main problems and agree on the core problem – usually linked to the highest number of negative statements. All the main problems and the core problem are then printed on cards and displayed on the wall for all participants to see. A discussion might be necessary to establish consensus on the definition of the core problem if it requires further clarification.

Once the core problem has been agreed, all other problems should be ordered according to whether they are a cause or an effect of the core problem, whether they lead to or result from the core problem. This ordering process should be used to clarify or discard unclear statements.

If more than one cause leads to a problem, they are placed side by side. Similarly if multiple effects result from a single cause, they are placed side by side. Vertical links are drawn to show cause-effect relationships, and horizontal links to show joint causes and combined effects. The end result of this process is a problem tree with the causes below the effects, thereby making a cause-effect model (exhibit 2.4).

Once the process is completed, the tree should be reviewed to ensure that the related streams of cause and effect are as accurate as possible and to check the completeness and logic of the cause-effect structure. To review, take a card from the top of the problem tree and work backwards through the diagram asking the question, “what leads to, or causes that.” The exercise should be repeated for all top cards. In addition, the model should be checked for clarity, logic, sufficiency and simplicity, using the following guiding questions.
• **Clarity**: Are the statements clear and unambiguous?
• **Logic**: Are the links between each statement logical and reasonable?
• **Sufficiency**: Are actions at one level sufficient to support results on the next level? Will the achievement of a level help support the attainment of the level above it?
• **Gap analysis**: Are there missing levels/objectives? Should other positive actions and/or statements be added? Is the detail adequate?
• **Simplicity**: Is the overall structure a simple, robust, clear version of reality? If it is too complicated, it is likely to be less useful for providing direction to subsequent steps in the analyses.

The accuracy of the cause-effect relationships should be cross-checked with informed stakeholders who have not been involved in developing it.

**Step 2: Analysing Potential solutions and Generating a Means-ends Model**

Once the cause-effect model has been completed, solutions to the problems have to be proposed. In its simplest form, the means-ends model involves transforming the negative statements from the cause-effect diagram into positive statements. Here it has the same structure as the cause-effect model, but with the problem statements (negatives) turned into statements of potential solutions (positives).

In reality however, planning is an iterative process. The elements of both problem analysis and stakeholder analysis will need to be revisited regularly as new information and ideas come to light. It is recommended that a simple means-end model be drafted at the planning workshop, and used as the basis for further analysis rather than a fixed blueprint of the project. The draft revisited after some time and checked for clarity, logic, sufficiency and simplicity, using the guiding questions outlined in the section above.

A means-end model is a diagram that shows the hierarchy of relationships between a set of solutions, derived from the problem tree. It is also known as an objectives tree.

**Using a results chain to sort problems**

The notion of cause and effect has been criticized for its linearity. The analysis of cause and effect is based on the assumption that it is possible to link causes of problems to their effects in a linear manner. This is a simplification of reality that makes the problem tree analysis seem reductionist. To address this problem, IUCN has modified the problem tree analysis by using the results tree as the basis of sorting out problems generated during the brainstorming session (exhibit 2.5). This process can be improved even further by developing a vision before identifying the problems to be solved. The vision acts as a beacon, a guide to an ideal situation to be attained. The problems then are the barriers between the current situation and the ideal (see sections below on visioning).

**Developing indicators**

Once the intervention logic has been identified and conditions necessary for success analysed, it is time to generate indicators. Although indicators have been defined in many ways, most definitions concur that an indicator provides evidence of change, or signs that the conditions the project is trying to improve have changed. They also provide evidence of the progress of project implementation and attainment of results. Indicators help to answer the question, “How shall we know that outputs have been produced and that results have been achieved?” The specific question depends on the level of the indicator in the LFA (Exhibit 3.8).
Exhibit 3.8 Indicators along the LFA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of result in the LFA</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goal</td>
<td>Evidence of long-term changes in the condition (impacts). Note that projects contribute to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>impacts, so indicators would show contribution rather than wholesale change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose</td>
<td>Evidence that outcomes have been realised (institutions and systems are changing)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Result/Objective</td>
<td>Evidence that intermediate effects are happening (people are changing)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities</td>
<td>Evidence that activities were implemented and outputs were produced - deliverables.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Activity indicators are the outputs, the deliverables that should be evident when an activity has been implemented. For example, the number of people trained or of workshops held, study tours conducted, number of seedlings planted etc. These are simple and need no further discussion.

**Indicators for Results**

Unlike indicators for the activity level, results indicators (intermediate effects, outcomes and impacts) are more complex. They can be direct or indirect (proxy), qualitative, or quantitative.

**Direct Indicators**

Direct indicators provide the most direct evidence or measure. For example, if a project result deals with the transfer of sustainable farming methods, it might be stated as, “Farming practices improved”. The most direct indicator for this result would be the percentage of farmers who have successfully adopted a number of specific sustainable practices. For this indicator to make sense, two concepts need to be defined: sustainable farming practices and how many specific sustainable practices constitute sustainable farming practices.

**Proxy Indicators**

It will not always be possible to measure change directly, either because information is not available or because the cost of collecting it is prohibitive. In these cases, proxy indicators have to be used. For a project dealing with the restoration of a watershed, for example, reduced erosion might be chosen as an indicator. Because it is difficult to measure the level of erosion, the level of sedimentation in the river may be used as a proxy. Where it is difficult to collect information about the evolution of a community’s wellbeing, the number of improved houses is often used as a proxy. This requires defining “improved houses” which can range from tin roofs to bricks, depending on the community. Infant mortality has also been used as a proxy for changes in health levels.

Proxy indicators are very often used in conservation projects where short-term interventions are adopted to change long-term processes. In a project seeking to improve livelihoods and the quality of a local forest, for example, it may be very difficult to identify meaningful impact indicators that can be monitored during the lifetime of the project. In such cases, proxies such as the percentage increase in household income and number of seedlings surviving beyond a certain age may be used as proxies as they demonstrate the contribution rather than the attainment of the ultimate impact, which is in line with the project’s contribution to the goal.

**Quantitative Indicators**

Quantitative indicators refer to evidence that can be demonstrated in countable measures. The number of seedlings surviving beyond a certain age or the percentage of people with zinc roofs, bicycles, or a combination of both. Other examples are hectarage of forest under joint forest management, the percentage change in species richness index, or the percentage change in tree density, etc.
Qualitative Indicators

A qualitative indicator is a non-quantitative evidence of change. For example, if our result is “improved capacity of local organisations to manage their resources,” it might be very difficult to find a number that shows this. In such a case, we might choose a qualitative indicator such as change in the strength of local organisations and then define ten characteristics, for example, that explain what we understand by organisational strength. We may then establish a scale like the one below:

- Very weak - those exhibiting none of the 10 characteristics
- Weak – those exhibiting less than 3 of the characteristics
- Relatively strong – those showing 4-6 of the characteristics
- Strong – those showing 7-9 of the characteristics
- Very strong – those showing all the 10 characteristics

This process is referred to as quantifying qualitative indicators. Here, we used a scale (10 characteristics) and a range (very weak to very strong) to quantify the indicator. Another example is the rate at which improved farming practices are adopted, as an indicator for improvement in farming practices. But adoption might mean very different things to different farmers, so that a simple number may not correlate well with actual improvement in farming practices in general. A non-quantifiable measure such as the extent to which farmers pick and practice the better practices may be more informative because it would tell us whether farmers are adopting or adapting the improved practices. Once again, we have to define characteristics of a successful adoption, using the number of practices adopted and the level of practice.

Combination of qualitative and quantitative indicators

A combination of qualitative and qualitative indicators is often used. For example, the percentage (quantitative) of organisations in the strong to very strong category (qualitative) or the percentage of staff with positive perceptions on improvement of performance as a result of training.

These classifications are not mutually exclusive since one indicator can fall under several categories, be direct and qualitative, a direct proxy, etc. The important thing is that the evidence can be independently verified in a non-subjective manner.

http://www.iucn.org/programme/eval/documents2/training_courses/core_course/module3_logic_models2/module3_logic_models2_04.pdf

More on Baseline Studies

A baseline study describes the condition of key outcome-related indicators prior to, or in the very early stages of, project implementation. It is a benchmark against which management-induced changes can be identified and measured.

Preparation or commencement of a biodiversity conservation project often requires a comprehensive survey to determine factors such as: the areas of highest biodiversity value; the types and location of threats to those values; the ecological history of the area, etc. However, future monitoring generally does not need to update this full data set. In most cases, managers are concerned with trends rather than absolute values. Absolute values are generally not needed on a day-to-day basis; changes in relative indices of these parameters (trends) will provide the information that managers need. This is an important consideration, because too often there is a tendency to delay the commencement of monitoring until baseline studies have been completed. For many indicators, baseline data will be required to provide “calibration” of the indicators, and to show whether trends are moving dangerously close to unacceptable situations. However, these can be collected after monitoring has commenced, and will need to be repeated (usually at fairly long intervals) to “recalibrate” the indicators. Budgets for M&E plans should include funds for baseline and calibration studies; these can be relatively expensive undertakings, especially for focal areas such as biodiversity, land degradation and international waters.
Logical Framework Analysis

A Logical Framework Analysis, often abbreviated as LFA, is an analytical planning tool that can provide:

- A logic model that includes performance measures
- A tool to organise thinking
- A flexible results-driven planning tool
- Methods that are widely accepted
- Methods that can accommodate new tools

Projects are implemented in dynamic situations and adaptive management require that plans be constantly updated. LFAs provide a tool to organise and present the project plans in a visual, manner that is easy to update. Because they allow presentation of the various project components in summary form, LFAs make it possible to display the relationships between the various parts, making analysis easier.

Exhibit 3.4: Components of LFA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intervention logic</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Means of verification</th>
<th>Risks and assumptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What the project will do to bring about change. An outline of the theory of action</td>
<td>Evidence of achievement that can be objectively verified</td>
<td>Where the information to verify achievement will be found</td>
<td>Conditions necessary for success - Factors outside the control of management that can influence achievement of results</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unfortunately, like planning language, LFA language can be confusing. This is largely because different donors use different terminology for the same concepts. (Exhibits 3.1 and 3.2). Since IUCN works with a range of donors, it is important that project managers understand the concept in order not to be confused by the terminology.

http://www.iucn.org/programme/eval/documents2/training_courses/core_course/module3_logic_models2/module3_logic_models2_04.pdf