

## Contents

|   |    |
|---|----|
| A. Strategic Relevance.....   | 2  |
| B. Quality of Project Design.....                                   | 3  |
| C. Nature of External Context.....                                  | 3  |
| D. Effectiveness.....   | 4  |
| D1. Delivery of Outputs.....  | 4  |
| D2. Achievement of Outcomes .....                                   | 5  |
| D3. Likelihood of Impact.....                                       | 5  |
| E. Financial Management.....  | 7  |
| E1. Completeness of Financial Information .....                     | 7  |
| E2. Communication Between Finance and Project Management Staff..... | 8  |
| F. Efficiency .....   | 8  |
| G. Monitoring and Reporting.....                                    | 9  |
| G1. Monitoring Design and Budgeting.....                            | 9  |
| G2. Monitoring of Project Implementation .....                      | 9  |
| G3. Project Reporting .....   | 10 |
| H. Sustainability.....  | 11 |
| H1. Socio-political Sustainability .....                            | 11 |
| H2. Financial Sustainability.....                                   | 13 |
| H3. Sustainability of the Institutional Framework .....             | 14 |
| I. Factors Affecting Performance.....                               | 15 |
| I1. Preparation and Readiness.....                                  | 15 |
| I2. Quality of Project Management and Supervision .....             | 16 |
| I3. Stakeholders' Participation and Cooperation .....               | 17 |
| I4. Responsiveness to Human Rights and Gender Equity .....          | 18 |
| I5. Country Ownership and Driven-ness.....                          | 19 |
| I6. Communication and Public Awareness.....                         | 19 |

## ABBREVIATIONS

|        |   |
|--------|---|
| BSP    | Bali Strategic Plan                             |
| ESE(S) | Environmental, Social and Economic (Safeguards) |
| FMO    | Fund Management Officer                         |
| MTS    | Medium Term Strategy                            |
| NAMA   | Nationally Appropriate Mitigation Actions       |
| PM     | Project Manager                                 |
| POW    | Programme of Work                               |
| ProDoc | Project Document                                |
| TOC    | Theory of Change                                |
| UNDAF  | UN Development Assistance Framework             |

## A. Strategic Relevance

The evaluation will assess, in line with the OECD/DAC definition of relevance, *'the extent to which the activity is suited to the priorities and policies of the target group, recipient and donor'*. The evaluation will include an assessment of the project's relevance in relation to UN Environment's mandate and its alignment with UN Environment's policies and strategies at the time of project approval. Under strategic relevance an assessment of the complementarity of the project with other interventions addressing the needs of the same target groups will be made. This criterion comprises four elements:

1. *Alignment to the UN Environment Medium Term Strategy1 (MTS) and Programme of Work (POW)*

The evaluation should assess the project's alignment with the MTS and POW under which the project was approved and include, in its narrative, reflections on the scale and scope of any contributions made to the planned results reflected in the relevant MTS and POW.

2. *Alignment to UN Environment / Donor/GEF Strategic Priorities*

Donor, including GEF, strategic priorities will vary across interventions. UN Environment strategic priorities include the Bali Strategic Plan for Technology Support and Capacity Building<sup>2</sup> (BSP) and South-South Cooperation (S-SC). The BSP relates to the capacity of governments to: comply with international agreements and obligations at the national level; promote, facilitate and finance environmentally sound technologies and to strengthen frameworks for developing coherent international environmental policies. S-SC is regarded as the exchange of resources, technology and knowledge between developing countries. GEF priorities are specified in published programming priorities and focal area strategies.

3. *Relevance to Regional, Sub-regional and National Environmental Priorities*

The evaluation will assess the extent to which the intervention is suited, or responding to, the stated environmental concerns and needs of the countries, sub-regions or regions where it is being implemented. Examples may include: national or sub-national development plans, poverty reduction strategies or Nationally Appropriate Mitigation Action (NAMA) plans or regional agreements etc.

4. *Complementarity with Existing Interventions*

An assessment will be made of how well the project, either at design stage or during the project mobilization, took account of ongoing and planned initiatives (under the same sub-programme, other UN Environment sub-programmes, or being implemented by other agencies) that address similar needs of the same target groups. The evaluation will consider if the project team, in collaboration with Regional Offices and Sub-Programme Coordinators, made efforts to ensure their own intervention was complementary to other interventions, optimized any synergies and avoided duplication of effort. Examples may include UN Development Assistance Frameworks or One UN programming. Linkages with other interventions should be described and instances where UN Environment's comparative advantage has been particularly well applied should be highlighted.

| Highly Unsatisfactory   | Unsatisfactory  | Moderately Unsatisfactory  | Moderately Satisfactory  | Satisfactory  | Highly Satisfactory   |
|---|---|--|--|---|---|
| <p>The project's, implementation strategies and delivered contributions (results) show:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- lack of alignment with a) - c)</li> <li>- very limited consideration of d) - f)</li> </ul> <p>a) UNEP's Mandate, Medium Term Strategy / Thematic Priorities.</p> <p>b) Regional, sub-regional and / or national environmental priorities (e.g. NAMAs / UNDAFs)</p> <p>c) Target group and beneficiary needs and priorities</p> <p>d) Donor/funding agency priorities</p> <p>e) The intervention was NOT complementary to (or duplicates) other recent or ongoing interventions by UNEP or other organisations working in the project area or on the same problem/issue.</p> <p>f) UNEP's Capacity building (BSP), and South - South Cooperation policies (where applicable).</p> | <p>The project's implementation strategies and delivered contributions (results) show:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- weak alignment with a)</li> <li>- limited alignment with b) - d)</li> <li>- very limited consideration of e) &amp; f)</li> </ul> <p>a) UNEP's Mandate, Medium Term Strategy / Thematic Priorities.</p> <p>b) Regional, sub-regional and / or national environmental priorities (e.g. NAMAs / UNDAFs)</p> <p>c) Target group and beneficiary needs and priorities</p> <p>d) Donor/funding agency priorities</p> <p>e) The intervention was complementary to other recent, ongoing or planned interventions by UNEP or other organisations working in the project area or on the same problem/issue.</p> <p>f) UNEP's Capacity building (BSP), and South - South Cooperation policies (where applicable).</p> | <p>The project's implementation strategies and delivered contributions (results) show:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- partial alignment with a) – d)</li> <li>- limited consideration of e) &amp; f)</li> </ul> <p>a) UNEP's Mandate, Medium Term Strategy / Thematic Priorities.</p> <p>b) Regional, sub-regional and / or national environmental priorities (e.g. NAMAs / UNDAFs)</p> <p>c) Target group and beneficiary needs and priorities</p> <p>d) Donor/funding agency priorities</p> <p>e) The intervention was complementary to other recent, ongoing or planned interventions by UNEP or other organisations working in the project area or on the same problem/issue.</p> <p>f) UNEP's Capacity building (BSP), and South - South Cooperation policies (where applicable).</p> | <p>The project's implementation strategies and delivered contributions (results) show:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- explicit and full alignment with a) &amp; b)</li> <li>- partial alignment with c) &amp; d)</li> <li>- partial consideration of e) &amp; f)</li> </ul> <p>a) UNEP's Mandate, Medium Term Strategy / Thematic Priorities.</p> <p>b) Regional, sub-regional and / or national environmental priorities (e.g. NAMAs / UNDAFs)</p> <p>c) Target group and beneficiary needs and priorities</p> <p>d) Donor/funding agency priorities</p> <p>e) The intervention was complementary to other recent, ongoing or planned interventions by UNEP or other organisations working in the project area or on the same problem/issue.</p> <p>f) UNEP's Capacity building (BSP), and South - South Cooperation policies (where applicable).</p> | <p>The project's implementation strategies and delivered contributions (results) show:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-explicit and full alignment with all of a) - d)</li> <li>-partial consideration of e) &amp; f)</li> </ul> <p>a) UNEP's Mandate, Medium Term Strategy / Thematic Priorities.</p> <p>b) Regional, sub-regional and / or national environmental priorities (e.g. NAMAs / UNDAFs)</p> <p>c) Target group and beneficiary needs and priorities</p> <p>d) Donor/funding agency priorities</p> <p>e) The intervention was complementary to other recent, ongoing or planned interventions by UNEP or other organisations working in the project area or on the same problem/issue.</p> <p>f) UNEP's Capacity building (BSP), and South - South Cooperation policies (where applicable).</p> | <p>The project's implementation strategies and delivered contributions (results) show:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- explicit and full alignment with all of the following:</li> </ul> <p>a) UNEP's Mandate, Medium Term Strategy / Thematic Priorities.</p> <p>b) Regional, sub-regional and / or national environmental priorities (e.g. NAMAs / UNDAFs)</p> <p>c) Target group and beneficiary needs and priorities</p> <p>d) Donor/funding agency priorities</p> <p>e) The intervention was complementary to other recent, ongoing or planned interventions by UNEP or other organisations working in the project area or on the same problem/issue.</p> <p>f) UNEP's Capacity building (BSP), and South - South Cooperation policies (where applicable)..</p> |

<sup>1</sup> UN Environment's Medium Term Strategy (MTS) is a document that guides UN Environment's programme planning over a four-year period. It identifies UN Environment's thematic priorities, known as Sub-programmes (SP), and sets out the desired outcomes, known as Expected Accomplishments (EAs), of the Sub-programmes.

<sup>2</sup> <http://www.unep.org/GC/GC23/documents/GC23-6-add-1.pdf>

| <b>B. Quality of Project Design</b>   |   |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| <p>The quality of project design is assessed using an agreed template during the evaluation inception phase, ratings are attributed to identified criteria and an overall Project Design Quality rating is established (<a href="https://www.unenvironment.org/about-un-environment/evaluation">https://www.unenvironment.org/about-un-environment/evaluation</a>). This overall Project Design Quality rating is entered in the final evaluation ratings table as item B.</p> <p>In the Main Evaluation Report a summary of the project's strengths and weaknesses at design stage is included, while the complete Project Design Quality template is annexed in the Inception Report.</p> |   |   |   |   |   |
| Highly Unsatisfactory   | Unsatisfactory  | Moderately Unsatisfactory   | Moderately Satisfactory   | Satisfactory  | Highly Satisfactory   |
| <p><i>Insert ratings from Assessment of Project Design Quality (This assessment is included in the Inception Report)</i></p> <p><a href="https://www.unenvironment.org/about-un-environment/evaluation/our-evaluation-approach/templates-and-tools">https://www.unenvironment.org/about-un-environment/evaluation/our-evaluation-approach/templates-and-tools</a></p>   | <p><i>Insert ratings from Assessment of Project Design Quality (Inception Report)</i></p> | <p><i>Insert ratings from Assessment of Project Design Quality (Inception Report)</i></p> | <p><i>Insert ratings from Assessment of Project Design Quality (Inception Report)</i></p> | <p><i>Insert ratings from Assessment of Project Design Quality (Inception Report)</i></p> | <p><i>Insert ratings from Assessment of Project Design Quality (Inception Report)</i></p> |

| <b>C. Nature of External Context</b>   |   |   |  |   |   |
|--|---|---|--|---|---|
| <p>At evaluation inception stage a rating is established for the project's external operating context (i.e. considering the prevalence of conflict, natural disasters and political upheaval). This rating is entered in the final evaluation ratings table as Item C. It is not, however, included in the calculation of the Overall Rating of the Project.</p> <p>Where a project has been rated as facing either an Unfavourable or Highly Unfavourable external operating context, and/or a negative external event has occurred during project implementation, the ratings for Effectiveness, Efficiency and/or Sustainability may be increased at the discretion of the Evaluation Consultant and Evaluation Manager together. A justification for such an increase must be given.</p> |   |   |  |   |   |
| Highly Unfavourable  | Unfavourable  | Moderately Unfavourable   | Moderately Favourable  | Favourable  | Highly Favourable   |
| <p>HU rating if <b>any</b> of the following conditions were present.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Extremely challenging climatic conditions (hurricanes, droughts floods etc.) repeatedly or profoundly affected project operations.</li> <li>Security situation for project staff and partners consistently extremely challenging to project operations.</li> <li>Poor infrastructure (roads, power, telecommunications) routinely creates significant barriers to efficient project implementation</li> <li>Economic instability created significant difficulties for project operations in project locations (e.g. hyper-inflation)</li> <li>Political context routinely hampered project operations to a significant extent (e.g. coups, 'Arab Spring')</li> </ul>         | <p>U rating if <b>more than one</b> of the following conditions were present.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Climatic events (hurricanes, droughts floods etc.) disturbed project operations for a prolonged period to a significant extent.</li> <li>Security situation temporarily affected project staff and partners operations to a significant extent,</li> <li>Poor infrastructure intermittently or partially affected project operations to a significant extent</li> <li>Economic conditions intermittently but significantly hampered project operations in project locations (e.g. currency trading restrictions)</li> <li>Political context significantly hampered project operations in project locations for a prolonged period (e.g. national elections)</li> </ul> | <p>MU rating if <b>more than one</b> of the following conditions were present.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Climatic events (hurricanes, droughts floods etc.) temporarily hampered several parts of the project's operations to a significant extent.</li> <li>Security situation temporarily affected project staff and partners operations to a moderate extent,</li> <li>Poor infrastructure intermittently or partially affected project operations to a moderate extent</li> <li>Economic conditions intermittently or partially affected project operations to a moderate extent.</li> <li>Political context intermittently or partially affected project operations to a moderate extent (e.g. national / local elections)</li> </ul> | <p>MF rating if <b>at least three</b> the following conditions were present.<br/>(For MTEs - or have a high likelihood of occurrence).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Climatic events (hurricanes, droughts floods etc.) temporarily hampered a part of the project's operations to a moderate extent.</li> <li>Security situation had occasional minor effects on project operations, staff and partners</li> <li>Infrastructure weaknesses only occasionally affected project operations. Temporal or spatially variability (e.g. Power supply, road access to sites etc.)</li> <li>Economic conditions generally stable but occasionally hampered project operations.</li> <li>Political context is generally favourable occasional but repeated minor effects on project operations</li> </ul> | <p>F rating if <b>any two</b> of the following conditions were present.<br/>(For MTEs - or have a medium likelihood of occurrence).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Climatic events (hurricanes, droughts floods etc.) had minor (intermittent or partial) effects on project operations.</li> <li>Security situation had occasional minor effects on project operations, staff and partners</li> <li>Infrastructure weaknesses only occasionally affected project operations. Temporal or spatially variability (e.g. Power supply, road access to sites etc.)</li> <li>Economic conditions generally stable but occasionally hampered project operations.</li> <li>Political context is favourable occasional minor effects on project operations</li> </ul> | <p>HF rating if <b>all</b> of the following conditions were present.<br/>(For MTEs – if situation likely to be maintained).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Climatic events (hurricanes, droughts floods etc.) that could affect project operations have not occurred (and are highly unlikely).</li> <li>Security situation was favourable and stable. Security issues have not affected project operations</li> <li>Infrastructure (roads, power, telecomms) are robust, modern and stable – facilitating efficient project operations</li> <li>Economic conditions are favourable and stable allowing efficient project operations.</li> <li>Political context is favourable and stable allowing efficient project operations.</li> </ul> |

**D. Effectiveness**  
 Effectiveness is assessed against the three sub-criteria of: a) Delivery of Outputs, b) Achievement of Outcomes and c) Likelihood of Impact

**D1. Delivery of Outputs**

The evaluation will assess the project's success in producing the programmed outputs (*products, capital goods and services resulting from the intervention*) and achieving milestones as per the project design document (ProDoc). Any *formal* modifications/revisions made during project implementation will be considered part of the project design. Where the project outputs are inappropriately or inaccurately stated in the ProDoc, reformulations may be necessary in the reconstruction of the TOC. In such cases a table should be provided showing the original and the reformulation of the outputs for transparency. The delivery of outputs will be assessed in terms of both quantity and quality, and the assessment will consider their ownership by, and usefulness to, intended beneficiaries and the timeliness of their delivery. The evaluation will briefly explain the reasons behind the success or shortcomings of the project in delivering its programmed outputs and meeting expected quality standards.

**OECD/DAC Definition of outputs:**

*'The products, capital goods and services which result from a development intervention; may also include changes resulting from the intervention which are relevant to the achievement of outcomes'.*

**ProDoC Definition of outputs:**

*The products, capital goods and services delivered by the project. Outputs relate to the completion of activities and managers have a high degree of control over*

**Common Interpretation:**

*The immediate effects of the completion of activities e.g. increased knowledge, access to a product.*

| Highly Unsatisfactory   | Unsatisfactory  | Moderately Unsatisfactory  | Moderately Satisfactory  | Satisfactory   | Highly Satisfactory  |
|---|---|--|--|--|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Less than 20% of the planned/approved outputs were delivered fully.</li> <li>All outputs were delivered too late for their intended use.</li> <li>All delivered outputs were deemed to be of poor quality / utility by users and reviewers.</li> <li>Very little or no user ownership - intended users of key outputs not involved in / party to their preparation.</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>21 - 40% of the planned/approved outputs were delivered fully.</li> <li>The most important outputs to achieve outcomes were delivered too late for their intended use.</li> <li>Among the delivered outputs, the most important to achieve outcomes were deemed to be of poor quality / utility by users and reviewers.</li> <li>Very low user ownership - intended users of key outputs only peripherally involved in / party to their preparation.</li> </ul> <p>Where additional relevant outputs were delivered or output level targets were exceeded:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This work was somewhat late for its intended use and was below average quality.</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>41 - 60% of the planned/approved outputs were delivered fully.</li> <li>The delivery of the most important outputs to achieve outcomes was delayed but they still fulfilled their intended use.</li> <li>Among the delivered outputs, the most important to achieve outcomes were deemed to be of good quality / utility by users and reviewers.</li> <li>Low user ownership - intended users of key outputs were partially and unevenly involved in / party to their preparation.</li> </ul> <p>Where additional relevant outputs were delivered or output level targets were exceeded: this work was available somewhat late for its intended use and was of average quality.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>61 - 80% of the planned/approved outputs were delivered fully.</li> <li>The delivery of the most important outputs to achieve outcomes was on time and they fulfilled their intended use.</li> <li>Among the delivered outputs, the most important to achieve outcomes were deemed to be of good quality / utility by users and reviewers.</li> <li>Acceptable levels of user ownership - intended users of key outputs somewhat involved in / party to their preparation.</li> </ul> <p>Where additional relevant outputs were delivered or output level targets were exceeded: this work was available on time for its intended use and was of average quality.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>81-99% of the planned/approved outputs were delivered fully.</li> <li>The most important outputs to achieve outcomes were delivered in time to allow high levels of use.</li> <li>Nearly all the delivered outputs, including the most important to achieve outcomes were deemed to be of very good quality / utility by users and reviewers.</li> <li>Good levels of user ownership - intended users of key outputs meaningfully involved in / party to their preparation.</li> </ul> <p>Where additional relevant outputs were delivered or output level targets were exceeded: this work was available on time for its intended use and was of good quality.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All (100%) of planned/approved outputs delivered fully.</li> <li>All outputs delivered at the time required to maximise their intended use.</li> <li>All outputs deemed to be of excellent quality / utility by users and reviewers.</li> <li>High levels of user ownership - intended users of key outputs closely involved in / party to their preparation</li> </ul> <p>Where additional relevant outputs were delivered or output level targets were exceeded: this work was available on time for its intended use and was of excellent quality.</p> |

## D2. Achievement of Outcomes

The achievement of direct outcomes (*short and medium-term effects of the intervention's outputs; a change of behaviour resulting from the use/application of outputs, which is not under the direct control of the intervention's direct actors*) is assessed as performance against the direct outcomes as defined in the reconstructed<sup>3</sup> Theory of Change. These are the first-level outcomes expected to be achieved as an immediate result of project outputs. As in 1, above, a table can be used where substantive amendments to the formulation of direct outcomes is necessary. The evaluation should report evidence of attribution between UN Environment's intervention and the direct outcomes. In cases of normative work or where several actors are collaborating to achieve common outcomes, evidence of the nature and magnitude of UN Environment's 'substantive contribution' should be included and/or 'credible association' established between project efforts and the direct outcomes realised.

### OECD/DAC Definition of outcomes:

'The likely or achieved short-term and medium-term effects of an intervention's outputs.'

### ProDoc Definition of outcomes:

'The uptake, adoption or use of project outputs by the project beneficiaries, observed as change of behavior, attitude/action, condition, knowledge or skill.'

### Common Interpretation:

"A change of behavior resulting from the use/application of outputs that is not under the direct control of the intervention's direct actors"<sup>4</sup>

| Highly Unsatisfactory   | Unsatisfactory  | Moderately Unsatisfactory  | Moderately Satisfactory  | Satisfactory  | Highly Satisfactory  |
|---|---|--|--|---|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No direct outcomes achieved (not even partial achievement).</li> <li>Assumptions for the change process from project outputs to direct outcome(s) do <u>not</u> hold.</li> <li>Drivers to support transition from outputs to direct outcome(s) <u>not</u> in place.</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some direct outcomes <i>partially</i> achieved but do <u>not</u> include those most important to attain intermediate states/impact.</li> <li>Assumptions for the change process from project outputs to direct outcome(s) do <u>not</u> hold.</li> <li>Drivers to support transition from outputs to direct outcome(s) are <u>not</u> in place.</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some direct outcomes <i>fully</i> achieved, but do <u>not</u> include those most important to attain intermediate states/impact.</li> <li>Assumptions for progress from project outputs to direct outcome(s) do <u>not</u> hold.</li> <li>Drivers to support transition from outputs to direct outcome(s) are <u>not</u> in place.</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Those direct outcomes that are the most important to attain intermediate states, <i>partially</i> achieved. Other direct outcomes are not/only partially achieved.</li> <li>Assumptions for progress from project outputs to direct outcome(s) hold <i>partially</i>.</li> <li>Drivers to support transition from outputs to direct outcome(s) are only <i>partially</i> in place.</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Those direct outcomes that are the most important to attain intermediate states, <i>fully</i> achieved. Other direct outcomes are not/only partially achieved.</li> <li>Assumptions for progress from project outputs to direct outcome(s) hold.</li> <li>Drivers to support transition from outputs to direct outcome(s) are in place.</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All direct outcomes fully achieved.</li> <li>Assumptions for progress from project outputs to direct outcome(s) hold <i>fully</i>.</li> <li>Drivers to support transition from outputs to direct outcome(s) are <i>fully</i> in place.</li> </ul> |

## D3. Likelihood of Impact

Based on the articulation of longer term effects in the reconstructed Theory of Change (TOC) - i.e. from direct outcomes, via intermediate states, to impact - the evaluation will assess the likelihood of the intended, positive impacts becoming a reality. Project objectives or goals should be incorporated in the TOC, possibly as intermediate states or long-term impacts. The Evaluation Office's approach to the use of TOC in project evaluations is outlined in a guidance note available on the UN Environment Evaluation Office website, [www.unenvironment.org/evaluation](http://www.unenvironment.org/evaluation) and is supported by an excel-based flow chart, 'Likelihood of Impact Assessment Decision Tree'. Essentially the approach follows a 'likelihood tree' from direct outcomes to impacts, taking account of whether the assumptions and drivers identified in the reconstructed TOC held. Any unintended positive effects should also be identified and their causal linkages to the intended impact described.

The evaluation will also consider the likelihood that the intervention may lead, or contribute to, unintended negative effects. Some of these potential negative effects may have been identified in the project design as risks or as part of the analysis of Environmental, Social and Economic Safeguards.<sup>5</sup>

The evaluation will consider the extent to which the project has played a catalytic role or has promoted scaling up and/or replication<sup>6</sup> as part of its Theory of Change and as factors that are likely to contribute to longer term impact.

Ultimately UN Environment and all its partners aim to bring about benefits to the environment and human well-being. Few projects are likely to have impact statements that reflect such long-term or broad-based changes. However, the evaluation will assess the likelihood of the project to make a substantive contribution to the high-level changes represented by UN Environment's Expected Accomplishments, the Sustainable Development Goals<sup>7</sup> and/or the high-level results prioritised by the funding partner.

### OECD/DAC Definition of impact:

Positive and negative, primary and secondary long-term effects produced by a development intervention, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended''.

**Un Environment Interpretation:** Some effects may be achieved in a short time period, but impact requires that the effects are long-lasting

| Highly Unlikely | Unlikely | Moderately Unlikely | Moderately Likely | Likely | Highly Likely |
|-----------------|----------|---------------------|-------------------|--------|---------------|
|-----------------|----------|---------------------|-------------------|--------|---------------|

<sup>3</sup> UN Environment staff are currently required to submit a Theory of Change (TOC) with all submitted project designs. The level of 'reconstruction' needed during an evaluation will depend on the quality of this initial TOC, the time that has lapsed between project design and implementation (which may be related to securing and disbursing funds) and the level of any changes made to the project design. In the case of projects pre-dating 2013 the intervention logic is often represented in a logical framework and a TOC will need to be constructed in the inception stage of the evaluation.

<sup>4</sup> Outcomes are defined as 'Effects or behaviour changes resulting from programme outputs'. DFID

<sup>5</sup> Further information on Environmental, Social and Economic Safeguards (ESES) can be found at <http://www.unenvironment.org>

<sup>6</sup> *Scaling up* refers to approaches being adopted on a much larger scale, but in a very similar context. Scaling up is often the longer-term objective of pilot initiatives. *Replication* refers to approaches being repeated or lessons being explicitly applied in new/different contexts e.g. other geographic areas, different target group etc. Effective replication typically requires some form of revision or adaptation to the new context. It is possible to replicate at either the same or a different scale.

<sup>7</sup> A list of relevant Sustainable Development Goals is available on the UN Environment Evaluation Office website at [www.unenvironment.org/evaluation](http://www.unenvironment.org/evaluation)

|   |  |   |  |  |   |
|---|--|---|--|--|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No direct outcomes achieved (not even partial achievement).</li> <li>Assumptions for the change process from direct outcomes to intermediate states do <u>not</u> hold.</li> <li>Drivers to support transition from direct outcome(s) to intermediate states <u>not</u> in place.</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some direct outcomes <i>partially</i> achieved but do <u>not</u> include those most important to achieve intermediate states/impact.</li> <li>Assumptions for the change process from direct outcomes to intermediate states do <u>not</u> hold.</li> <li>Drivers to support transition from direct outcome(s) to intermediate states <u>not</u> in place.</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some direct outcomes <i>fully</i> achieved, but do <u>not</u> include those most important to attain intermediate states/impact.</li> <li>Assumptions for progress from project outputs to direct outcome(s) do <u>not</u> hold.</li> <li>Drivers to support transition from outputs to direct outcome(s) are <u>not</u> in place.</li> </ul> <p>AND, in addition</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No intermediate state(s) achieved.</li> <li>Assumptions for the change process from intermediate state(s) to impact do <u>not</u> hold.</li> <li>Drivers to support transition from intermediate state(s) to impact <u>not</u> in place.</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Those direct outcomes that are the most important to attain intermediate states, <i>partially</i> achieved. Other direct outcomes are not/only partially achieved.</li> <li>Assumptions for progress from project outputs to direct outcome(s) hold <i>partially</i>.</li> <li>Drivers to support transition from outputs to direct outcome(s) are only <i>partially</i> in place.</li> </ul> <p>AND, in addition</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No intermediate state(s) achieved.</li> <li>Assumptions for the change process from intermediate state(s) to impact do hold.</li> <li>Drivers to support transition from intermediate state(s) to impact are <u>not</u> in place.</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Those direct outcomes that are the most important to attain intermediate states, <i>fully</i> achieved. Other direct outcomes are not/only partially achieved.</li> <li>Assumptions for progress from project outputs to direct outcome(s) hold.</li> <li>Drivers to support transition from outputs to direct outcome(s) are in place.</li> </ul> <p>AND, in addition</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some intermediate state(s) <i>partially</i> achieved.</li> <li>Assumptions for the change process from intermediate state(s) to impact do hold.</li> <li>Drivers to support transition from intermediate state(s) to impact are <i>partially</i> in place.</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All direct outcomes fully achieved.</li> <li>Assumptions for progress from project outputs to direct outcome(s) hold <i>fully</i>.</li> <li>Drivers to support transition from outputs to direct outcome(s) are <i>fully</i> in place.</li> </ul> <p>AND, in addition</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All intermediate states fully achieved.</li> <li>Assumptions for the change process from intermediate state(s) to impact do hold.</li> <li>Drivers to support transition from intermediate state(s) to impact are <i>fully</i> in place.</li> </ul> |
|---|--|---|--|--|---|

## E. Financial Management

Financial management will be assessed under two themes: *completeness* of financial information and *communication* between financial and project management staff. The evaluation will establish the actual spend across the life of the project of funds secured from all donors. This expenditure will be reported, where possible, at output level and will be compared with the approved budget. The evaluation will assess the level of communication between the Project/Task Manager and the Fund Management Officer as it relates to the effective delivery of the planned project and the needs of a responsive, adaptive management approach. The evaluation will verify the application of proper financial management standards and adherence to UN Environment's financial management policies. Any financial management issues that have affected the timely delivery of the project or the quality of its performance will be highlighted.

### E1. Completeness of Financial Information

| <b>Highly Unsatisfactory</b>  | <b>Unsatisfactory</b>  | <b>Moderately Unsatisfactory</b>   | <b>Moderately Satisfactory</b>  | <b>Satisfactory</b>  | <b>Highly Satisfactory</b>  |
|---|--|--|---|--|---|
| <p>None of the applicable <b>items a-k</b> are complete and made available to the evaluation.</p> <p>a) High level project budget (costs) for secured and unsecured funds.</p> <p>b) High level project budget by funding source(s) for secured and unsecured funds.</p> <p>c) Disbursement (Funds Transfer) document from funding source(s) to UN Environment.</p> <p>d) Project expenditure sheet (to-date).</p> <p>e) Detailed project (budget by output/outcome) for secured funds.</p> <p>f) Partner legal agreements and documentation for all amendments exists.</p> <p><i>Where applicable:</i></p> <p>g) Re-approved project budget (by budget line) for project extensions (both cost and no-cost extension).</p> <p>h) Disbursement (Funds Transfer) documents (cash statement) from UN Environment to Partners.</p> <p><i>For GEF funded projects:</i></p> <p>i) Proof/report of delivery of in-kind contributions exists.</p> <p>j) For externally executed GEF projects, audit reports for the Executing Agency exist.</p> <p>k) Management response to audit reports exists.</p> | <p>Less than 50% of the applicable <b>items a-k</b> are complete and made available to the evaluation.</p> <p>a) High level project budget (costs) for secured and unsecured funds.</p> <p>b) High level project budget by funding source(s) for secured and unsecured funds</p> <p>c) Disbursement (Funds Transfer) document from funding source(s) to UN Environment.</p> <p>d) Project expenditure sheet (to-date).</p> <p>e) Detailed project budget (by output/outcome) for secured funds.</p> <p>f) Proof/report of delivery of in-kind contributions.</p> <p>g) Partner legal agreements and documentation for all amendments exists.</p> <p><i>Where applicable:</i></p> <p>h) Re-approved project budget by budget line for project extensions (both cost and no-cost extension).</p> <p>i) Disbursement (Funds Transfer) documents (cash statement) from UN Environment to Partners.</p> <p><i>For GEF funded projects:</i></p> <p>j) Proof/report of delivery of in-kind contributions exists.</p> <p>k) For externally executed GEF projects, audit reports for the Executing Agency exist.</p> <p>l) Management response to audit reports exists.</p> | <p>50 - 80% of the applicable <b>items a-k</b> are complete and made available to the evaluation.</p> <p>a) High level project budget (costs) for secured and unsecured funds.</p> <p>b) High level project budget by funding source(s) for secured and unsecured funds.</p> <p>c) Disbursement (Funds Transfer) document from funding source(s) to UN Environment.</p> <p>d) Project expenditure sheet (to-date).</p> <p>e) Detailed project budget (by output/outcome) for secured funds.</p> <p>f) Proof/report of delivery of in-kind contributions.</p> <p>g) Partner legal agreements and documentation for all amendments exists.</p> <p><i>Where applicable:</i></p> <p>h) Re-approved project budget by budget line for project extensions (both cost and no-cost extension).</p> <p>i) Disbursement (Funds Transfer) documents (cash statement) from UN Environment to Partners.</p> <p><i>For GEF funded projects:</i></p> <p>j) Proof/report of delivery of in-kind contributions exists.</p> <p>k) For externally executed GEF projects, audit reports for the Executing Agency exist.</p> <p>l) Management response to audit reports exists.</p> | <p>81 – 100% applicable <b>items a-k</b> are complete and made available to the evaluation.</p> <p>a) High level project budget (costs) for secured and unsecured funds.</p> <p>b) High level project budget by funding source(s) for secured and unsecured funds.</p> <p>c) Disbursement (Funds Transfer) document from funding source(s) to UN Environment.</p> <p>d) Project expenditure sheet (to-date).</p> <p>e) Detailed project budget (by output/outcome) for secured funds.</p> <p>f) Partner legal agreements and documentation for all amendments exist.</p> <p><i>Where applicable:</i></p> <p>g) Re-approved project budget for project extensions (both cost and no-cost extension).</p> <p>h) Disbursement (Funds Transfer) documents (cash statement) from UN Environment to Partners.</p> <p><i>For GEF funded projects:</i></p> <p>i) Proof/report of delivery of in-kind contributions exists.</p> <p>j) For externally executed GEF projects, audit reports for the Executing Agency exist.</p> <p>k) Management response to audit reports exists.</p> | <p>All applicable <b>items a-k</b> are complete and made available to the evaluation.</p> <p><b>AND</b></p> <p><b>Items d &amp; e</b> are presented annually (quarterly for externally executed projects).</p> <p><b>AND</b></p> <p><b>Item e</b> is signed/stamped by the Project Manager/FMO</p> <p>a) High level project budget (costs) for secured and unsecured funds.</p> <p>b) High level project budget by funding source(s) for secured and unsecured funds.</p> <p>c) Disbursement (Funds Transfer) document from funding source(s) to UN Environment.</p> <p>d) Project expenditure sheet by output/outcome (to-date).</p> <p>e) Detailed project budget (by output/outcome) for secured funds.</p> <p>f) Proof/report of delivery of in-kind contributions.</p> <p>g) Partner legal agreements and documentation for all amendments exist.</p> <p><i>Where applicable:</i></p> <p>h) Re-approved project budget by budget line for project extensions (both cost and no-cost extension).</p> <p>i) Disbursement (Funds Transfer) documents (cash statement) from UN Environment to Partners.</p> <p><i>For GEF funded projects:</i></p> <p>j) Proof/report of delivery of in-kind contributions exists.</p> <p>k) For externally executed GEF projects, audit reports for the Executing Agency exist.</p> <p>l) Management response to audit reports exists.</p> | <p>All applicable <b>items a-k</b> are complete and made available to the evaluation.</p> <p><b>AND</b></p> <p><b>Items d &amp; e</b> are presented at annual/quarterly level</p> <p><b>AND</b></p> <p><b>Item e</b> is signed/stamped by the Project Manager/FMO</p> <p><b>AND</b></p> <p><b>Item e</b> is presented at results level (outputs/outcomes)</p> <p>a) High level project budget (costs) for secured and unsecured funds.</p> <p>b) High level project budget by funding source(s) for secured and unsecured funds.</p> <p>c) Disbursement (Funds Transfer) document from funding source(s) to UN Environment.</p> <p>d) Project expenditure sheet (to-date).</p> <p>e) Detailed project budget (by output/outcome) for secured funds.</p> <p>f) Proof/report of delivery of in-kind contributions.</p> <p>g) Partner legal agreements and documentation for all amendments exist.</p> <p><i>Where applicable:</i></p> <p>h) Re-approved project budget by budget line for project extensions (both cost and no-cost extension).</p> <p>i) Disbursement (Funds Transfer) documents (cash statement) from UN Environment to Partners.</p> <p><i>For GEF funded projects:</i></p> <p>j) Proof/report of delivery of in-kind contributions exists.</p> <p>k) For externally executed GEF projects, audit reports for the Executing Agency exist.</p> <p>l) Management response to audit reports exists.</p> |

| E2. Communication Between Finance and Project Management Staff   |  |   |   |   |  |
|--|--|---|---|---|--|
| <p>Evidence suggests that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the project manager has <i>no awareness</i> of the current financial status of project.</li> <li>the FMO is <i>not aware</i> of project progress yet financial disbursements are made (i.e. Disbursements made <i>without</i> financial and technical progress reports).</li> <li>there is <i>no</i> regular / frequent contact between PM and FMO.</li> </ul> <p>AND/OR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>there is evidence that the lack of communication between financial and project staff members has <i>negatively affected</i> project implementation.</li> </ul> | <p>Evidence suggests that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the project manager has <i>little awareness</i> of the current financial status of project.</li> <li>the FMO has <i>little awareness</i> of project progress when financial disbursements are made (i.e. Disbursements made against <i>low quality</i> financial and technical progress reports).</li> <li>there is <i>little</i> documented interaction between project Manager and FMO.</li> </ul> <p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>financial issues are only addressed retrospectively when identified by senior management/staff external to the project team.</li> </ul> | <p>Evidence suggests that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the project manager has <i>moderate awareness</i> of the current financial status of project.</li> <li>the FMO has <i>moderate awareness</i> of project progress when financial disbursements are made (i.e. Disbursements made against <i>low quality</i> financial and technical progress reports).</li> <li>there is <i>moderate</i> documented interaction between project Manager and FMO.</li> </ul> <p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>financial issues are only addressed retrospectively when identified by senior management/staff external to the project team.</li> <li>narrative reports are only reviewed by project manager and financial reports only by the FMO.</li> </ul> | <p>Evidence suggests that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the project manager has <i>strong awareness</i> of the current financial status of project.</li> <li>the FMO has <i>strong awareness</i> of overall project progress when financial disbursements are made. (i.e. Disbursements made against <i>good quality</i> financial and technical progress reports).</li> <li>there is <i>regular / frequent</i> contact between PM and FMO.</li> </ul> <p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>financial issues are only addressed retrospectively when identified by senior management/staff external to the project team.</li> <li>all narrative and financial reports are reviewed by both finance and project staff members prior to submission.</li> </ul> | <p>Evidence suggests that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the project manager has <i>strong awareness</i> of the current financial status of project.</li> <li>the FMO has <i>strong awareness</i> of overall project progress when financial disbursements are made. (i.e. Disbursements made against <i>good quality</i> financial and technical progress reports).</li> <li>there is <i>regular / frequent</i> contact between PM and FMO.</li> </ul> <p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>evidence that PM or FMO are proactive in raising and resolving financial issues.</li> <li>all narrative and financial reports are reviewed by both finance and project staff members prior to submission.</li> </ul> | <p>Evidence suggests that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the project manager has <i>strong awareness</i> of the current financial status of project.</li> <li>the FMO has <i>strong awareness</i> of overall project progress when financial disbursements are made. (i.e. Disbursements made against <i>good quality</i> financial and technical progress reports).</li> <li>there is <i>regular / frequent</i> contact between PM and FMO.</li> </ul> <p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>evidence that PM or FMO are proactive in raising and resolving financial issues.</li> <li>all narrative and financial reports are reviewed by both finance and project staff members prior to submission.</li> <li>there is evidence that good communication between financial and project staff members has positively affected project implementation (i.e. <i>within budget, no extensions, more outputs than planned</i> etc).</li> </ul> |

| F. Efficiency   |   |  |  |  |  |
|---|---|--|--|--|--|
| <p>In keeping with the OECD/DAC definition of efficiency the evaluation will assess the extent to which the project delivered maximum results from the given resources. This will include an assessment of the cost-effectiveness and timeliness of project execution. Focussing on the translation of inputs into outputs, cost-effectiveness is the extent to which an intervention has achieved, or is expected to achieve, its results at the lowest possible cost. Timeliness refers to whether planned activities were delivered according to expected timeframes as well as whether events were sequenced efficiently. The evaluation will also assess to what extent any project extension could have been avoided through stronger project management and identify any negative impacts caused by project delays or extensions. The evaluation will describe any cost or time-saving measures put in place to maximise results within the secured budget and agreed project timeframe and consider whether the project was implemented in the most efficient way compared to alternative interventions or approaches.</p> <p>The evaluation will give special attention to efforts by the project teams to make use of/build upon pre-existing institutions, agreements and partnerships, data sources, synergies and complementarities with other initiatives, programmes and projects etc. to increase project efficiency. The evaluation will also consider the extent to which the management of the project <u>minimised UN Environment's environmental footprint</u>.</p> <p>The factors underpinning the need for any project extensions will also be explored and discussed. As management or project support costs cannot be increased in cases of 'no cost extensions', such extensions represent an increase in unstated costs to implementing parties.</p> |   |  |  |  |  |
| Highly Unsatisfactory   | Unsatisfactory  | Moderately Unsatisfactory  | Moderately Satisfactory  | Satisfactory   | Highly Satisfactory  |
| <p>The project has had three or more 'no-cost extensions' against the formally approved results framework.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>The delays in project implementation (timeliness) had negative impacts on at least one group of stakeholders.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Evidence suggests that a lack of cost effective approaches undermined the achievement of project targets.</p>  | <p>The project has had two 'no cost extensions' of one year or more against the formally approved results framework.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>The delays in project implementation (timeliness) had negative impacts on at least one group of stakeholders.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Project activities/events were occasionally sequenced efficiently.</p> | <p>The project has had two 'no cost extensions' of one year or more against the formally approved results framework.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Project activities/events were <i>occasionally</i> sequenced efficiently.</p> | <p>The project has had one 'no cost extension' of one year or less and with justified amendments to the formally approved results framework.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Project activities/events were <i>frequently</i> sequenced efficiently.</p> | <p>The project has had one 'no cost extension' of one year or less and with justified amendments to the formally approved results framework.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Evidence suggests that the application of cost effective approaches <i>strongly supported</i> the achievement of project targets.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Project activities/events were <i>frequently</i> sequenced efficiently.</p> | <p>The project was implemented within the originally intended (first approval) timeframe (i.e. duration) or was implemented within the timeframe and against an appropriately revised results framework specified by a formal revision that secured additional resources.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>The project had a 'costed' extension (ie. additional funds were awarded to either continue or extend the agreed scope of work)</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Evidence suggests that cost-effective approaches supported project targets being exceeded.</p> |



## G. Monitoring and Reporting

The evaluation will assess monitoring and reporting across three sub-categories: monitoring design and budgeting, monitoring implementation and project reporting.

### G1. Monitoring Design and Budgeting

Each project should be supported by a sound monitoring plan that is designed to track progress against SMART<sup>8</sup> indicators towards the achievement of the projects outputs and direct outcomes, including at a level disaggregated by gender, vulnerability or marginalisation. The evaluation will assess the quality of the design of the monitoring plan as well as the funds allocated for its implementation. The adequacy of resources for mid-term and terminal evaluation/review should be discussed if applicable.

| Highly Unsatisfactory  | Unsatisfactory  | Moderately Unsatisfactory  | Moderately Satisfactory  | Satisfactory  | Highly Satisfactory  |
|--|---|--|--|---|--|
| At project launch/mobilisation no monitoring plan exists (i.e. only the logical framework and/or details of UN Environment/donor reporting requirements exist) | At project launch/mobilisation a monitoring plan that covers <b>only item a</b> exists:<br>a) Covers all indicators in the logical framework.<br>b) Has data collection methods.<br>c) Has data collection frequency.<br>d) Data collection frequency is appropriate for the indicator.<br><br>None of <b>item e - h</b> hold:<br>e) The project has a dedicated budget by monitoring activity.<br>f) Person responsible for monitoring progress against each indicator is identified.<br>g) Is disaggregated by relevant stakeholder groups including gender and minority/disadvantaged groups.<br>h) When applicable, additional gender specific indicators are developed<br>i) Funds for mid-term and terminal evaluations/reviews are considered adequate by the Evaluation Office (and are available to the evaluation). | At project launch/mobilisation a monitoring plan exists that covers <b>only items a-d</b> :<br>a) Covers all indicators in the logical framework.<br>b) Has data collection methods.<br>c) Has data collection frequency.<br>d) Data collection frequency is appropriate for the indicator.<br><br>None of <b>items e - i</b> hold:<br>e) The project has a dedicated budget by monitoring activity.<br>f) Person responsible for monitoring progress against each indicator is identified.<br>g) Is disaggregated by relevant stakeholder groups including gender and minority/disadvantaged groups.<br>h) When applicable, additional gender specific indicators are developed<br>i) Funds for mid-term and terminal evaluations/reviews are considered adequate by the Evaluation Office (and are available to the evaluation). | At project launch/mobilisation a monitoring plan exists that covers <b>items a-d</b> and has <b>items e and f</b> :<br>a) Covers all indicators in the logical framework.<br>b) Has data collection methods.<br>c) Has data collection frequency.<br>d) Data collection frequency is appropriate for the indicator.<br><br><b>Items e and f</b> hold:<br>e) The project has a dedicated budget by monitoring activity.<br>f) Person responsible for monitoring progress against each indicator is identified.<br>g) Is disaggregated by relevant stakeholder groups including gender and minority/disadvantaged groups.<br>h) When applicable, additional gender specific indicators are developed<br>i) Funds for mid-term and terminal evaluations/reviews are considered adequate by the Evaluation Office (and are available to the evaluation). | At project launch/mobilisation a monitoring plan <b>exists</b> that covers <b>items a-i</b> , but is not known by more than one member of the project team:<br>a) Covers all indicators in the logical framework<br>b) Has data collection methods<br>c) Has data collection frequency<br>d) Data collection frequency is appropriate for the indicator.<br>e) The project has a dedicated budget by monitoring activity.<br>f) Person responsible for monitoring progress against each indicator is identified.<br>g) Is disaggregated by relevant stakeholder groups including gender and minority/disadvantaged groups.<br>h) When applicable, additional gender specific indicators are developed<br>i) Funds for mid-term and terminal evaluations/reviews are considered adequate by the Evaluation Office (and are available to the evaluation). | At project launch/mobilisation a monitoring plan exists that covers all <b>items a-i</b> and is owned by the project team:<br>a) Covers all indicators in the logical framework<br>b) Has data collection methods<br>c) Has data collection frequency<br>d) The project has a dedicated budget by monitoring activity.<br>e) Person responsible for monitoring progress against each indicator is identified.<br>f) Is disaggregated by relevant stakeholder groups including gender and minority/disadvantaged groups.<br>g) When applicable, additional gender specific indicators are developed<br>h) Funds for mid-term and terminal evaluations/reviews are considered adequate by the Evaluation Office (and are available to the evaluation). |

### G2. Monitoring of Project Implementation

The evaluation will assess whether the monitoring system was operational and facilitated the timely tracking of results and progress towards projects objectives throughout the project implementation period. This should include monitoring the representation and participation of disaggregated groups (including gendered, vulnerable or marginalised groups) in project activities. It will also consider how information generated by the monitoring system during project implementation was used to adapt and improve project execution, achievement of outcomes and ensure sustainability. The evaluation should confirm that funds allocated for monitoring were used to support this activity.

#### NOTES:

'responsive to gender needs' means that effective strategies and resources are utilised to ensure that female beneficiaries are targeted for monitoring in a gender sensitive manner taking into account their social functions/workload and the social and cultural norms and practices which may inhibit their full participation

| Highly Unsatisfactory   | Unsatisfactory   | Moderately Unsatisfactory  | Moderately Satisfactory   | Satisfactory  | Highly Satisfactory   |
|---|--|--|---|---|---|
| At evaluation, evidence suggests that:<br><ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No monitoring plan exists (i.e. only the logical framework and/or details of UN Environment/donor reporting requirements exist)</li> <li>No workplan exists</li> </ul> | At evaluation, evidence suggests that:<br><ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A basic monitoring plan (items a-c above) exists.</li> <li>A completed workplan exists.</li> <li>No project implementation data were collected against the monitoring plan and workplan.</li> </ul> | At evaluation, evidence suggests that:<br><ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A basic monitoring plan (items a-c above) exists.</li> <li>A completed workplan exists.</li> <li>Some project implementation data were collected against the monitoring plan and workplan.</li> </ul> | At evaluation, evidence suggests that:<br><ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Complete (although this may not be at the level of detail required) monitoring data were collected regularly in accordance with a monitoring plan and workplan, but there is no evidence that the data have been shared or used during the life of the project.</li> </ul> | At evaluation, evidence suggests that :<br><ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Complete, relevant and detailed monitoring data were collected regularly in accordance with a monitoring plan and workplan. These data were analysed and shared with appropriate project managers and steering partners.</li> </ul> | At evaluation, evidence suggests that :<br><ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Complete, relevant and detailed monitoring data were collected regularly in accordance with a monitoring plan and workplan, these data were analysed and shared with appropriate project managers and steering partners.</li> </ul> |

<sup>8</sup> SMART refers to indicators that are specific, measurable, assignable, realistic and time-specific.

|  |  |  |  |   |  |
|--|--|--|--|---|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is no evidence any project implementation data were collected.</li> </ul> |  | <p>workplan, but it is incomplete and cannot be used to validate indicators.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Data collected is not disaggregated by vulnerable/marginalized groups, including gender.</li> </ul> <p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is no evidence that any funds were spent on monitoring.</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Data collected is disaggregated by vulnerable/marginalized groups, including gender.</li> <li>Tools and methodologies that are responsive to the needs of different stakeholder groups care utilised during monitoring</li> </ul> <p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Funds were spent on monitoring but not in accordance with any planned spend or against budget lines identified for monitoring.</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Detailed data by indicator are made available to the evaluators.</li> <li>Data collected is disaggregated by vulnerable/marginalized groups, including gender.</li> <li>Tools and methodologies that are responsive to the needs of different stakeholder groups are utilised during monitoring</li> </ul> <p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>An adequate, planned monitoring budget was reasonably spent.</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Detailed data by indicator are made available to the evaluators.</li> <li>Data collected is disaggregated by vulnerable/marginalized groups, including gender.</li> <li>Tools and methodologies that are responsive to the needs of different stakeholder groups are utilised during monitoring</li> <li>An adequate, planned monitoring budget was reasonably spent.</li> </ul> <p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Information generated by the implementation of the monitoring plan during the life of the project has been used to adapt and improve project execution, achievement of outcomes and to ensure sustainability.</li> </ul> |
|--|--|--|--|---|--|

### G3. Project Reporting

UN Environment has a centralised Project Information Management System (PIMS) in which project managers upload six-monthly status reports against agreed project milestones. This information will be provided to the Evaluation Consultant(s) by the Evaluation Manager. Some projects have additional requirements to report regularly to funding partners, which will be supplied by the project team (e.g. the Project Implementation Reviews and Tracking Tool for GEF-funded projects). The evaluation will assess the extent to which both UN Environment and donor reporting commitments have been fulfilled. Consideration will be given as to whether reporting has been carried out with respect to the effects of the initiative on disaggregated groups.

**NOTES:**

'Appropriate UN Environment colleagues' are taken to mean other staff working on complementary projects or working in the same sector/on the same topic/in the same country. The aim is to recognize efforts to work outside 'silos'.

| <b>Highly Unsatisfactory</b>  | <b>Unsatisfactory</b>   | <b>Moderately Unsatisfactory</b>   | <b>Moderately Satisfactory</b>  | <b>Satisfactory</b>  | <b>Highly Satisfactory</b>  |
|---|---|--|---|--|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No documentation of project progress available.</li> <li>No evidence of effective collaboration and communication with appropriate UN Environment colleagues<sup>1</sup>.</li> <li>No PIMS/donor reporting has been done.</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No documentation of project progress available.</li> <li>No evidence of effective collaboration and communication with appropriate UN Environment colleagues.</li> <li>PIMS/donor reporting has frequent gaps.</li> <li>Data reported is not disaggregated by vulnerable/marginalized groups, including gender.</li> </ul> <p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The PIMS/donor reporting does not adequately reflect the project scope of work. (e.g. many sub-projects or countries; PIMS outputs don't cover all the project contracts)</li> </ul> <p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Considerable inconsistency between report progress in PIMS/donor reports and available evidence</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Only fragmented documentation of project progress available.</li> <li>Evidence of limited effective collaboration and communication with appropriate UN Environment colleagues.</li> <li>PIMS/donor reporting has frequent gaps.</li> <li>Data reported is not disaggregated by vulnerable/marginalized groups, including gender.</li> </ul> <p>AND ONE OF EITHER A OR B (below) HOLD:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The PIMS/donor reporting does not adequately reflect the project scope of work. (e.g. many sub-projects or countries; PIMS outputs don't cover all the project contracts)</li> <li>Considerable inconsistency between report progress in PIMS/donor reports and available evidence</li> </ol> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Only fragmented documentation of project progress available.</li> <li>Evidence of limited effective collaboration and communication with appropriate UN Environment colleagues.</li> <li>PIMS/donor reporting has occasional gaps</li> <li>Data reported is disaggregated by vulnerable/marginalized groups, including gender.</li> </ul> <p>AND ONE OF EITHER A OR B (below) HOLD:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The PIMS/donor reporting adequately reflects the project scope of work. (e.g. many sub-projects or countries; PIMS outputs don't cover all the project contracts)</li> <li>Consistency between report progress in PIMS/donor reports and available evidence.</li> </ol> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Substantial (but still incomplete) documentation of project progress available.</li> <li>Evidence of substantial collaboration and communication with appropriate UN Environment colleagues.</li> <li>PIMS/donor reporting has occasional gaps</li> <li>Data reported is disaggregated by vulnerable/marginalized groups, including gender.</li> </ul> <p>AND A TO C (below) HOLD :</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The PIMS/donor reporting adequately reflects the project scope of work. (e.g. many sub-projects or countries; PIMS outputs don't cover all the project contracts)</li> <li>Consistency between report progress in PIMS/donor reports and available evidence.</li> <li>Monitoring report is gender neutral (ie. reflecting gendered experiences equally) and/or, where appropriate, gender sensitive (ie. reporting experiences differentiated by gender groups)</li> </ol> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Complete and high-quality documentation of project progress available.</li> <li>Evidence of highly-effective collaboration and communication with appropriate UN Environment colleagues</li> <li>PIMS/donor reporting has no gaps</li> <li>Data reported is disaggregated by vulnerable/marginalized groups, including gender.</li> </ul> <p>AND A TO D (below) HOLD :</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Official records in PIMS/donor reports fully match available evidence.</li> <li>The PIMS/donor reporting adequately reflects the project scope of work. (e.g. many sub-projects or countries; PIMS outputs cover all the project contracts)</li> <li>Project reporting supports outcome level results and/or beyond.</li> <li>Monitoring report is gender neutral (ie. reflecting gendered experiences equally) and/or, where appropriate, gender sensitive (ie. reporting experiences differentiated by gender groups)</li> </ol> |

## H. Sustainability

Sustainability is understood as the probability of direct outcomes being maintained and developed after the close of the intervention. The evaluation will identify and assess the key conditions or factors that are likely to undermine or contribute to the persistence of achieved direct outcomes (ie. 'assumptions' and 'drivers'). Some factors of sustainability may be embedded in the project design and implementation approaches while others may be contextual circumstances or conditions that evolve over the life of the intervention.

Where applicable [an assessment of bio-physical factors](#) that may affect the sustainability of direct outcomes may also be included.

Sustainability is assessed against three sub-criteria: a) socio-political sustainability, b) financial sustainability and c) institutional sustainability.

### H1. Socio-political Sustainability

The evaluation will assess the extent to which social or political factors support the continuation and further development of project direct outcomes. It will consider the level of ownership, interest and commitment among government and other stakeholders to take the project achievements forwards.

|            |          | Dependency |       |        |        |         |      |
|------------|----------|------------|-------|--------|--------|---------|------|
|            |          | None       | 0-25% | 25-50% | 50-75% | 75-100% | 100% |
| Dependency | High     | HU         | HU    | U      | MU     | MS      | S    |
|            | Moderate | HU         | U     | MU     | MS     | S       | HS   |
|            | Low      | U          | MU    | MS     | S      | HS      | HS   |
|            | None     |            |       |        |        |         | HS   |
|            |          | None       | 0-25% | 25-50% | 50-75% | 75-100% | 100% |
| MITIGATION |          |            |       |        |        |         |      |

| Highly Unsatisfactory  | Unsatisfactory   | Moderately Unsatisfactory  | Moderately Satisfactory   | Satisfactory  | Highly Satisfactory   |
|--|--|--|---|---|---|
| <p>At evaluation, evidence suggests that :</p> <p><b>High/moderate dependency<br/>No (0-5%) mitigation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The sustainability of project outcomes has a <i>high/moderate</i> degree of dependency on social/political factors</li> </ul> <p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is <i>no</i> ownership, interest and commitment among government and among other stakeholders to sustain the project outcomes.</li> <li><i>No</i> mechanism is in place to adapt to changes in the social/political context. (e.g. <i>relevant social norms and/or political priorities have not been identified during the project</i>).</li> </ul> <p>OR</p> <p><b>High dependency<br/>5-25% mitigation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The sustainability of project outcomes has a <i>high</i> degree of dependency on social/political factors</li> </ul> <p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is <i>little or no</i> ownership, interest and commitment among government and among other stakeholders to sustain the project outcomes.</li> <li><i>No</i> mechanism is in place to adapt to changes in the social/political context. (e.g. <i>relevant social norms and/or political priorities have not been identified during the project</i>).</li> </ul> | <p>At evaluation, evidence suggests that :</p> <p><b>High dependency<br/>25-50% mitigation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The sustainability of project outcomes has a <i>high</i> degree of dependency on social/political factors</li> </ul> <p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is <i>moderate</i> ownership, interest and commitment among government and among other stakeholders to sustain the project outcomes.</li> <li>A <i>partial</i> mechanism is in place to adapt to changes in the social/political context (e.g. <i>some relevant social norms and/or political priorities have been identified during the project</i>).</li> </ul> <p>OR</p> <p><b>Moderate dependency<br/>5-25% mitigation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The sustainability of project outcomes has a <i>moderate</i> degree of dependency on social/political factors</li> </ul> <p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is <i>weak</i> ownership, interest and commitment among government and among other stakeholders to sustain the project outcomes.</li> <li>A <i>partial</i> mechanism is in place to adapt to changes in the social/political context (e.g. <i>some relevant social norms and/or political priorities have been identified during the project</i>).</li> </ul> <p>OR</p> <p><b>Low dependency<br/>No (0-5%) mitigation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The sustainability of project outcomes has a <i>low</i> degree of dependency on social/political factors</li> </ul> <p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is <i>no</i> ownership, interest and commitment among government and among</li> </ul> | <p>At evaluation, evidence suggests that :</p> <p><b>High dependency<br/>50-75% mitigation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The sustainability of project outcomes has a <i>high</i> degree of dependency on social/political factors</li> </ul> <p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is <i>fairly strong</i> ownership, interest and commitment among government and among other stakeholders but it does not reach the levels which have the power to sustain the project outcomes.</li> <li>A <i>weak</i> mechanism is in place to adapt to changes in the social/political context (e.g. <i>all relevant social norms and/or political priorities have been identified during the project, but none have been discussed with stakeholders</i>).</li> </ul> <p>OR</p> <p><b>Moderate dependency<br/>25-50% mitigation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The sustainability of project outcomes has a <i>moderate</i> degree of dependency on social/political factors</li> </ul> <p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is <i>weak</i> ownership, interest and commitment among government and among other stakeholders to sustain the project outcomes.</li> <li>A <i>weak</i> mechanism is in place to adapt to changes in the social/political context (e.g. <i>all relevant social norms and/or political priorities have been identified during the project, but none have been discussed with stakeholders</i>).</li> </ul> <p>OR</p> <p><b>Low dependency<br/>5-25% mitigation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The sustainability of project outcomes has a <i>low</i> degree of dependency on social/political factors</li> </ul> | <p>At evaluation, evidence suggests that :</p> <p><b>High dependency<br/>75-99% mitigation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The sustainability of project outcomes has a <i>high</i> degree of dependency on social/political factors</li> </ul> <p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is <i>strong</i> ownership, interest and commitment among government and among other stakeholders which to some extent extends to the critical levels of government which have the power to sustain project outcomes. The ownership might be subject to government changes.</li> <li>A <i>moderate</i> mechanism is in place to adapt to changes in the social/political context (e.g. <i>all relevant social norms and/or political priorities have been identified during the project, and some have been discussed with stakeholders</i>)</li> </ul> <p>OR</p> <p><b>Moderate dependency<br/>50-75% mitigation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The sustainability of project outcomes has a <i>moderate</i> degree of dependency on social/political factors</li> </ul> <p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is <i>fairly strong</i> ownership, interest and commitment among government and among other stakeholders but it does not reach the levels which have the power to sustain the project outcomes.</li> <li>A <i>moderate</i> mechanism is in place to adapt to changes in the social/political context (e.g. <i>all relevant social norms and/or political priorities have been identified during the project, and some have been discussed with stakeholders</i>)</li> </ul> <p>OR</p> <p><b>Low dependency<br/>25-50% mitigation</b></p> | <p>At evaluation, evidence suggests that :</p> <p><b>High dependency<br/>100% mitigation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The sustainability of project outcomes has a <i>high</i> degree of dependency on social/political factors</li> </ul> <p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is a <i>high level</i> of ownership, interest and commitment among government and among other stakeholders. Concrete action has been taken to sustain outcomes. Only a small possibility of this ownership to vanish with future government changes.</li> <li>A <i>strong</i> mechanism is in place to adapt to changes in the social/political context (e.g. <i>all relevant social norms and/or political priorities have been identified during the project and all have been discussed with stakeholders</i>)</li> </ul> <p>OR</p> <p><b>Moderate dependency<br/>75-99% mitigation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The sustainability of project outcomes has a <i>moderate</i> degree of dependency on social/political factors</li> </ul> <p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is <i>strong</i> ownership, interest and commitment among government and among other stakeholders which to some extent extends to the critical levels of government which have the power to sustain project outcomes. The ownership might be subject to government changes.</li> <li>A <i>strong</i> mechanism is in place to adapt to changes in the social/political context (e.g. <i>all relevant social norms and/or political priorities have been identified during the project and all have been discussed with stakeholders</i>)</li> </ul> <p>OR</p> <p><b>Low dependency<br/>75-100% mitigation</b></p> | <p>At evaluation, evidence suggests that :</p> <p><b>Moderate dependency<br/>100% mitigation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The sustainability of project outcomes has a <i>moderate</i> degree of dependency on social/political factors</li> </ul> <p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is a <i>high level</i> of ownership, interest and commitment among government and among other stakeholders. Full action has been taken to sustain outcomes. There is strong evidence the outcome(s) are long-term.</li> <li>An <i>adaptive</i> mechanism is in place to respond to changes in the social/political context, should it become necessary (e.g. <i>all relevant social norms and/or political priorities have been identified during the project, all have been discussed with stakeholders and some action has been taken to ensure consistency between the project's direct outcomes and these social norms and/or political priorities</i>)</li> </ul> <p>OR</p> <p><b>Low dependency<br/>75-100% mitigation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The sustainability of project outcomes has a <i>low</i> degree of dependency on social/political factors</li> </ul> <p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is <i>strong</i> ownership, interest and commitment among government and among other stakeholders which to some extent extends to the critical levels of government which have the power to sustain project outcomes. The ownership might be subject to government changes.</li> <li>An <i>adaptive</i> mechanism is in place to respond to changes in the social/political context, should it become necessary (see example above)</li> </ul> |

|  |  |  |  |  |   |
|--|--|--|--|--|---|
|  | <p>other stakeholders to sustain the project outcomes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A <i>partial</i> mechanism is in place to adapt to changes in the social/political context (e.g. some relevant social norms and/or political priorities have been identified during the project).</li> </ul> | <p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is <i>no</i> ownership, interest and commitment among government and among other stakeholders to sustain the project outcomes.</li> <li>• A <i>weak</i> mechanism is in place to adapt to changes in the social/political context (e.g. all relevant social norms and/or political priorities have been identified during the project, but none have been discussed with stakeholders).</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The sustainability of project outcomes has a <i>low</i> degree of dependency on social/political factors</li> </ul> <p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is <i>weak</i> ownership, interest and commitment among government and among other stakeholders to sustain the project outcomes.</li> <li>• A <i>moderate</i> mechanism is in place to adapt to changes in the social/political context (e.g. all relevant social norms and/or political priorities have been identified during the project, and some have been discussed with stakeholders)</li> </ul> | <p><b>50-75% mitigation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The sustainability of project outcomes has a <i>low</i> degree of dependency on social/political factors</li> </ul> <p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is <i>fairly strong</i> ownership, interest and commitment among government and among other stakeholders but it does not reach the levels which have the power to to sustain the project outcomes.</li> <li>• A <i>strong</i> mechanism is in place to adapt to changes in the social/political context (e.g. all relevant social norms and/or political priorities have been identified during the project and all have been discussed with stakeholders)</li> </ul> | <p><b>OR</b></p> <p><b>No dependency</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project outcomes have <i>no</i> dependency on/are <i>not</i> sensitive to, social/political factors.</li> </ul> <p>An <i>adaptive</i> mechanism is in place to respond to changes in the social/political context, should it become necessary (see example above)</p> |
|--|--|--|--|--|---|

## H2. Financial Sustainability

Some direct outcomes, once achieved, do not require further financial inputs, e.g. the adoption of a revised policy. However, in order to derive a benefit from this outcome further management action may still be needed e.g. to undertake actions to enforce the policy. Other direct outcomes may be dependent on a continuous flow of action that needs to be resourced for them to be maintained, e.g. continuation of a new resource management approach. The evaluation will assess the extent to which project outcomes are dependent on future funding for the benefits they bring to be sustained. Secured future funding is only relevant to financial sustainability where the direct outcomes of a project have been extended into a future project phase. Even where future funding has been secured, the question still remains as to whether the project outcomes are financially sustainable.

|            |          | Dependency |       |        |        |         |      |
|------------|----------|------------|-------|--------|--------|---------|------|
|            |          | None       | 0-25% | 25-50% | 50-75% | 75-100% | 100% |
| Dependency | High     | HU         | HU    | U      | MU     | MS      | S    |
|            | Moderate | HU         | U     | MU     | MS     | S       | HS   |
|            | Low      | U          | MU    | MS     | S      | HS      | HS   |
|            | None     |            |       |        |        |         | HS   |
|            |          | MITIGATION |       |        |        |         |      |

| Highly Unsatisfactory   | Unsatisfactory  | Moderately Unsatisfactory  | Moderately Satisfactory   | Satisfactory  | Highly Satisfactory  |
|---|---|--|---|---|--|
| <p><b>At evaluation, evidence suggests that:</b></p> <p><b>High/moderate dependency<br/>No (0-5%) mitigation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project outcomes have a <i>high or moderate dependency</i> on future funding / financial flows to persist.</li> </ul> <p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>None</i> of the required future funding requirements have been secured</li> <li><i>No</i> exit strategy has been developed</li> </ul> <p><b>OR</b></p> <p><b>High dependency<br/>5-25% mitigation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project outcomes have a <i>moderate dependency</i> on future funding / financial flows to persist.</li> </ul> <p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>No</i> future funding sources have been secured</li> <li><i>No</i> exit strategy has been developed</li> </ul> | <p><b>At evaluation, evidence suggests that:</b></p> <p><b>High dependency<br/>25-50% mitigation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project outcomes have a <i>high dependency</i> on future funding / financial flows to persist.</li> </ul> <p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Only 25-50%</i> of the required future funding requirements have been secured</li> <li><i>No</i> exit strategy has been developed</li> </ul> <p><b>OR</b></p> <p><b>Moderate dependency<br/>5-25% mitigation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project outcomes have a <i>moderate dependency</i> on future funding / financial flows to persist.</li> </ul> <p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Only 5-25%</i> of the required future funding requirements have been secured</li> <li><i>No</i> exit strategy has been developed</li> </ul> <p><b>OR</b></p> <p><b>Low dependency<br/>No mitigation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project outcomes have a <i>low dependency</i> on future funding/ financial flows to persist.</li> </ul> <p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>None</i> of the required future funding requirements have been secured</li> <li><i>No</i> exit strategy has been developed</li> </ul> | <p><b>At evaluation, evidence suggests that:</b></p> <p><b>High dependency<br/>50-75% mitigation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project outcomes have a <i>high dependency</i> on future funding / financial flows to persist.</li> </ul> <p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Only 50-75%</i> of the required future funding requirements have been secured</li> <li>An exit strategy has been developed but with <i>no</i> financial component.</li> </ul> <p><b>OR</b></p> <p><b>Moderate dependency<br/>25-50% mitigation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project outcomes have a <i>moderate dependency</i> on future funding / financial flows to persist.</li> </ul> <p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Only 25-50%</i> of the required future funding requirements have been secured</li> <li>An exit strategy has been developed but with <i>no</i> financial component.</li> </ul> <p><b>OR</b></p> <p><b>Low dependency<br/>5-25% mitigation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project outcomes have a <i>low dependency</i> on future funding / financial flows to persist.</li> </ul> <p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Only 5-25%</i> of the required future funding requirements have been secured</li> <li>An exit strategy has been developed but with <i>no</i> financial component.</li> </ul> | <p><b>At evaluation, evidence suggests that:</b></p> <p><b>High dependency<br/>75-99% mitigation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project outcomes have a <i>high dependency</i> on future funding / financial flows to persist.</li> </ul> <p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>75-99%</i> of the required future funding requirements have been secured</li> <li>An exit strategy with a financial component has been developed</li> </ul> <p><b>OR</b></p> <p><b>Moderate dependency<br/>50-75% mitigation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project outcomes have a <i>moderate dependency</i> on future funding / financial flows to persist.</li> </ul> <p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Only 50-75%</i> of the required future funding requirements have been secured</li> <li>An exit strategy with a financial component has been developed</li> </ul> <p><b>OR</b></p> <p><b>Low dependency<br/>25-50% mitigation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project outcomes have a <i>low dependency</i> on future funding / financial flows to persist.</li> </ul> <p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>25-50%</i> of the required future funding requirements have been secured</li> <li>An exit strategy with a financial component has been developed</li> </ul> | <p><b>At evaluation, evidence suggests that:</b></p> <p><b>High dependency<br/>100% mitigation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project outcomes have a <i>high dependency</i> on future funding / financial flows to persist.</li> </ul> <p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>100%</i> of the required future funding requirements have been secured</li> <li>An exit strategy with a financial component has been <i>initiated</i>.</li> </ul> <p><b>OR</b></p> <p><b>Moderate dependency<br/>75-99% mitigation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project outcomes have a <i>moderate dependency</i> on future funding / financial flows to persist.</li> </ul> <p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>75-99%</i> of the required future funding requirements have been secured</li> <li>An exit strategy with a financial component has been <i>initiated</i>.</li> </ul> <p><b>OR</b></p> <p><b>Low dependency<br/>50-75% mitigation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project outcomes have a <i>low dependency</i> on future funding / financial flows to persist.</li> </ul> <p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Only 50-75%</i> of the required future funding requirements have been secured</li> <li>An exit strategy with a financial component has been <i>initiated</i>.</li> </ul> | <p><b>At evaluation, evidence suggests that:</b></p> <p><b>Moderate dependency<br/>100% mitigation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project outcomes have a <i>moderate dependency</i> on future funding / financial flows to persist.</li> </ul> <p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>100%</i> of the required future funding requirements have been secured</li> <li>An exit strategy with a financial component has been <i>initiated</i>.</li> </ul> <p><b>OR</b></p> <p><b>Low dependency<br/>75-100% mitigation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project outcomes have a <i>low dependency</i> on future funding / financial flows to persist.</li> </ul> <p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>75-100%</i> of the required future funding requirements have been secured</li> <li>An exit strategy with a financial component has been <i>initiated</i></li> </ul> <p><b>OR</b></p> <p><b>No dependency</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sustainability of project outcomes has <i>no</i> dependency on future funding</li> </ul> <p><i>(In exceptional cases, e.g. conflict countries, external funding may be an ongoing need, in which case fully secured funding for a further 3 years will classify as HS).</i></p> |

### H3. Sustainability of the Institutional Framework

The evaluation will assess the extent to which the sustainability of project outcomes (especially those relating to policies and laws) is dependent on issues relating to institutional frameworks and governance. It will consider whether institutional achievements such as governance structures and processes, policies, sub-regional agreements, legal and accountability frameworks etc. are robust enough to continue delivering the benefits associated with the project outcomes after project closure. In particular the evaluation will consider whether institutional capacity development efforts are likely to be sustained.

|            |          | Dependency |          |        |        |         |      |
|------------|----------|------------|----------|--------|--------|---------|------|
|            |          | High       | Moderate | Low    | None   |         |      |
| Dependency | High     | HU         | HU       | U      | MU     | MS      | S    |
|            | Moderate | HU         | U        | MU     | MS     | S       | HS   |
|            | Low      | U          | MU       | MS     | S      | HS      | HS   |
|            | None     |            |          |        |        |         | HS   |
|            |          | None       | 0-25%    | 25-50% | 50-75% | 75-100% | 100% |
| MITIGATION |          |            |          |        |        |         |      |

| Highly Unsatisfactory  | Unsatisfactory   | Moderately Unsatisfactory  | Moderately Satisfactory  | Satisfactory  | Highly Satisfactory  |
|--|--|--|--|---|--|
| <p>At evaluation, evidence suggests that :</p> <p><b>High/moderate dependency<br/>No mitigation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sustainability of project outcomes have a <i>high/moderate</i> dependency on / sensitivity to insititutional support.</li> </ul> <p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No mechanism in place to sustain/support the institutionalisation of direct outcomes (e.g. processes to draft policies and/or laws were not completed).</li> <li>No capacity has been developed (i.e. only knowledge transferred, no attitudinal or skills-based changes evident)</li> <li>No exit strategy has been developed.</li> </ul> <p>OR</p> <p><b>High dependency<br/>0-25% mitigation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sustainability of project outcomes have a <i>high</i> dependency on / sensitivity to insititutional support.</li> </ul> <p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No effective mechanism in place to sustain/support the institutionalisation of direct outcomes (e.g. processes to draft policies and/or laws were not completed). Limited expressions of interest of governance structures to address this but no concrete action taken.</li> <li>No capacity has been developed (i.e. only knowledge transferred, no attitudinal or skills-based changes evident)</li> <li>No exit strategy has been developed.</li> </ul> | <p>At evaluation, evidence suggests that :</p> <p><b>High dependency<br/>25-50% mitigation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sustainability of project outcomes have a <i>high</i> dependency on / sensitivity to insititutional support.</li> </ul> <p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A <i>partial</i> mechanism is in place to sustain/support the institutionalisation of direct outcomes (e.g. <i>only some of the planned processes to draft policies and/or laws completed</i>).</li> <li>Limited capacity being developed (i.e. <i>some knowledge transfer and attitudinal change but no skills adoption</i>)</li> <li>No exit strategy has been developed.</li> </ul> <p>OR</p> <p><b>Moderate dependency<br/>5-25% mitigation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sustainability of project outcomes have a <i>moderate</i> dependency on / sensitivity to insititutional support.</li> </ul> <p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No effective mechanism in place limited attempts were made to sustain/support the institutionalisation of direct outcomes (e.g. <i>processes to draft policies and/or laws were not completed</i>).</li> <li>No capacity has been developed (i.e. <i>only knowledge transferred, no attitudinal or skills-based changes evident</i>)</li> <li>No exit strategy has been developed.</li> </ul> <p>OR</p> <p><b>Low dependency<br/>No (0-5%) mitigation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The sustainability of project outcomes has a <i>low</i> degree of dependency on / sensitivity to insititutional support.</li> </ul> <p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No mechanism in place to sustain/support the institutionalisation of direct outcomes (e.g. <i>processes to draft policies and/or laws were not completed</i>).</li> <li>No capacity has been developed (i.e. <i>only knowledge transferred, no attitudinal or skills-based changes evident</i>)</li> <li>No exit strategy has been developed.</li> </ul> | <p>At evaluation, evidence suggests that :</p> <p><b>High dependency<br/>50-75% mitigation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sustainability of project outcomes have a <i>high</i> dependency on / sensitivity to insititutional support.</li> </ul> <p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A complete but <i>weak</i> mechanism is in place to sustain/support the institutionalisation of direct outcomes (e.g. all planned processes to draft policies and/or laws completed but none have yet been approved).</li> <li>Capacity of relevant individuals appears to be sustained (i.e. new skills practised or new practices adopted), but targeted individuals likely to move to other assignments.</li> <li>An exit strategy has been developed but with no insititutional component.</li> </ul> <p>OR</p> <p><b>Moderate dependency<br/>25-50% mitigation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sustainability of project outcomes have a <i>moderate</i> dependency on / sensitivity to insititutional support.</li> </ul> <p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A <i>partial</i> mechanism is in place to sustain/support the institutionalisation of direct outcomes (e.g. <i>only some of the planned processes to draft policies and/or laws completed</i>).</li> <li>Limited capacity being developed (i.e. <i>some knowledge transfer and attitudinal change but no skills adoption</i>)</li> </ul> <p>OR</p> <p><b>Low dependency<br/>5-25% mitigation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The sustainability of project outcomes has a <i>low</i> degree of dependency on / sensitivity to insititutional support.</li> </ul> <p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No effective mechanism in place limited attempts were made to sustain/support the institutionalisation of direct outcomes (e.g. <i>processes to draft policies and/or laws were not completed</i>).</li> <li>No capacity has been developed (i.e. <i>only knowledge transferred, no attitudinal or skills-based changes evident</i>)</li> <li>An exit strategy <i>has</i> been developed but with no insititutional component.</li> </ul> | <p>At evaluation, evidence suggests that :</p> <p><b>High dependency<br/>75-99% mitigation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sustainability of project outcomes have a <i>high</i> dependency on / sensitivity to insititutional support.</li> </ul> <p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A <i>robust</i> mechanism is in place to sustain/support the institutionalisation of direct outcomes (e.g. <i>all planned processes to draft policies and/or laws are completed and some have been approved</i>).</li> <li>Capacity of relevant individuals has been enhanced, and they are likely to stay in their position (or in a position where they can continue to support the direct outcomes).</li> <li>An exit strategy with an insititutional component has been developed.</li> </ul> <p>OR</p> <p><b>Moderate dependency<br/>50-75% mitigation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sustainability of project outcomes have a <i>moderate</i> dependency on / sensitivity to insititutional support.</li> </ul> <p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A complete but <i>weak</i> mechanism is in place to sustain/support the institutionalisation of direct outcomes (e.g. all planned processes to draft policies and/or laws completed but none have yet been approved).</li> <li>Capacity of relevant individuals appears to be sustained (i.e. <i>new skills practised or new practices adopted</i>), but targeted individuals likely to move to other assignments.</li> <li>An exit strategy with an insititutional component <i>has</i> been developed.</li> </ul> <p>OR</p> <p><b>Low dependency<br/>25-50% mitigation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The sustainability of project outcomes has a <i>low</i> degree of dependency on / sensitivity to insititutional support.</li> </ul> <p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A <i>partial</i> mechanism is in place to sustain/support the institutionalisation of direct outcomes (e.g. <i>only some of the planned processes to draft policies and/or laws completed</i>).</li> <li>Limited capacity being developed (i.e. <i>some knowledge transfer and</i></li> </ul> | <p>At evaluation, evidence suggests that :</p> <p><b>High dependency<br/>100% mitigation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sustainability of project outcomes have a <i>high</i> dependency on / sensitivity to insititutional support.</li> </ul> <p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A <i>strong</i> mechanism is in place to sustain/support the institutionalisation of direct outcomes. (e.g. all planned new policies and laws have been completed and approved, although no action to implement them has yet been taken).</li> <li>Capacity of relevant individuals <i>has</i> been enhanced and they are seen to exercise increased influence in support of the direct outcomes.</li> <li>An exit strategy with an insititutional component <i>has</i> been initiated.</li> </ul> <p>OR</p> <p><b>Moderate dependency<br/>75-99% mitigation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sustainability of project outcomes have a <i>moderate</i> dependency on / sensitivity to insititutional support.</li> </ul> <p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A <i>robust</i> mechanism is in place to sustain/support the institutionalisation of direct outcomes (e.g. all planned processes to draft policies and/or laws are completed and some have been approved).</li> <li>Capacity of relevant individuals <i>has</i> been enhanced, and they are likely to stay in their position (or in a position where they can continue to support the direct outcomes).</li> <li>An exit strategy with an insititutional component <i>has</i> been initiated.</li> </ul> <p>OR</p> <p><b>Low dependency<br/>50-75% mitigation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The sustainability of project outcomes has a <i>low</i> degree of dependency on / sensitivity to insititutional support.</li> </ul> <p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A complete but <i>weak</i> mechanism is in place to sustain/support the institutionalisation of direct outcomes (e.g. <i>all planned processes to draft</i></li> </ul> | <p>At evaluation, evidence suggests that :</p> <p><b>Moderate dependency<br/>100% mitigation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sustainability of project outcomes have a <i>moderate</i> dependency on / sensitivity to insititutional support.</li> </ul> <p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A <i>strong</i> mechanism is in place to sustain/support the institutionalisation of direct outcomes. (e.g. all planned new policies and laws have been completed and approved, although no action to implement them has yet been taken).</li> <li>Capacity of relevant individuals has been enhanced and they are seen to exercise increased influence in support of the direct outcomes.</li> <li>An exit strategy with an insititutional component has been initiated.</li> </ul> <p>OR</p> <p><b>Low dependency<br/>75-100% mitigation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The sustainability of project outcomes has a <i>low</i> degree of dependency on / sensitivity to insititutional support.</li> </ul> <p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A <i>robust</i> mechanism is in place to sustain/support the institutionalisation of direct outcomes (e.g. <i>all planned processes to draft policies and/or laws are completed and some have been approved</i>).</li> <li>Capacity of relevant individuals has been enhanced, and they are likely to stay in their position (or in a position where they can continue to support the direct outcomes).</li> <li>An exit strategy with an insititutional component <i>has</i> been initiated.</li> </ul> <p>OR</p> <p><b>No dependency</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project outcomes have <i>no</i> dependency on/<i>are not</i> sensitive to, insititutional support.</li> <li>Project outcomes are <i>fully</i> institutionalised (e.g. new policies and laws completed, approved and some action has been taken to implement them).</li> <li>Capacity of relevant individuals has been enhanced and they are seen to</li> </ul> |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|
|  |  |  | <p><i>attitudinal change but no skills adoption)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>An exit strategy with an insitutional component has been developed.</li> </ul> | <p><i>policies and/or laws completed but none have yet been approved).</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Capacity of relevant individuals appears to be sustained (<i>i.e. new skills practised or new practices adopted</i>), but targeted individuals likely to move to other assignments.</li> <li>An exit strategy with an institutional component has been initiated.</li> </ul> | <p>exercise increased influence in support of the direct outcomes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>An exit strategy with an institutional component <i>has</i> been initiated.</li> </ul> |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|

## I. Factors Affecting Performance

### 11. Preparation and Readiness

**Preparation and Readiness is the time between project approval and first disbursement i.e. the inception period.**

This criterion focuses on the inception or mobilisation stage of the project (ie. the time between project approval and first disbursement). The evaluation will assess whether appropriate measures were taken to either address weaknesses in the project design or respond to changes that took place between project approval, the securing of funds and project mobilisation. In particular the evaluation will consider the nature and quality of engagement with stakeholder groups by the project team, the confirmation of partner capacity and development of partnership agreements as well as initial staffing and financing arrangements. (*Project preparation is included in the template for the assessment of Project Design Quality*).

| Highly Unsatisfactory   | Unsatisfactory  | Moderately Unsatisfactory   | Moderately Satisfactory   | Satisfactory   | Highly Satisfactory  |
|---|---|---|---|--|--|
| <p>Evidence suggests that, where the following had not already been undertaken or were out of date, they were done/updated between project approval and first disbursement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) No inception meeting was held</li> <li>b) No annual, costed workplan was developed</li> <li>c) No procurement plan was developed</li> <li>d) No Steering Committee was established</li> <li>e) No ESE safeguards assessment was carried out</li> <li>f) No confirmation of partners' capacity.</li> <li>g) Legal agreements and financial arrangements were not signed with partners in a timely manner.</li> <li>h) Staffing mobilisation was not undertaken in a timely manner.</li> <li>i) No engagement with relevant stakeholders.</li> <li>j) No measures were taken to implement PRC recommendations or respond to contextual changes that took place between project approval, the securing of funds and project mobilization.</li> </ul> <p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>k) The period between project approval and first disbursement exceeds 18 months.</li> </ul> | <p>Evidence suggests that, where the following had not already been undertaken or were out of date, they were done/updated between project approval and first disbursement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) No/late inception meeting was held and reported on</li> <li>b) No/late annual, costed workplan was developed</li> <li>c) No/late procurement plan was developed</li> <li>d) No/late Steering Committee was established</li> <li>e) No/late ESE safeguards assessment was carried out</li> <li>f) No/late confirmation of partners' capacity.</li> <li>g) Legal agreements and financial arrangements were not signed with partners in a timely manner.</li> <li>h) Staffing mobilisation was not undertaken in a timely manner.</li> <li>i) No/late engagement with relevant stakeholders.</li> <li>j) No/late measures were taken to implement PRC recommendations or respond to contextual changes that took place between project approval, the securing of funds and project mobilization.</li> </ul> <p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>k) The period between project approval and first disbursement is between 12 and 18 months.</li> </ul> | <p>Evidence suggests that, where the following had not already been undertaken or were out of date, they were done/updated between project approval and first disbursement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) An inception meeting was held and reported on, but did not cover all required elements</li> <li>b) An annual workplan was developed, but it was not costed and lacked detail</li> <li>c) A procurement plan was developed, but without detail or accuracy</li> <li>d) A Steering Committee was established, but without full or relevant representation</li> <li>e) An ESE safeguards assessment was carried out, but it was superficial.</li> <li>f) Some confirmation of partners capacity, but superficial.</li> <li>g) Legal agreements and financial arrangements were not signed with partners in a timely manner.</li> <li>h) Staffing mobilisation was not undertaken in a timely manner</li> <li>i) Partial (e.g. not all relevant groups targeted) and superficial (depth of discussions) stakeholder engagement.</li> <li>j) Some measures (but not all) were taken to implement PRC recommendations or respond to contextual changes that took place between project approval, the securing of funds and project mobilization. These were timely but insufficient</li> </ul> <p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>k) The period between project approval and first disbursement is between 9 and 12 months.</li> </ul> | <p>Evidence suggests that, where the following had not already been undertaken or were out of date, they were done/updated between project approval and first disbursement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) A comprehensive inception meeting was held and reported on</li> <li>b) An annual, costed workplan was developed with appropriate detail</li> <li>c) A detailed and compliant procurement plan was developed</li> <li>d) A Steering Committee was established with full, appropriate representation</li> <li>e) A good ESE safeguards assessment was carried out, with stakeholder participation.</li> <li>f) All partners capacity was confirmed/addressed,</li> <li>g) Legal agreements were signed with partners in a timely manner.</li> <li>h) Comprehensive and relevant stakeholder analysis undertaken (or reviewed/ revised).</li> <li>i) Staffing mobilisation was undertaken in a timely manner.</li> <li>j) Appropriate and adequate governance arrangements established.</li> </ul> <p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>k) Some measures (but not all) were taken to implement PRC recommendations or respond to contextual changes that took place between project approval, the securing of funds and project mobilization. These were timely and of good quality.</li> <li>l) The period between project approval and first disbursement is between 6 and 9 months.</li> </ul> | <p>Evidence suggests that, where the following had not already been undertaken or were out of date, they were done/updated between project approval and first disbursement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) A comprehensive inception meeting was held and reported on</li> <li>b) An annual, costed workplan was developed with appropriate detail</li> <li>c) A detailed and compliant procurement plan was developed</li> <li>d) A Steering Committee was established with full, appropriate representation</li> <li>e) A good ESE safeguards assessment was carried out, with stakeholder participation.</li> <li>f) All partners capacity was confirmed/addressed,</li> <li>g) Legal agreements were signed with partners in a timely manner.</li> <li>h) Comprehensive and relevant stakeholder analysis undertaken (or reviewed/ revised).</li> <li>i) Staffing mobilisation was undertaken in a timely manner.</li> <li>j) Appropriate and adequate governance arrangements established.</li> </ul> <p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>k) All necessary measures were taken to implement PRC recommendations or respond to contextual changes that took place between project approval, the securing of funds and project mobilization. These were timely and of good quality.</li> <li>l) The period between project approval and first disbursement is 6 months or less.</li> <li>m) Measures taken between approval and inception noticeably strengthened the project design.</li> </ul> | <p>Evidence suggests that, where the following had not already been undertaken or were out of date, they were done/updated between project approval and first disbursement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) A comprehensive inception meeting was held and reported on</li> <li>b) An annual, costed workplan was developed with appropriate detail</li> <li>c) A detailed and compliant procurement plan was developed</li> <li>d) A Steering Committee was established with full, appropriate representation</li> <li>e) A good ESE safeguards assessment was carried out, with stakeholder participation.</li> <li>f) Comprehensive and relevant stakeholder analysis undertaken (or reviewed/ revised).</li> <li>g) All partners capacity was confirmed/addressed,</li> <li>h) Legal agreements were signed with partners in a timely manner.</li> <li>i) Staffing mobilisation was undertaken in a timely manner.</li> <li>j) Appropriate and adequate governance arrangements established.</li> </ul> <p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>k) All necessary measures were taken to implement PRC recommendations or respond to contextual changes that took place between project approval, the securing of funds and project mobilization. These were timely and of good quality.</li> <li>l) The period between project approval and first disbursement is 6 months or less.</li> <li>m) Measures taken between approval and inception noticeably strengthened the project design.</li> </ul> |

## I2. Quality of Project Management and Supervision

In some cases 'project management and supervision' will refer to the supervision and guidance provided by UN Environment to implementing partners and national governments while in others, specifically for GEF funded projects, it will refer to the project management performance of the executing agency and the technical backstopping and supervision provided by UN Environment.

The evaluation will assess the effectiveness of project management with regard to: providing leadership towards achieving the planned outcomes; managing team structures; maintaining productive partner relationships (including Steering Groups etc.); communication and collaboration with UN Environment colleagues; risk management; use of problem-solving; project adaptation and overall project execution. Evidence of adaptive management should be highlighted.

| <b>Highly Unsatisfactory</b>  | <b>Unsatisfactory</b>  | <b>Moderately Unsatisfactory</b>   | <b>Moderately Satisfactory</b>   | <b>Satisfactory</b>   | <b>Highly Satisfactory</b>   |
|---|--|--|--|---|--|
| <p><i>Evidence suggests that:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Planned Steering Committee (or equivalent oversight/guidance mechanism) not established</li> <li>Teams involved in implementation structures have not been well managed</li> <li>The working relationship between the PM/TM and project partners has not been constructive and/or effective.</li> <li>Turnover of staff associated with no handover processes or information exchange between outgoing and incoming staff</li> <li>No project staff at UNEP and its partners have capacity that is aligned with project requirements</li> <li>Key project staff are located inappropriately for efficient project implementation</li> <li>No regular and constructive information exchange between project team, PM/TM and UN Environment colleagues has taken place.</li> <li>Implementation Agency and/or Executing Agency provide no leadership towards achieving the planned outcomes.</li> </ul> <p>AND <i>no</i> adaptive management, assessed based on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Speed of responses to execution challenges or contextual changes (evidenced through email correspondence and / or other communication/reporting)</li> <li>Adequacy of management response to any financial shortfalls, response shows clear prioritization and movement of funds to meet implementation and all accountability requirements where required</li> <li>Frequency and relevance of advice provided by PM/TM to deal with known problems, <b>risks</b> or challenges</li> </ul> | <p><i>Evidence suggests that:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Steering Committee (or equivalent oversight/guidance mechanism) convened, but with no functionality e.g. no records of any subsequent meetings</li> <li>Teams involved in implementation structures have been poorly managed</li> <li>The working relationship between the PM/TM and project partners has been constructive and/or effective to a minimal extent.</li> <li>Turnover of staff associated with weak (i.e. ad hoc) handover processes and limited information exchange between outgoing and incoming staff</li> <li>A minority of project staff, but not key members, have capacity that is aligned with project requirements</li> <li>A minority of project staff members, but no key members, are located appropriately for efficient project implementation</li> <li>Little regular and constructive information exchange between project team, PM/TM and UN Environment colleagues has taken place.</li> <li>Implementation Agency and/or Executing Agency provide weak leadership towards achieving the planned outcomes.</li> </ul> <p>AND <i>weak</i> adaptive management, assessed based on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Speed of responses to execution challenges or contextual changes (evidenced through email correspondence and / or other communication/reporting)</li> <li>Adequacy of management response to any financial shortfalls, response shows clear prioritization and movement of funds to meet implementation and all accountability requirements where required</li> <li>Frequency and relevance of advice provided by PM/TM to deal with known problems, <b>risks</b> or challenges</li> </ul> | <p><i>Evidence suggests that:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Steering Committee (or equivalent oversight/guidance mechanism) established and functioning poorly (records of infrequent/irregular meetings but partial attendance)</li> <li>Teams involved in implementation structures have been managed moderately well</li> <li>The working relationship between the PM/TM and project partners has been constructive and/or effective to a moderate extent.</li> <li>Turnover of staff associated with adequate (i.e. complete but not systematized) handover processes and limited information exchange between outgoing and incoming staff</li> <li>A minority of project staff, including some key members, have capacity that is aligned with project requirements</li> <li>A minority of project staff members, including some key members, are located appropriately for efficient project implementation</li> <li>A moderate amount of regular and constructive information exchange between project team, PM/TM and UN Environment colleagues has taken place.</li> <li>Implementation Agency and/or Executing Agency provide moderate leadership towards achieving the planned outcomes.</li> </ul> <p>AND <i>moderate</i> adaptive management, assessed based on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Speed of responses to execution challenges or contextual changes (evidenced through email correspondence and / or other communication/reporting)</li> <li>Adequacy of management response to any financial shortfalls, response shows clear prioritization and movement of funds to meet implementation and all accountability requirements where required</li> <li>Frequency and relevance of advice provided by PM/TM to deal with known problems, <b>risks</b> or challenges</li> </ul> | <p><i>Evidence suggests that:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Steering Committee (or equivalent oversight/guidance mechanism) established and functioning moderately well (records of regular meetings where relevant content is discussed)</li> <li>Teams involved in implementation structures have been managed well</li> <li>The working relationship between the PM/TM and project partners has been constructive and/or effective to a large extent.</li> <li>Turnover of staff associated with good (i.e. systematized but partial) handover processes and information exchange (supported by good documentation) between outgoing and incoming staff</li> <li>The majority of project staff, including some key members, have capacity that is aligned with project requirements</li> <li>The majority of project staff, including some key members, are located appropriately for efficient project implementation</li> <li>A good amount of regular and constructive information exchange between project team, PM/TM and UN Environment colleagues has taken place.</li> <li>Implementation Agency and/or Executing Agency provide good leadership towards achieving the planned outcomes.</li> </ul> <p>AND <i>good</i> adaptive management, assessed based on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Speed of responses to execution challenges or contextual changes (evidenced through email correspondence and / or other communication/reporting)</li> <li>Adequacy of management response to any financial shortfalls, response shows clear prioritization and movement of funds to meet implementation and all accountability requirements where required</li> <li>Frequency and relevance of advice provided by PM/TM to deal with known problems, <b>risks</b> or challenges</li> </ul> | <p><i>Evidence suggests that:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Steering Committee (or equivalent oversight/guidance mechanism) established and functioning well (records of regular meetings, relevant content discussed, decisions reached)</li> <li>Teams involved in implementation structures have been managed very well</li> <li>The working relationship between the PM/TM and project partners has been constructive and/or effective to a very large extent.</li> <li>Turnover of staff associated with strong (i.e. systemized and complete) handover processes and information exchange (supported by good documentation) between outgoing and incoming staff</li> <li>The majority of project staff, including all key members, have capacity that is aligned with project requirements</li> <li>The majority of project staff, including all key members, are located appropriately for efficient project implementation</li> <li>A strong amount of regular and constructive information exchange between project team, PM/TM and UN Environment colleagues has taken place.</li> <li>Implementation Agency and/or Executing Agency provide strong leadership towards achieving the planned outcomes.</li> </ul> <p>AND <i>strong</i> adaptive management, assessed based on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Speed of responses to execution challenges or contextual changes (evidenced through email correspondence and / or other communication/reporting)</li> <li>Adequacy of management response to any financial shortfalls, response shows clear prioritization and movement of funds to meet implementation and all accountability requirements where required</li> <li>Frequency and relevance of advice provided by PM/TM to deal with known problems, <b>risks</b> or challenges</li> </ul> | <p><i>Evidence suggests that:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Steering Committee (or equivalent oversight/guidance mechanism) established and functioning very well (all conditions under 'Satisfactory', plus demonstrating leadership)</li> <li>Teams involved in implementation structures have been managed excellently.</li> <li>The working relationship between the PM/TM and project partners has been constructive and/or effective to an excellent extent.</li> <li>Turnover of staff associated with highly effective (i.e. systematized, complete and ensures smooth transition) handover processes and information exchange (supported by good documentation) between outgoing and incoming staff.</li> <li>All project staff have capacity that is aligned with project requirements</li> <li>All project staff are located appropriately for efficient project implementation</li> <li>An excellent amount of regular and constructive information exchange between project team, PM/TM and UN Environment colleagues has taken place.</li> <li>Implementation Agency and/or Executing Agency provide excellent leadership towards achieving the planned outcomes.</li> </ul> <p>AND <i>excellent</i> adaptive management, assessed based on :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Speed of responses to execution challenges or contextual changes (evidenced through email correspondence and / or other communication/reporting)</li> <li>Adequacy of management response to any financial shortfalls, response shows clear prioritization and movement of funds to meet implementation and all accountability requirements where required</li> <li>Frequency and relevance of advice provided by PM/TM to deal with known problems, <b>risks</b> or challenges</li> </ul> |



### 13. Stakeholders' Participation and Cooperation

Here the term 'stakeholder' should be considered in a broad sense, encompassing all project partners, duty bearers with a role in delivering project outputs and target users of project outputs and any other collaborating agents external to UN Environment. The assessment will consider the quality and effectiveness of all forms of communication and consultation with stakeholders throughout the project life and the support given to maximise collaboration and coherence between various stakeholders, including sharing plans, pooling resources and exchanging learning and expertise. The inclusion and participation of all differentiated groups, including gender groups should be considered.

Here the term 'stakeholder' should be considered in a broad sense, encompassing all project partners, duty bearers with a role in delivering project outputs and target users of project outputs and any other collaborating agents external to UN Environment.

| <b>Highly Unsatisfactory</b>   | <b>Unsatisfactory</b>  | <b>Moderately Unsatisfactory</b>  | <b>Moderately Satisfactory</b>   | <b>Satisfactory</b>   | <b>Highly Satisfactory</b>  |
|--|--|---|--|---|---|
| <p><i>Evidence suggests that:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Implementation began, and was undertaken, with no analysis of stakeholder groups (all those who are affected by or could affect this project).</li> <li>•There was no consultation and/or communication with stakeholder groups during the life of the project.</li> <li>•No support was given to collaboration or collective action between stakeholder groups (e.g. sharing plans, pooling resources, exchanging learning and expertise)</li> <li>•There have been no efforts made by Project Team to promote stakeholder ownership (of process or outcome)</li> <li>•Environmental, social and economic impacts to the key stakeholders and, in particular, to the most vulnerable groups are not considered or addressed and negative impacts on these groups have occurred.</li> <li>•Linkages to poverty alleviation or impact on economic livelihoods have not been considered or addressed in the project</li> </ul> | <p><i>Evidence suggests that:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Implementation began, and was undertaken, with a weak analysis of stakeholder groups (all those who are affected by or could affect this project).</li> <li>•There have been limited, and ineffective, efforts made by Project Team to promote stakeholder ownership (of process or outcome)</li> <li>•There was weak (ineffective, irregular and/or poorly timed) consultation and/or communication with stakeholder groups during the life of the project.</li> <li>•Weak support was given to collaboration or collective action between stakeholder groups (e.g. sharing plans, pooling resources, exchanging learning and expertise)</li> <li>•Environmental, social and economic impacts to the key stakeholders and, in particular, to the most vulnerable groups are not considered or addressed.</li> <li>•Linkages to poverty alleviation or impact on economic livelihoods have been poorly considered and/or addressed in the project (e.g. some consideration given but clearly insufficient attempts to assess and mitigate negative effects on sustainability of livelihoods, equity of opportunities and the protection of human rights for populations directly or indirectly affected by the project, have been made)</li> </ul> | <p><i>Evidence suggests that:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Implementation began, and was undertaken, with a moderate analysis of stakeholder groups (all those who are affected by or could affect this project).</li> <li>•There have been limited, but effective, efforts made by Project Team to promote stakeholder ownership (of process or outcome)</li> <li>•There was moderate (occasionally effective but mostly irregular and/or poorly timed) consultation and/or communication with stakeholder groups during the life of the project.</li> <li>•Moderate support was given to collaboration or collective action between stakeholder groups. (e.g. sharing plans, pooling resources, exchanging learning and expertise)</li> <li>•Environmental, social and economic impacts to the key stakeholders and, in particular, to the most vulnerable groups are considered or addressed to a limited extent.</li> <li>•Linkages to poverty alleviation or impact on economic livelihoods have been moderately considered and/or addressed in the project (e.g. some consideration given and partial or late attempts to assess and mitigate negative effects on sustainability of livelihoods, equity of opportunities and the protection of human rights for populations directly or indirectly affected by the project, have been made)</li> </ul> | <p><i>Evidence suggests that:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Implementation began, and was undertaken, with a good analysis of stakeholder groups (all those who are affected by or could affect this project).</li> <li>•There have been moderate efforts, with mixed effectiveness, made by Project Team to promote stakeholder ownership (of process or outcome)</li> <li>•There was good (mostly effective but sometimes irregular and/or poorly timed) consultation and/or communication with stakeholder groups during the life of the project.</li> <li>•Good support was given to collaboration or collective action between stakeholder groups (e.g. sharing plans, pooling resources, exchanging learning and expertise)</li> <li>•Environmental, social and economic impacts to the key stakeholders and, in particular, to the most vulnerable groups are considered or addressed to a moderate extent.</li> <li>•Linkages to poverty alleviation or impact on economic livelihoods have been considered and addressed in the project well (e.g. substantial consideration given and largely complete/timely attempts to assess and mitigate negative effects on sustainability of livelihoods, equity of opportunities and the protection of human rights for populations directly or indirectly affected by the project, have been made)</li> </ul> | <p><i>Evidence suggests that:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Implementation began, and was undertaken, with a strong analysis of stakeholder groups (all those who are affected by or could affect this project).</li> <li>•There have been strong efforts, with mixed effectiveness, made by Project Team to promote stakeholder ownership (of process or outcome)</li> <li>•There was strong (always effective but sometimes irregular and/or poorly timed) consultation and/or communication with stakeholder groups during the life of the project.</li> <li>•Strong support was given to collaboration or collective action between stakeholder groups (e.g. sharing plans, pooling resources, exchanging learning and expertise)</li> <li>•Environmental, social and economic impacts to the key stakeholders and, in particular, to the most vulnerable groups are considered or addressed to a large extent.</li> <li>•Linkages to poverty alleviation or impact on economic livelihoods have been considered and addressed in the project very well (e.g. substantial consideration given and all attempts are complete and well-timed) to assess and mitigate negative effects on sustainability of livelihoods, equity of opportunities and the protection of human rights for populations directly or indirectly affected by the project, have been made)</li> </ul> | <p><i>Evidence suggests that:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Implementation began, and was undertaken, with an excellent analysis of stakeholder groups (all those who are affected by or could affect this project).</li> <li>•There have been strong and fully effective efforts made by Project Team to promote stakeholder ownership (of process or outcome)</li> <li>•There was excellent (always effective, regular and well-timed) consultation and/or communication with stakeholder groups during the life of the project.</li> <li>•Excellent support was given to collaboration or collective action between stakeholder groups (e.g. sharing plans, pooling resources, exchanging learning and expertise)</li> <li>•Environmental, social and economic impacts to the key stakeholders and, in particular, to the most vulnerable groups are considered or taken into account to a large extent and positive equity gains have been observed.</li> <li>•Linkages to poverty alleviation or impact on economic livelihoods have been considered and addressed in the project excellently (e.g. full consideration given and all attempts are complete and well-timed) to assess and mitigate negative effects on sustainability of livelihoods, equity of opportunities and the protection of human rights for populations directly or indirectly affected by the project, have been made)</li> </ul> <p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Positive effects on equity are demonstrated.</li> </ul> |

#### 14. Responsiveness to Human Rights and Gender Equity

##### UNEP Gender Scoring:

0: gender blind: Gender relevance is evident but not at all reflected in the project document

1: gender partially mainstreamed: Gender is reflected in the context, implementation, logframe, **or** the budget

2a. Gender well mainstreamed throughout: Gender is reflected in the context, implementation, logframe, **and** the budget

2b. Targeted action on gender (to advance gender equity): [includes where]<sup>1</sup> the principle purpose of the project is to advance gender equality

n/a: Gender is not considered applicable: A gender analysis reveals that the project does not have direct interactions with and/or impacts on people, therefore, gender is considered not applicable.

The evaluation will ascertain to what extent the project has applied the UN Common Understanding on the human rights-based approach (HRBA) and the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous People. Within this human rights context the evaluation will assess to what extent the intervention adheres to UN Environment's Policy and Strategy for Gender Equality and the Environment.

In particular the evaluation will consider to what extent project design, implementation and monitoring have taken into consideration: (i) possible gender inequalities in access to, and the control over, natural resources; (ii) specific vulnerabilities of women and children to environmental degradation or disasters; and (iii) the role of women in mitigating or adapting to environmental changes and engaging in environmental protection and rehabilitation.

| <b>Highly Unsatisfactory</b>  | <b>Unsatisfactory</b>  | <b>Moderately Unsatisfactory</b>  | <b>Moderately Satisfactory</b>   | <b>Satisfactory</b>  | <b>Highly Satisfactory</b>   |
|---|--|---|--|--|--|
| <p>Evidence suggests gender considerations are demonstrated in 1 out of the 3 items below</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) context</li> <li>b) log frame</li> <li>c) budget</li> </ul> <p>AND</p> <p>No gender considerations in project implementation</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Project implementation is, on a consistent basis, substantially below the gender score at approval (e.g. project approved with 2b score and implementation consistently demonstrates 1)</p> | <p>Evidence suggests gender considerations are demonstrated in 2 out of 3 items below</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) context</li> <li>b) log frame</li> <li>c) budget</li> </ul> <p>AND</p> <p>No gender considerations in project implementation</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Project implementation is, on a consistent basis, moderately below the gender score at approval (e.g. project approved with 2a score and implementation consistently demonstrates 1)</p> | <p>Evidence suggests gender considerations are demonstrated in ALL of the items below</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) context</li> <li>b) log frame</li> <li>c) budget</li> </ul> <p>AND</p> <p>No gender considerations in project implementation</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Project implementation is mostly below the gender score at approval (e.g. project approved with 2a score and implementation sometimes demonstrates 1)</p> | <p>Evidence suggests gender considerations are demonstrated in the ALL of the items below</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) context</li> <li>b) log frame</li> <li>c) budget</li> </ul> <p>AND</p> <p>Weak gender considerations in project implementation</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Project implementation consistently reflects the gender score at approval (e.g. project approved with 2a score and implementation demonstrates 2a)</p> | <p>Evidence suggests gender considerations are demonstrated in the ALL of the items below</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) context</li> <li>b) log frame</li> <li>c) budget</li> </ul> <p>AND</p> <p>Moderate gender considerations in project implementation</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Project implementation consistently reflects scores of either 2a or 2b)</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Was approved as gender being n/a.</p> | <p>Evidence suggests gender considerations are demonstrated in ALL of the items below</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) context</li> <li>b) log frame</li> <li>c) budget</li> </ul> <p>AND</p> <p>Strong gender considerations in project implementation</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Project implementation improves on the gender score at approval (e.g. project approved with 1 score and implementation demonstrates 2a)</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Was approved as gender being n/a but demonstrated gender sensitivity or responsiveness during implementation.</p> |

##### **GUIDANCE ON GENDER:**

**Context:** having a gender analysis involving an examination of the differences, gaps and inequalities between women and men by using primary or secondary data.

**Logframe:** as an entry point, a project may specify sex disaggregation for indicators (and/or targets) concerning people (e.g. beneficiaries, number of government officials trained). Gender can also be reflected as an output statement, e.g. "Revised sustainable, affordable and gender sensitive social housing retrofit guidelines are adopted by JOSHCO".

**Budget:** It means having specific budget lines on gender (e.g. Travel for National Socio-Economic and Gender Expert, \$13,000), or at least making a remark that a certain budget line is gender-related. (A methodology to reflect gender in a project's budget is now being developed by the Gender Unit and is expected to be ready by end of 2016.)

**Implementation:** includes gender-targeted activities (e.g. a study on gender and modern energy efficiency in Maldives); gender-sensitive activities (e.g. the Global Waste Management Outlook with a topic sheet on gender and solid waste management); gender-sensitive arrangements (e.g. efforts of the International Resource Panel to increase women's representation and representation of social scientists), and/or the forging of partnerships to advance gender equality (e.g. a project on building efficiency that partners with another organisation to carry out/support the gender components). Examples of gender considerations in policymaking include ensuring representation and participation of women, minorities, urban, rural and people who are affected by the topic.

### 15. Country Ownership and Driven-ness

The evaluation will assess the quality and degree of engagement of government / public sector agencies in the project. While there is some overlap between Country Ownership and Institutional Sustainability, this criterion focuses primarily on the forward momentum of the intended projects results, ie. either a) moving forwards from outputs to direct outcomes or b) moving forward from direct outcomes towards intermediate states. The evaluation will consider the involvement not only of those directly involved in project execution and those participating in technical or leadership groups, but also those official representatives whose cooperation is needed for change to be embedded in their respective institutions and offices. This factor is concerned with the level of ownership generated by the project over outputs and outcomes and that is necessary for long term impact to be realised. This ownership should adequately represent the needs of interest of all gendered and marginalised groups.

Guidance: The focus here is on forward momentum, either: a) moving forwards from outputs to direct outcomes or, b) moving forward from direct outcomes towards intermediate states.

| Highly Unsatisfactory   | Unsatisfactory   | Moderately Unsatisfactory  | Moderately Satisfactory  | Satisfactory  | Highly Satisfactory  |
|---|--|--|--|---|--|
| <p>Evidence suggests that <u>no</u> Government ministries / public sector agencies that are essential for moving from outputs to direct outcomes or from direct outcomes to intermediate states took a leadership role in ANY of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provision of in-kind and / or cash co-financing contributions</li> <li>Strategic guidance of project delivery</li> <li>Securing additional resources</li> <li>Endorsing / accepting project results</li> <li>Driving or advocating for change to achieve higher level results</li> </ul> | <p>Evidence suggests that <u>very few</u> of those Government ministries / public sector agencies that are essential for moving from outputs to direct outcomes or from direct outcomes to intermediate states took a leadership role in THREE of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provision of in-kind and / or cash co-financing contributions</li> <li>Strategic guidance of project delivery</li> <li>Securing additional resources</li> <li>Endorsing / accepting project results</li> <li>Driving or advocating for change to achieve higher level results</li> </ul> | <p>Evidence suggests that <u>several (but not all)</u> of those Government ministries / public sector agencies that are essential for moving from outputs to direct outcomes or from direct outcomes to intermediate states took a leadership role in FOUR of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provision of in-kind and / or cash co-financing contributions</li> <li>Strategic guidance of project delivery</li> <li>Securing additional resources</li> <li>Endorsing / accepting project results</li> <li>Driving or advocating for change to achieve higher level results</li> </ul> | <p>Evidence suggests that <u>all</u> Government ministries / public sector agencies that are essential for moving from outputs to direct outcomes or from direct outcomes to intermediate states took a leadership role in THREE of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provision of in-kind and / or cash co-financing contributions</li> <li>Strategic guidance of project delivery</li> <li>Securing additional resources</li> <li>Endorsing / accepting project results</li> <li>Driving or advocating for change to achieve higher level results</li> </ul> | <p>Evidence suggests that <u>all</u> Government ministries / public sector agencies that are essential for moving from outputs to direct outcomes or from direct outcomes to intermediate states took a leadership role in FOUR of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provision of in-kind and / or cash co-financing contributions</li> <li>Strategic guidance of project delivery</li> <li>Securing additional resources</li> <li>Endorsing / accepting project results</li> <li>Driving or advocating for change to achieve higher level results</li> </ul> | <p>Evidence suggests that <u>all</u> Government ministries / public sector agencies that are essential for moving from outputs to direct outcomes or from direct outcomes to intermediate states took a leadership role in ALL of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provision of in-kind and / or cash co-financing contributions</li> <li>Strategic guidance of project delivery</li> <li>Securing additional resources</li> <li>Endorsing / accepting project results</li> <li>Driving or advocating for change to achieve higher level results</li> </ul> |

### 16. Communication and Public Awareness

The evaluation will assess the effectiveness of: a) communication of learning and experience sharing between project partners and interested groups arising from the project during its life and b) public awareness activities that were undertaken during the implementation of the project to influence attitudes or shape behaviour among wider communities and civil society at large. The evaluation should consider whether existing communication channels and networks were used effectively, including meeting the differentiated needs of gendered or marginalised groups, and whether any feedback channels were established. Where knowledge sharing platforms have been established under a project the evaluation will comment on the sustainability of the communication channel under either socio-political, institutional or financial sustainability, as appropriate.

| Highly Unsatisfactory   | Unsatisfactory  | Moderately Unsatisfactory   | Moderately Satisfactory  | Satisfactory  | Highly Satisfactory  |
|---|---|---|--|---|--|
| <p>Evidence suggests that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All audiences have no awareness of project's main messages</li> <li>There were no meaningful communication activities undertaken/ channels established</li> <li>Communication/public awareness was wholly ineffective to drive change towards results beyond outputs</li> <li>No experience sharing between project partners and other interested groups / stakeholders (evidence suggests that partners and interested groups are not informed of the project).</li> <li>A communication plan/strategy was not prepared</li> </ul> | <p>Evidence suggests that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some general audiences have limited awareness of project's main messages</li> <li>Communication activities and channels were:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Not targeted towards intended audience needs</li> <li>Rare over the life of the project</li> <li>Not interactive / responsive to audience feedback</li> <li>Not monitored</li> <li>Very inadequately budgeted / financed</li> </ul> </li> <li>Communication/public awareness efforts have been largely ineffective in driving change towards results beyond outputs.</li> <li>Very limited experience sharing between project partners and other interested groups / stakeholders.</li> <li>A weak communication plan/strategy was prepared but not implemented</li> </ul> | <p>Evidence suggests that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some general audiences have moderate awareness of project's main messages</li> <li>Communication activities and channels were:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Not well-targeted towards intended audiences</li> <li>Infrequent over the life of the project</li> <li>Rarely interactive / responsive to audience feedback</li> <li>Poorly monitored</li> <li>Inadequately budgeted / financed</li> </ul> </li> <li>Communication/public awareness efforts have been moderately ineffective in driving change towards results beyond outputs.</li> <li>Limited experience sharing between project partners and other interested groups / stakeholders.</li> <li>A moderate communication plan/strategy was prepared but not implemented</li> </ul> | <p>Evidence suggests that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some key audiences driving the desired change have moderate awareness of project's main messages</li> <li>Communication activities and channels were:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Targeted well towards some audiences</li> <li>Frequent over the life of the project</li> <li>Sometimes interactive / responsive to audience feedback</li> <li>Partially monitored</li> <li>Partially budgeted/ financed</li> </ul> </li> <li>Communication/public awareness efforts have been moderately effective in driving change towards results beyond outputs.</li> <li>Adequate experience sharing between project partners and other interested groups / stakeholders.</li> <li>A good but limited communication plan/strategy exists was prepared and partially implemented</li> </ul> | <p>Evidence suggests that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Most key audiences driving the desired change have strong awareness of project's main messages</li> <li>Communication activities and channels were:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Well-targeted towards some key audiences</li> <li>Very frequent over the life of the project</li> <li>Very frequently interactive / responsive to audience feedback</li> <li>Well monitored</li> <li>Adequately budgeted/financed</li> </ul> </li> <li>Communication / public awareness efforts have been largely effective in driving change towards results beyond outputs.</li> <li>Substantial experience sharing between project partners and other interested groups / stakeholders.</li> <li>A good but limited communication plan/strategy was prepared and fully implemented</li> </ul> | <p>Evidence suggests that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All key audiences driving the desired change have strong awareness of project's main messages.</li> <li>Communication activities and channels were:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Well-targeted towards all key audiences</li> <li>Continuous over the life of the project</li> <li>Always interactive / responsive to audience feedback</li> <li>Very well monitored</li> <li>Fully budgeted/financed</li> </ul> </li> <li>Communication / public awareness efforts have been highly effective in driving change towards results beyond outputs.</li> <li>Strong and comprehensive experience sharing between project partners and other interested groups / stakeholders.</li> <li>A strong and comprehensive communication plan/strategy was prepared and was fully implemented</li> </ul> |

Last Updated : 22.01.19

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| J. Overall Project Rating  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (Use the Evaluation Office 'Weightings Spreadsheet' to calculate the overall project rating) |  |  |  |  |  |  |

K. Table to Support Assessment of Sustainability

|                   |          |                   |       |        |        |         |      |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|-------|--------|--------|---------|------|
|                   |          | <b>Dependency</b> |       |        |        |         |      |
| <b>Dependency</b> | High     | HU                | HU    | U      | MU     | MS      | S    |
|                   | Moderate | HU                | U     | MU     | MS     | S       | HS   |
|                   | Low      | U                 | MU    | MS     | S      | HS      | HS   |
|                   | None     |                   |       |        |        |         | HS   |
|                   |          | None              | 0-25% | 25-50% | 50-75% | 75-100% | 100% |
|                   |          | <b>MITIGATION</b> |       |        |        |         |      |

This matrix allows us to consider two key features of sustainability. Firstly, on the vertical access, there is a scale of **low to high dependency or sensitivity** to the sustainability issues. For example, if a project's direct outcome is the application of a new skill or behaviour pattern, how dependent is the continuation of that new practice on the nature of an insitution's culture or its structure ? If the new practice is very consistent with the institutional culture (e.g. the institution has previously adopted the new practice in other parts of its structure and the project has worked to extend this new behaviour into a specifict unit, department or sector), then sustaining the direct outcome – the new behaviour – is unlikely to be dependent on continued work at an institutional level; dependency = low.

Secondly, on the horizontal access, there is a scale of **low to high mitigation** of any sensitivity or dependency. For example, if new behaviours have been introduced to one part of an institution and these new practices represent major changes in institutional thinking, then any intervention will need to have embedded those changes in ways that support their continuation. This may be having worked with senior management to ensure their commitment to the changes, establishment of a refresher training mechanism built on focal points or a peer-to-peer exchange model etc; mitigation = high.

**The combination of the assessed level of dependency and the assessed degree of mitigation leads to the rating.**