

TERMS OF REFERENCE

Terminal Review of the UNEP/GEF project “Implementing adaptation technologies in fragile ecosystems of Djibouti’s central plains” and “GEF ID 5021”

1. Project Rationale¹

Djibouti is vulnerable to the effects of climate change, particularly those related to changes in rainfall patterns. These changes negatively affect the ecosystems and lifestyles of rural communities, particularly pastoralists and farmers. The government has very limited financial and material capacity to deal with present and future threats caused by: i) climate change; and ii) overexploitation of ecosystem products and services. Therefore, the resources of the GEF Least Developed Countries Fund were used to implement the project entitled "Implementation of adaptation techniques in fragile ecosystems of the central plains of Djibouti" (referred as the Djibouti LDCF-2 project)

This project aims to increase the resilience of local communities to climate change and encourage the government to take into account the effects of climate change in its action program. To achieve this, the LDCF-2 project uses a combination of Ecosystem-based Adaptation (EbA) and hard infrastructure interventions supported by institutional and capacity development activities to reduce the climate vulnerability of local communities living in the Hanlé Plains of Dikhil Region and in the inland plains and coast of Tadjourah Region (hereafter referred to as Hanlé and Tadjourah). These regions were identified in Djibouti’s NAPA as being particularly vulnerable to climate change. The project aims at enhancing the delivery of ecosystems goods and services under conditions of climate change by: i) restoring degraded *Acacia* woodlands and mangroves; ii) using hard infrastructure to combat droughts and floods; and iii) establishing agropastoral plots to increase agricultural productivity and diversify livelihoods. The project uses a diverse range of adaptation technologies including *inter alia*: i) hard infrastructure such as gabion walls and levees to reduce the severity of flooding; ii) installation and rehabilitation of boreholes, including solar-powered borehole pumps; iii) rainwater harvesting techniques such as straw mulching, *Zai* and contouring; iv) improved climate-resilient agricultural techniques such as drip irrigation and distribution of comprehensive packages of high-quality farmer input kits; and v) climate-resilient alternative livelihoods such as apiculture, aviculture and marketing of crafts.

2. Project Results Framework

The overall project objective is as follows: Implement climate change adaptation interventions that protect human populations, maintain productive assets and enhance ecosystem resilience in the regions of Hanlé and Tadjourah.

In a nutshell, the project aims to contribute to the following:

- reduced or averted negative impacts of droughts and floods.
- increased productivity and climate-resilience of ecosystems.
- diversified livelihoods that are sustainable, climate-resilient and contribute to maintenance of ecosystem services; and
- increased capacity of institutions and communities to proactively adapt to climate change.

To do so, the project includes four components and eight outputs:

Component 1: **Protection against water-related climate change hazards**

¹ Grey =Info to be added

- Output 1.1. Protective measures against droughts and floods in cities and settlements
- Output 1.2. A hydrogeological model of current and projected water resources availability

Component 2: **Ecosystems rehabilitation, recovery and resilience**

- Output 2.1. Restored vegetative cover and soil stabilized in Acacia woodlands in Hanlé and in Tadjourah
- Output 2.2. Restored mangroves in central coastal zones of Tadjourah

Component 3: **Sustainable and resilient livelihoods**

- Output 3.1. Productive oasis ecosystems that provide livelihoods and ecosystem services
- Output 3.2. Increased, diversified and resilient livelihoods from the introduction of sustainable alternative economic development activities

Component 4: **Institutional capacity for adaptive development and communities' resilience**

- Output 4.1. Increased institutional and technical capacity of local and national government
- Output 4.2. Increased institutional capacity at local levels for adaptation to climate change using an ecosystem-based approach

3. **Executing Arrangements**

The project is implemented by UN Environment's Climate Change Adaptation Unit (CCAU) that provides technical assistance and oversight to project activities. It is executed by the Ministry of Habitat, Urbanism and Environment (MHUE) renamed Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development in close collaboration with the Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Hydraulic Resources and other relevant ministries. Every day work is conducted by a Project Management Unit (PMU) hosted and supervised by the Direction of Environment of the Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development. A Project Steering Committee meeting (PSC) meeting twice a year provides strategic direction and guidance to the project. Project implementation started in June 2014, after two no-cost extensions, its initial end date of June 2018 has been postponed to June 2023.

4. **Project Cost and Financing**

The project has a budget of US\$ 7,360,000 from the GEF LDCF and a co-financing of US\$ 14,170,000. As of 30th of June 2022 around US\$ 6,677,909 from GEF LDCF grant have been disbursed and reported upon and US\$ 13,670,000 in co-financing have been confirmed (see last Project Implementation Review)

5. **Implementation Issues**

According to the project Mid-term Review developed end of 2017 and the different progress reports, several factors have affected project performance including, among others :

1. Preparation and readiness: Underestimated budget at project design and weak project management were a constraint for the project implementation, affecting its overall performance.
2. Quality of project implementation and execution: Despite progress witnessed, duplication of responsibilities and limited capacity within the PMU has affected project performance especially at the beginning of the project. In addition, the lack of coordination with other similar climate change initiatives and with other key ministries limits project performance.
3. Stakeholders participation and cooperation: Community targets have been associated to the project with good recognition of the PMU staff by traditional leaders. Despite this beneficiaries' participation in some key activities including agriculture has been limited due to inadequate support communities still have to be successfully included in the exit project strategy

4. **Other factors:** include the lack of climate change integration into the implementation of key activities, the COVID-19, some bureaucratic arrangements, delays in importation of key material, characteristics of project sites (remote, scattered and difficult to access).

Those different challenges have been identified, discussed and reported during the project implementation. The project team supported by UNEP and the Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development have worked to put in place the most appropriate solutions to overcome those challenges and reduce their effects on project's implementation and impacts.

Section 2. OBJECTIVE AND SCOPE OF THE REVIEW

6. Objective of the Review

In line with the UNEP Evaluation Policy² and the UNEP Programme Manual³, the Terminal Review (TR) is undertaken at operational completion of the project to assess project performance (in terms of relevance, effectiveness and efficiency), and determine outcomes and impacts (actual and potential) stemming from the project, including their sustainability. The Review has two primary purposes: (i) to provide evidence of results to meet accountability requirements, and (ii) to promote operational improvement, learning and knowledge sharing through results and lessons learned among UNEP, its national partner the Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development and other stakeholders operating in the country. Therefore, the Review will identify lessons of operational relevance for future project formulation and implementation, especially for future adaptation projects.

7. Key Review principles

Review findings and judgements will be based on **sound evidence and analysis**, clearly documented in the Review Report. Information will be triangulated (i.e. verified from different sources) as far as possible, and when verification is not possible, the single source will be mentioned (whilst anonymity is still protected). Analysis leading to evaluative judgements should always be clearly spelled out.

The “Why?” Question. As this is a Terminal Review and a new LDCF project will be starting in 2023, particular attention will be given to learning from the experience. Therefore, the “why?” question should be at the front of the consultant(s)’ minds all through the review exercise and is supported by the use of a theory of change approach. This means that the consultant(s) need to go beyond the assessment of “what” the project performance was and make a serious effort to provide a deeper understanding of “why” the performance was as it was (i.e. what contributed to the achievement of the project’s results). This should provide the basis for the lessons that can be drawn from the project.

Attribution, Contribution and Credible Association: In order to *attribute* any outcomes and impacts to a project intervention, one needs to consider the difference between what has happened with, and what would have happened without, the project (i.e. take account of changes over time and between contexts in order to isolate the effects of an intervention). This requires appropriate baseline data and the identification of a relevant counterfactual, both of which are frequently not available for reviews. Establishing the *contribution* made by a project in a complex change process relies heavily on prior intentionality (e.g. approved project design documentation, logical framework) and the articulation of causality (e.g. narrative and/or illustration of the Theory of Change). Robust evidence that a project was delivered as designed and that the expected causal pathways developed supports claims of contribution and this is strengthened where an alternative theory of change can be excluded. A *credible association* between the implementation of a project and observed positive effects can be made where a strong causal narrative, although not explicitly articulated, can be inferred by the chronological sequence of events, active involvement of key actors and engagement in critical processes.

Communicating Review Results. A key aim of the Review is to encourage reflection and learning by UNEP staff and key project stakeholders. The consultant should consider how reflection and learning can be promoted, both through the review process and in the communication of review findings and key lessons. Clear and concise writing is required on all review deliverables. Draft and final versions of the main Review Report will be shared with key stakeholders by the Task Manager. There may, however, be several intended audiences, each with different interests and needs regarding the report. The consultant will plan with the

² <https://www.unenvironment.org/about-un-environment/evaluation-office/policies-and-strategies>

³ <https://wecollaborate.unep.org>

Task Manager which audiences to target and the easiest and clearest way to communicate the key review findings and lessons to them. This may include some, or all, of the following; a webinar, conference calls with relevant stakeholders, the preparation of a review brief or interactive presentation.

8. Key Strategic Questions

In addition to the review criteria outlined in Section 10 below, the Review will address the **strategic questions**⁴ listed below. These are questions of interest to UNEP and to which the project is believed to be able to make a substantive contribution. Also included are five questions that are required when reporting in the GEF Portal and these must be addressed in the TR:

Q1: To what extent did the project advance adaptation and what benefits did it generate in respect of which climate impacts? Have climate changes and their impacts been sufficiently taken into account in the project implementation?

Q2: Have arrangements in place allowed for an effective implementation of the project? Based on this experience, what improvements could be made to improve the implementation structure of future similar projects in the country?

Q3: To what extent did the project manage to secure full beneficiaries' engagement and participation and how could this have been maximized?

Q4: What are the key good practices and lessons learned coming out of the project implementation?

Q5: How well has the project ensured long-term impacts of its activities?

Address the questions required for the GEF Portal in the appropriate parts of the report and provide a **summary of the findings in the Conclusions section of the report**:

a) Under Monitoring and Reporting/Monitoring of Project Implementation:

What was the performance at the project's-completion against Core Indicator Targets? (For projects approved prior to GEF-7, these indicators will be identified retrospectively and comments on performance provided⁵).

b) Under Factors Affecting Performance/Stakeholder Participation and Cooperation:

What were the progress, challenges and outcomes regarding engagement of stakeholders in the project/program as evolved from the time of the MTR? *(This should be based on the description included in the Stakeholder Engagement Plan or equivalent documentation submitted at CEO Endorsement/Approval)*

c) Under Factors Affecting Performance/Responsiveness to Human Rights and Gender Equality:

What were the completed gender-responsive measures and, if applicable, actual gender result areas? *(This should be based on the documentation at CEO Endorsement/Approval, including gender-sensitive indicators contained in the project results framework or gender action plan or equivalent)*

d) Under Factors Affecting Performance/Environmental and Social Safeguards:

What was the progress made in the implementation of the management measures against the Safeguards Plan submitted at CEO Approval? The risk classifications reported in the latest PIR report should be verified and the findings of the effectiveness of any measures or lessons learned taken to address identified risks assessed. *(Any supporting documents gathered by the Consultant during this Review should be shared with the Task Manager for uploading in the GEF Portal)*

e) Under Factors Affecting Performance/Communication and Public Awareness:

What were the challenges and outcomes regarding the project's completed Knowledge Management Approach, including: Knowledge and Learning Deliverables (e.g. website/platform development); Knowledge Products/Events; Communication Strategy; Lessons Learned and Good Practice; Adaptive Management Actions? *(This should be based on the documentation approved at CEO Endorsement/Approval)*

⁴ The strategic questions should not duplicate questions that will be addressed under the standard review criteria described in section 10.

⁵ This does not apply to Enabling Activities

9. Review Criteria

All review criteria will be rated on a six-point scale. Sections A-I below, outline the scope of the review criteria. The set of review criteria are grouped in nine categories: (A) Strategic Relevance; (B) Quality of Project Design; (C) Nature of External Context; (D) Effectiveness, which comprises assessments of the availability of outputs, achievement of outcomes and likelihood of impact; (E) Financial Management; (F) Efficiency; (G) Monitoring and Reporting; (H) Sustainability; and (I) Factors Affecting Project Performance.

Annex 1 of these Terms of Reference provides a table with a list of various tools, templates and guidelines that can help Review Consultant(s) to follow a thorough review process that meets all of UNEP's needs.

A. Strategic Relevance

The Review will assess the extent to which the activity is suited to the priorities and policies of the donors, implementing regions/countries and the target beneficiaries. The Review will include an assessment of the project's relevance in relation to UNEP's mandate and its alignment with UNEP'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:

i. *Alignment to the UNEP's Medium-Term Strategy⁶ (MTS), Programme of Work (POW) and Strategic Priorities*

The Review 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. UNEP strategic priorities include the Bali Strategic Plan for Technology Support and Capacity Building⁷ (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.

ii. *Alignment to Donor/GEF/Partner Strategic Priorities*

Donor strategic priorities will vary across interventions. The Review will assess the extent to which the project is suited to, or responding to, donor priorities. In some cases, alignment with donor priorities may be a fundamental part of project design and grant approval processes while in others, for example, instances of 'softly-earmarked' funding, such alignment may be more of an assumption that should be assessed.

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

The Review will assess the alignment of the project with global priorities such as the SDGs and Agenda 2030. 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 will also be considered. Examples may include: UN Development Assistance Frameworks (UNDAF) or, national or sub-national development plans, poverty reduction strategies or Nationally Appropriate Mitigation Action (NAMA) plans or regional agreements etc. Within this section consideration will be given to whether the needs of all beneficiary groups are being met and reflects the current policy priority to leave no-one behind.

iv. *Complementarity with Relevant Existing Interventions/Coherence⁸*

An assessment will be made of how well the project, either at design stage or during the project inception or mobilization⁹, took account of ongoing and planned initiatives (under the same sub-programme, other UNEP sub-programmes, or being implemented by other agencies within the same country, sector or institution) that address similar needs of the same target groups. The Review 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

⁶ UNEP's Medium Term Strategy (MTS) is a document that guides UNEP's programme planning over a four-year period. It identifies UNEP's thematic priorities, known as Sub-programmes (SP), and sets out the desired outcomes, known as Expected Accomplishments (EAs), of the Sub-programmes. <https://www.unenvironment.org/about-un-environment/evaluation-office/our-evaluation-approach/un-environment-documents>

⁷ <http://www.unep.fr/ozonaction/about/bsp.htm>

⁸ This sub-category is consistent with the new criterion of 'Coherence' introduced by the OECD-DAC in 2019.

⁹ A project's inception or mobilization period is understood as the time between project approval and first disbursement. Complementarity during project implementation is considered under Efficiency, see below.

may include work within UNDAFs or One UN programming. Linkages with other interventions should be described and instances where UNEP's comparative advantage has been particularly well applied should be highlighted.

Factors affecting this criterion may include:

- Stakeholders' participation and cooperation
- Responsiveness to human rights and gender equity
- Country ownership and driven-ness

B. Quality of Project Design

The quality of project design is assessed using an agreed template during the review inception phase. Ratings are attributed to identified criteria and an overall Project Design Quality rating is established. The complete Project Design Quality template should be annexed in the Review Inception Report. Later, the overall Project Design Quality rating¹⁰ should be entered in the final review ratings table (as item B) in the Main Review Report and a summary of the project's strengths and weaknesses at design stage should be included within the body of the Main Review Report.

Factors affecting this criterion may include (at the design stage):

- Stakeholders participation and cooperation
- Responsiveness to human rights and gender equity

C. Nature of External Context

At review inception stage a rating is established for the project's external operating context (considering the prevalence of conflict, natural disasters and political upheaval¹¹). This rating is entered in the final review ratings table as item C. 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 Review Consultant and Task Manager together. A justification for such an increase must be given.

D. Effectiveness

i. Availability of Outputs¹²

The Review will assess the project's success in producing the programmed outputs and making them available to the intended beneficiaries as well as its success in 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 Theory of Change (TOC). In such cases a table should be provided showing the original and the reformulation of the outputs for transparency. The availability 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 provision. It is noted that emphasis is placed on the performance of those outputs that are most important to achieve outcomes. The Review will briefly explain the reasons behind the success or shortcomings of the project in delivering its programmed outputs available and meeting expected quality standards.

Factors affecting this criterion may include:

- Preparation and readiness
- Quality of project management and supervision¹³

¹⁰ In some instances, based on data collected during the review process, the assessment of the project's design quality may change from Inception Report to Main Review Report.

¹¹ Note that 'political upheaval' does not include regular national election cycles, but unanticipated unrest or prolonged disruption. The potential delays or changes in political support that are often associated with the regular national election cycle should be part of the project's design and addressed through adaptive management of the project team. From March 2020 this should include the effects of COVID-19.

¹² Outputs are the availability (for intended beneficiaries/users) of new products and services and/or gains in knowledge, abilities and awareness of individuals or within institutions (UNEP, 2019).

¹³ For GEF funded projects 'project management and supervision' will refer to the project management performance of the Executing Agency and the technical backstopping provided by UNEP, as Implementing Agency.

ii. **Achievement of Project Outcomes¹⁴**

The achievement of project outcomes is assessed as performance against the outcomes as defined in the reconstructed¹⁵ Theory of Change. These are outcomes that are intended to be achieved by the end of the project timeframe and within the project's resource envelope. Emphasis is placed on the achievement of project outcomes that are most important for attaining intermediate states. As with outputs, a table can be used to show where substantive amendments to the formulation of project outcomes is necessary to allow for an assessment of performance. The Review should report evidence of attribution between UNEP's intervention and the project outcomes. In cases of normative work or where several actors are collaborating to achieve common outcomes, evidence of the nature and magnitude of UNEP's 'substantive contribution' should be included and/or 'credible association' established between project efforts and the project outcomes realised.

Factors affecting this criterion may include:

- Quality of project management and supervision
- Stakeholders' participation and cooperation
- Responsiveness to human rights and gender equity
- Communication and public awareness

iii. **Likelihood of Impact**

Based on the articulation of long-lasting effects in the reconstructed TOC (*i.e. from project outcomes, via intermediate states, to impact*), the Review 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-lasting impacts. The Evaluation Office's approach to the use of TOC in project reviews is outlined in a guidance note and is supported by an excel-based flow chart, 'Likelihood of Impact Assessment Decision Tree'. Essentially the approach follows a 'likelihood tree' from project 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 Review will also consider the likelihood that the intervention may lead, or contribute to, unintended negative effects (e.g. will vulnerable groups such as those living with disabilities and/or women and children, be disproportionately affected by the project?). Some of these potential negative effects may have been identified in the project design as risks or as part of the analysis of Environmental and Social Safeguards.

The Review will consider the extent to which the project has played a catalytic role¹⁶ or has promoted scaling up and/or replication as part of its Theory of Change (either explicitly as in a project with a demonstration component or implicitly as expressed in the drivers required to move to outcome levels) and as factors that are likely to contribute to greater or long lasting impact.

Ultimately UNEP 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-lasting or broad-based changes. However, the Review will assess the likelihood of the project to make a substantive contribution to the long-

¹⁴ Outcomes are the use (i.e. uptake, adoption, application) of an output by intended beneficiaries, observed as changes in institutions or behavior, attitude or condition (UNEP, 2019)

¹⁵ UNEP staff are currently required to submit a Theory of Change with all submitted project designs. The level of 'reconstruction' needed during a review 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 review.

¹⁶ The terms *catalytic effect*, *scaling up* and *replication* are inter-related and generally refer to extending the coverage or magnitude of the effects of a project. *Catalytic effect* is associated with triggering additional actions that are not directly funded by the project – these effects can be both concrete or less tangible, can be intentionally caused by the project or implied in the design and reflected in the TOC drivers, or can be unintentional and can rely on funding from another source or have no financial requirements. *Scaling up* and *Replication* require more intentionality for projects, or individual components and approaches, to be reproduced in other similar contexts. *Scaling up* suggests a substantive increase in the number of new beneficiaries reached/involved and may require adapted delivery mechanisms while *Replication* suggests the repetition of an approach or component at a similar scale but among different beneficiaries. Even with highly technical work, where scaling up or replication involves working with a new community, some consideration of the new context should take place and adjustments made as necessary.

lasting changes represented by the Sustainable Development Goals, and/or the intermediate-level results reflected in UNEP's Expected Accomplishments and the strategic priorities of funding partner(s).

Factors affecting this criterion may include:

- Quality of Project Management and Supervision (including adaptive management)
- Stakeholders participation and cooperation
- Responsiveness to human rights and gender equity
- Country ownership and driven-ness
- Communication and public awareness

E. Financial Management

Financial management will be assessed under three themes: *adherence* to UNEP's financial policies and procedures, *completeness* of financial information and *communication* between financial and project management staff. The Review 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/component level and will be compared with the approved budget. The Review will verify the application of proper financial management standards and adherence to UNEP'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. The Review will record where standard financial documentation is missing, inaccurate, incomplete or unavailable in a timely manner. The Review will assess the level of communication between the Project 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.

Factors affecting this criterion may include:

- Preparation and readiness
- Quality of project management and supervision

F. Efficiency

Under the efficiency criterion the Review 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.

Focusing 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 Review 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 Review 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.

The Review will give special attention to efforts made by the project teams during project implementation to make use of/build upon pre-existing institutions, agreements and partnerships, data sources, synergies and complementarities¹⁷ with other initiatives, programmes and projects etc. to increase project efficiency.

The factors underpinning the need for any project extensions will also be explored and discussed.

Consultants should note that as management or project support costs cannot be increased in cases of 'no cost extensions', such extensions represent an increase in unstated costs to UNEP and Executing Agencies.

Factors affecting this criterion may include:

- Preparation and readiness (e.g. timeliness)
- Quality of project management and supervision
- Stakeholders participation and cooperation

G. Monitoring and Reporting

¹⁷ Complementarity with other interventions during project design, inception or mobilization is considered under Strategic Relevance above.

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

i. Monitoring Design and Budgeting

Each project should be supported by a sound monitoring plan that is designed to track progress against SMART¹⁸ results towards the achievement of the project's outputs and outcomes, including at a level disaggregated by gender, marginalisation or vulnerability, including those living with disabilities. In particular, the Review will assess the relevance and appropriateness of the project indicators as well as the methods used for tracking progress against them as part of conscious results-based management. The Review 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, where applicable.

ii. Monitoring of Project Implementation

The Review will assess whether the monitoring system was operational and facilitated the timely tracking of results and progress towards project objectives throughout the project implementation period. This assessment will include consideration of whether the project gathered relevant and good quality baseline data that is accurately and appropriately documented. This should include monitoring the representation and participation of disaggregated groups, including gendered, marginalised or vulnerable groups, such as those living with disabilities, in project activities. It will also consider the quality of the information generated by the monitoring system during project implementation and how it was used to adapt and improve project execution, achievement of outcomes and ensure sustainability. The Review should confirm that funds allocated for monitoring were used to support this activity.

The performance at project completion against Core Indicator Targets should be reviewed. For projects approved prior to GEF-7, these indicators will be identified retrospectively and comments on performance provided.

iii. Project Reporting

UNEP has a centralised project information management system (Anubis) in which project managers upload six-monthly progress reports against agreed project milestones. This information will be provided to the Review Consultant(s) by the Task 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 Review will assess the extent to which both UNEP and GEF 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.

Factors affecting this criterion may include:

- Quality of project management and supervision
- Responsiveness to human rights and gender equity (e.g disaggregated indicators and data)

H. Sustainability

Sustainability¹⁹ is understood as the probability of the benefits derived from the achievement of project outcomes being maintained and developed after the close of the intervention. The Review will identify and assess the key conditions or factors that are likely to undermine or contribute to the endurance of achieved project outcomes (i.e. '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.

i. Socio-political Sustainability

¹⁸ SMART refers to results that are specific, measurable, achievable, relevant and time-oriented. Indicators help to make results measurable.

¹⁹ As used here, 'sustainability' means the long-term maintenance of outcomes and consequent impacts, whether environmental or not. This is distinct from the concept of sustainability in the terms 'environmental sustainability' or 'sustainable development', which imply 'not living beyond our means' or 'not diminishing global environmental benefits' (GEF STAP Paper, 2019, Achieving More Enduring Outcomes from GEF Investment)

The Review will assess the extent to which social or political factors support the continuation and further development of the benefits derived from project outcomes. It will consider the level of ownership, interest and commitment among government and other stakeholders to take the project achievements forwards. In particular the Review will consider whether individual capacity development efforts are likely to be sustained.

ii. Financial Sustainability

Some project 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 project 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 natural resource management approach. The Review 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 project outcomes 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.

iii. Institutional Sustainability

The Review 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 Review will consider whether institutional capacity development efforts are likely to be sustained.

Factors affecting this criterion may include:

- Stakeholders participation and cooperation
- Responsiveness to human rights and gender equity (e.g. where interventions are not inclusive, their sustainability may be undermined)
- Communication and public awareness
- Country ownership and driven-ness

I. Factors Affecting Project Performance and Cross-Cutting Issues

(These factors are rated in the ratings table but are discussed within the Main Review Report as cross-cutting themes as appropriate under the other review criteria, above. If these issues have not been addressed under the Review Criteria above, then independent summaries of their status within the reviewed project should be given in this section)

i. Preparation and Readiness

This criterion focuses on the inception or mobilisation stage of the project (i.e. the time between project approval and first disbursement). The Review 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 Review 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).*

ii. Quality of Project Management and Supervision

For GEF funded projects 'project management and supervision' may refer to the project management performance of the Executing Agency and the technical backstopping and supervision provided by UNEP as Implementing Agency. The performance of parties playing different roles should be discussed and a rating provided for both types of supervision (UNEP/Implementing Agency; Partner/Executing Agency) and the overall rating for this sub-category established as a simple average of the two.

The Review 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.); maintaining project relevance within changing external and

strategic contexts; communication and collaboration with UNEP colleagues; risk management; use of problem-solving; project adaptation and overall project execution. Evidence of adaptive management should be highlighted.

iii. Stakeholder 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, target users of project outputs and any other collaborating agents external to UNEP and the executing partner(s). 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.

The progress, challenges and outcomes regarding engagement of stakeholders in the project/program occurring since the MTR should be reviewed. This should be based on the description included in the Stakeholder Engagement Plan or equivalent documentation submitted at CEO Endorsement/Approval.

iv. Responsiveness to Human Rights and Gender Equality

The Review 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 Review will assess to what extent the intervention adheres to UNEP's Policy and Strategy for Gender Equality and the Environment²⁰.

The report should present the extent to which the intervention, following an adequate gender analysis at design stage, has implemented the identified actions and/or applied adaptive management to ensure that Gender Equality and Human Rights are adequately taken into account. In particular the Review will consider to what extent project implementation and monitoring have taken into consideration: (i) possible inequalities (especially those related to gender) in access to, and the control over, natural resources; (ii) specific vulnerabilities of disadvantaged groups (especially women, youth and children and those living with disabilities) to environmental degradation or disasters; and (iii) the role of disadvantaged groups (especially women, youth and children and those living with disabilities) in mitigating or adapting to environmental changes and engaging in environmental protection and rehabilitation.

The completed gender-responsive measures and, if applicable, actual gender result areas should be reviewed. This should be based on the documentation at CEO Endorsement/Approval, including gender-sensitive indicators contained in the project results framework or gender action plan or equivalent.

v. Environmental and Social Safeguards

UNEP projects address environmental and social safeguards primarily through the process of environmental and social screening at the project approval stage, risk assessment and management (avoidance, minimization, mitigation or, in exceptional cases, offsetting) of potential environmental and social risks and impacts associated with project and programme activities. The Review will confirm whether UNEP requirements²¹ were met to: *review* risk ratings on a regular basis; *monitor* project implementation for possible safeguard issues; *respond* (where relevant) to safeguard issues through risk avoidance, minimization, mitigation or offsetting and *report* on the implementation of safeguard management measures taken. UNEP requirements for proposed projects to be screened for any safeguarding issues; for sound environmental and social risk assessments to be conducted and initial risk ratings to be assigned are reviewed above under Quality of Project Design).

The Review will also consider the extent to which the management of the project minimised UNEP's environmental footprint.

Implementation of the management measures against the Safeguards Plan submitted at CEO Approval should be reviewed, the risk classifications verified and the findings of the effectiveness of any measures or

²⁰The Evaluation Office notes that Gender Equality was first introduced in the UNEP Project Review Committee Checklist in 2010 and therefore, provides a criterion rating on gender for projects approved from 2010 onwards. Equally, it is noted that policy documents, operational guidelines and other capacity building efforts have only been developed since then and have evolved over time. https://wedocs.unep.org/bitstream/handle/20.500.11822/7655/-Gender_equality_and_the_environment_Policy_and_strategy-2015Gender_equality_and_the_environment_policy_and_strategy.pdf.pdf?sequence=3&isAllowed=y

²¹ For the review of project concepts and proposals, the Safeguard Risk Identification Form (SRIF) was introduced in 2019 and replaced the Environmental, Social and Economic Review note (ESERN), which had been in place since 2016. In GEF projects safeguards have been considered in project designs since 2011.

lessons learned taken to address identified risks assessed. Any supporting documents gathered by the Consultant should be shared with the Task Manager.

vi. Country Ownership and Driven-ness

The Review 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, i.e. either: a) moving forwards from outputs to project outcomes or b) moving forward from project outcomes towards intermediate states. The Review 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 (e.g. representatives from multiple sectors or relevant ministries beyond Ministry of Environment). 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. Ownership should extend to all gender and marginalised groups.

vii. Communication and Public Awareness

The Review 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 Review 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 Review will comment on the sustainability of the communication channel under either socio-political, institutional or financial sustainability, as appropriate

The project's completed Knowledge Management Approach, including: Knowledge and Learning Deliverables (e.g. website/platform development); Knowledge Products/Events; Communication Strategy; Lessons Learned and Good Practice; Adaptive Management Actions should be reviewed. This should be based on the documentation approved at CEO Endorsement/Approval.

Section 3. REVIEW APPROACH, METHODS AND DELIVERABLES

The Terminal Review will be an in-depth review using a participatory approach whereby key stakeholders are kept informed and consulted throughout the review process. Both quantitative and qualitative review methods will be used as appropriate to determine project achievements against the expected outputs, outcomes and impacts. It is highly recommended that the consultant(s) maintains close communication with the project team and promotes information exchange throughout the review implementation phase in order to increase their (and other stakeholder) ownership of the review findings. Where applicable, the consultant(s) should provide a geo-referenced map that demarcates the area covered by the project and, where possible, provide geo-reference photographs of key intervention sites (e.g. sites of habitat rehabilitation and protection, pollution treatment infrastructure, etc.)

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

- (a) **A desk review of:**
 - Relevant background documentation
 - Project design documents (CEO ER and Prodoc), Annual Work Plans and Budgets, the logical framework and its budget;
 - Project reports such as progress and financial reports, meeting minutes, relevant correspondence including the Project Implementation Reviews and Half Year Reports...
 - Project deliverables including but not limited to master theses, hydrological studies, experts' activity reports, mission reports, climate modelling and vulnerability analysis
 - Mid-Term Review of the project;
 - Project's Baseline Assessment and Result Verification Report (April 2023)

- Evaluations/Reviews of similar projects.
- (b) **Interviews** (individual or in group) with:
- UNEP Task Managers (TM)
 - Project Manager (PM)
 - Former and current members of the project management team including the assistants and the Chief Technical Advisors (CTA);
 - UNEP Fund Management Officer (FMO);
 - Executing Agency and partner institutions, including co-financing entities
 - Any other relevant resource persons;
- (c) **Surveys** as deemed necessary and designed during the inception phase of the TE.
- (d) **Field visits** to project sites and consultations with beneficiaries
- (e) **Other data collection tools** as deemed necessary and designed during the inception phase of the TE

10. Review Deliverables and Review Procedures

The Review Consultant will prepare:

- **Inception Report:** (see Annex 1 for a list of all templates, tables and guidance notes) containing an assessment of project design quality, a draft reconstructed Theory of Change of the project, project stakeholder analysis, review framework and a tentative review schedule.
- **Preliminary Findings Note:** typically in the form of a PowerPoint presentation, the sharing of preliminary findings is intended to support the participation of the project team, act as a means to ensure all information sources have been accessed and provide an opportunity to verify emerging findings.
- **A Review Brief** (a 2-page overview of the evaluation and review findings) for wider dissemination through the UNEP website may be required. This will be discussed with the Task Manager no later than during the finalization of the Inception Report.
- **Draft and Final Review Report:** containing an executive summary that can act as a stand-alone document; detailed analysis of the review findings organised by review criteria and supported with evidence; lessons learned and recommendations and an annotated ratings table.

All those above-mentioned deliverables will need to be developed in French with executive summaries in English and French. Final Terminal Evaluation Report will need to be translated into English for submission to UNEP and the GEF.

Review of the Draft Review Report. The Review Consultant will submit a draft report to the Task Manager and revise the draft in response to their comments and suggestions. The Task Manager will then forward the revised draft report to other project stakeholders, for their review and comments. Stakeholders may provide feedback on any errors of fact and may highlight the significance of such errors in any conclusions as well as providing feedback on the proposed recommendations and lessons. Any comments or responses to draft reports will be sent to the Task Manager for consolidation. The Task Manager will provide all comments to the Review Consultant for consideration in preparing the final report, along with guidance on areas of contradiction or issues requiring an institutional response.

The final version of the Terminal Review report will be assessed for its quality by the UNEP Evaluation Office using a standard template and this assessment will be annexed to the final Terminal Review report.

At the end of the review process, the Task Manager will prepare a **Recommendations Implementation Plan** in the format of a table, to be completed and updated at regular intervals, and circulate the **Lessons Learned**.

11. The Review Consultant

The Review Consultant will work under the overall responsibility of the Task Manager Eva Comba temporarily replaced by Alexander Forbes in consultation with the Fund Management Officer Bwiza Wameyo-Odemba and/or her team and the Head of Unit/Branch and the Portfolio Manager Jessica Troni.

The Review Consultant will liaise with the Task Manager on any procedural and methodological matters related to the Review. It is, however, the consultant's individual responsibility (where applicable) to arrange for their visas and immunizations as well as to plan meetings with stakeholders, organize online surveys, obtain documentary evidence and any other logistical matters related to the assignment. The UNEP Task Manager and project team will, where possible, provide logistical support (introductions, meetings etc.) allowing the consultants to conduct the Review as efficiently and independently as possible.

The Review Consultant will be hired over a period of 4 months and should have the following: a university degree in environmental/climate sciences, international development or other relevant political or social sciences area is required and an advanced degree in the same areas is desirable; a minimum of 5 years of technical / evaluation experience is required, preferably including evaluating large, regional or global programmes and using a Theory of Change approach; and a good/broad understanding of adaptation to climate change is desired. English and French are the working languages of the United Nations Secretariat. For this consultancy, fluency in oral and written English and French is a requirement. Working knowledge of the UN system and specifically the work of UNEP is an added advantage. The work will be home-based with field mission to Djibouti.

The Review Consultant will be responsible, in close consultation with the Task Manager, for overall quality of the review and timely delivery of its outputs, described above in Section 11 Review Deliverables, above. The Review Consultant will ensure that all review criteria and questions are adequately covered.

12. Schedule of the Review

The table below presents the tentative schedule for the Review.

Table 3. Tentative schedule for the Review

Milestone	Tentative Dates
Evaluation Initiation Meeting	Late May 2023
Inception Report	Early June 2023
Review Mission	5 – 20 June 2023
E-based interviews, surveys etc.	June 2023
PowerPoint/presentation on preliminary findings and recommendations	At end of review mission in Djibouti
Draft Review Report to Task Manager (and Project Manager)	July 2023
Draft Review Report shared with wider group of stakeholders	July 2023
Final Review Report	August 2023
Final Review Report shared with all respondents	August 2023

Annex 1: Tools, Templates and Guidance Notes for use in the Review

The tools, templates and guidance notes listed in the table below, and available from the Evaluation Office (cecilia.morales@un.org), are intended to help Task Managers and Review Consultants to produce review products that are consistent with each other. This suite of documents is also intended to make the review process as transparent as possible so that all those involved in the process can participate on an informed basis. It is recognised that the review needs of projects and portfolio vary and adjustments may be necessary so that the purpose of the review process (broadly, accountability and lesson learning), can be met. Such adjustments should be decided between the Task Manager and the Review Consultant in order to produce review reports that are both useful to project implementers and that produce credible findings.

ADVICE TO CONSULTANTS: As our tools, templates and guidance notes are updated on a continuous basis, kindly download documents from the link provided by the Evaluation Office during the Inception Phase and use those versions throughout the review.

List of Tools, templates and guidance Notes available:

Document #	Name
1	00_Tools Description and Mapping (Word File)
2	00a_UNEP Glossary Results Definitions (PDF file)
3	00b_List of Documents Needed for Reviews (Word File)
4	01_Review Criteria (Word File)
5	02_Criterion Rating Descriptions Matrix (Word File)
6	03_Review Ratings Table ONLY (Word File)
7	04_Weighed Ratings Table (Excel File)
8	05_Project Identification Table ONLY (Word File)
9	06_Inception Report Structure and Contents (Word File)
10	07_Main Review Report Structure and Contents (Word File)
11	08_TOC Reformulation Justification Table ONLY (Word File)
12	09_Quality of Project Design Assessment (Word File)
13	09a Quality of Project Design Assessment Template.xlsx (Excel File)
14	10_Stakeholder Analysis Guidance Note (Word File)
15	11_Gender Methods Note for Consultants (Word File)
16	12_Safeguards Methods Note for Consultants (Word File)
17	13_Use of Theory of Change in Project Reviews (Word File)
18	14_Financial Tables (Word File)
19	15_Likelihood of Impact.xlsm (Excel File)
20	15a_Likelihood of impact Test Case (Excel File)
21	16_Recommendations Quality Guidance Note (Word File)
22	16a_In Report Template Presenting Recommendations and Lesson Learned (Word File)
23	17_Recommendation Implementation Plan Template (Word File)
24	18_Cover Page Prelims and Style Sheet Main Review Report (Word File)
25	19_Review Assessment Quality of the Terminal Review Report (Word File)

Annex 2: Review Criteria and Ratings Table

The Review should provide individual ratings for the review criteria described in the table below. A suite of support tools, templates and guidance notes is available from the Evaluation Office to support the assessment of performance against these criteria (contact: cecilia.morales@un.org).

Most criteria will be rated on a six-point scale as follows: Highly Satisfactory (HS); Satisfactory (S); Moderately Satisfactory (MS); Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU); Unsatisfactory (U); Highly Unsatisfactory (HU). *Sustainability* and *Likelihood of Impact* are rated from Highly Likely (HL) down to Highly Unlikely (HU) and *Nature of External Context* is rated from Highly Favourable (HF) to Highly Unfavourable (HU). A Criteria Ratings Matrix is available, within the suite of tools, to support a common interpretation of points on the scale for each review criterion. The ratings against each criterion are 'weighted' to derive the Overall Project Performance Rating.

In the Conclusions section of the Main Review Report, ratings will be presented together in a table, with a brief justification for each rating, cross-referenced to findings in the main body of the report (see Table 1 below).

Table 1: Project Performance Ratings Table

Criterion <i>(Once the ratings have been determined, enter the rating for each sub-category into the Weighted Ratings Table and the aggregated scores will be automatically calculated, as well as the Overall Project Performance Rating. Note that for items B, C and F the rating needs to be entered at the level of the whole category).</i>	Summary Assessment	Rating
A. Strategic Relevance		HS → HU
1. Alignment to UNEP's MTS, POW and strategic priorities		HS → HU
2. Alignment to Donor/Partner strategic priorities		HS → HU
3. Relevance to regional, sub-regional and national environmental priorities		HS → HU
4. Complementarity with relevant existing interventions		HS → HU
B. Quality of Project Design		HS → HU
C. Nature of External Context²²		HF → HU
D. Effectiveness		HS → HU
1. Availability of outputs		HS → HU
2. Achievement of project outcomes		HS → HU
3. Likelihood of impact		HL → HU
E. Financial Management		HS → HU
1. Adherence to UNEP's policies and procedures		HS → HU
2. Completeness of project financial information		HS → HU
3. Communication between finance and project management staff		HS → HU
F. Efficiency		HS → HU
G. Monitoring and Reporting		HS → HU
1. Monitoring design and budgeting		HS → HU
2. Monitoring of project implementation		HS → HU
3. Project reporting		
H. Sustainability <i>(the overall rating for Sustainability will be the lowest rating among the three sub-categories)</i>		HL → HU
1. Socio-political sustainability		HL → HU
2. Financial sustainability		HL → HU
3. Institutional sustainability		HL → HU
I. Factors Affecting Performance and Cross-Cutting Issues²³		HS → HU
1. Preparation and readiness		HS → HU
2. Quality of project management and supervision ²⁴		HS → HU
2.1 UNEP/Implementing Agency:		HS → HU
2.2 Partners/Executing Agency:		HS → HU

²² Where a project is rated as facing either an Unfavourable or Highly Unfavourable external operating context, ratings for Effectiveness, Efficiency and/or Sustainability may be increased at the discretion of the Review Consultant and Project Manager together. Any adjustments must be fully justified.

²³ While ratings are required for each of these factors individually, they should be discussed within the Main Review Report as cross-cutting issues as they relate to other criteria. Note that catalytic role, replication and scaling up are expected to be discussed under Effectiveness if they are a relevant part of the TOC.

²⁴ In some cases 'project management and supervision' will refer to the supervision and guidance provided by UNEP 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 provided by UNEP, as the Implementing Agency. Comments and a rating should be provided for both types of supervision and the overall rating for this sub-category is calculated as a simple average of the two.

Criterion <i>(Once the ratings have been determined, enter the rating for each sub-category into the Weighted Ratings Table and the aggregated scores will be automatically calculated, as well as the Overall Project Performance Rating. Note that for items B, C and F the rating needs to be entered at the level of the whole category).</i>	Summary Assessment	Rating
3. Stakeholders participation and cooperation		HS → HU
4. Responsiveness to human rights and gender equality		HS → HU
5. Environmental and social safeguards		HS → HU
6. Country ownership and driven-ness		HS → HU
7. Communication and public awareness		HS → HU
Overall Project Rating		HS → HU

Annex 3: Guidance on the Structure and Contents of the Review Inception Report

See the SharePoint link shared with you containing a suite of tools, templates and guidance notes. Please make a fresh download for every new Terminal Review as we update these materials regularly.

Section	Notes	Data Sources	Recommended no. pages
Preliminary pages	Review and complete (where necessary) the Project Identification Table that was in the Terms of Reference.	TOR, ProDoc, PM	1
1. Introduction	<i>Summarise:</i> Purpose and scope of the review (i.e. <i>learning/accountability and the project boundaries the review covers e.g. timeframe, funding envelope etc</i>) Project problem statement and justification for the intervention. Institutional context of the project (MTS, POW, Division/Branch, umbrella etc) Target audience for the review findings.	TOR and ProDoc	1
2. Project outputs and outcomes	Confirm and present the formulation of planned project outputs and expected outcomes. The project should be assessed against its intended results, but these may need to be rephrased, re-aligned etc to make them consistent with UNEP results definitions²⁵ and to create the Theory of Change (TOC). <i>Where the articulation of the project's results framework, including outputs, outcomes, long term impacts and objectives/goals, needs to be revised, a simple table should be provided showing the original version and the revisions proposed for use in the review (see sample table below).</i> <i>SPECIFY WHICH GEF CORE INDICATOR TARGETS WERE IDENTIFIED AT CEO ENDORSEMENT/APPROVAL (For projects approved prior to GEF-7 these will be identified retrospectively and progress against them assessed).</i>	ProDoc, formal Revision Documents ²⁶ , consultation with Project Manager (PM)	1 / 2
3. Review of quality of project design	Complete the template for assessment of Project Design Quality, including section ratings, and present as an annex (template available) Summarise the project design strengths and weaknesses within the body of the inception report.	Project document and formal Revision Documents.	1-page narrative and completed assessment of PDQ template
4. Stakeholder analysis ²⁷	Identify key stakeholder groups and provide an analysis of the levels of influence and interest each stakeholder group has over the project outcomes. Give due attention to gender and under-represented/marginalised groups. (guidance note available)	Project document Project preparation phase. PM	1

²⁵ UNEP, 2019, Glossary of Results Definitions

²⁶ Formal revisions can be evidenced through ProDoc revisions, GEF PIRs, Steering Committee meeting minutes, Recommendation Implementation Plan from an MTR/MTE etc.

²⁷ Evaluation Office of UNEP identifies stakeholders broadly as all those who are affected by, or who could affect (positively or negatively) the project's results. At a disaggregated level key groups should be identified, such as: implementing partners; government officials and duty bearers (e.g. national focal points, coordinators); civil society leaders (e.g. associations and networks) and beneficiaries (e.g. households, tradespeople, disadvantaged groups, members of civil society etc.).

Section	Notes	Data Sources	Recommended no. pages
5. Theory of Change	The Project Design document should have a TOC. Review, revise and reconstruct, as necessary, the TOC at Review Inception²⁸ (<i>TOC at Review Inception</i>) based on project documentation, and formal Revision Documents. Present this TOC as a one-page diagram, where possible, and explain it with a narrative, including a discussion of the assumptions and drivers (guidance note and samples available). Identify aspects of the TOC at Review Inception that need to be explored further during the Review process with the project team and stakeholders. Note if the needs of different groups (vulnerable, gender groups, those living with disabilities etc) need to be reflected in the TOC Identify any key literature/seminal texts that establish cause and effect relationships for this kind of intervention at higher results levels (e.g. benefits of introducing unleaded fuel)	Project document narrative, logical framework and budget tables. Other project related documents.	Diagram and up to 2 pages of narrative
6. Review methods	Describe all review methods (<i>especially how sites/countries will be selected for field visits or case studies; how any surveys will be administered; how findings will be analysed etc</i>) Methods to ensure that potentially excluded groups (excluded by gender, vulnerability, disability or marginalisation) are reached and their experiences captured effectively, should be made explicit in this section. Summarise data sources/groups of respondents and methods of data collection to be used with each (e.g. skype, survey, site visit etc) Create a review framework that includes detailed review questions linked to data sources. Note that the Evaluation Office provides a matrix for rating each of its review criteria. Include any new questions raised by review of Project Design Quality and TOC analysis. Present this as a table/matrix in the annex (samples available) Design draft data collection tools and present in the annex (e.g. <i>interview schedules, questionnaires etc</i>)	Review of all project documents.	1-page narrative. The review framework as a matrix and draft data collection tools as annexes.
7. Team roles and responsibilities	Describe the roles and responsibilities among the Review Team, where appropriate		½

²⁸The project's *TOC at Review Inception* is prepared during the inception phase of the review and refined during the review process to become the *TOC at Review*. For the *TOC at Review Inception* the review team will need to examine the result statements and their causal logic from the project logframe and the drivers and assumptions from the narrative sections from the ProDoc (in particular from the critical success factors and risks sections). Stakeholder roles may be available from the description of the project intervention and the stakeholder and partner analysis sections.

Section	Notes	Data Sources	Recommended no. pages
8. Review schedule	Provide a revised timeline for the overall review (<i>dates of travel, where appropriate, and key review milestones</i>) Tentative programme for site/country visits, where appropriate.	Discussion with PM on logistics	½ (table)
9. Learning, communication and outreach	Describe the approach and methods that will be used to promote reflection and learning through the review process (<i>e.g. opportunities for feedback to stakeholders; translation needs etc</i>)	Discussions with the PM	½
TOTAL NARRATIVE PAGES			8-12 pages, plus annexes
Annexes (to be provided by the Review Consultant)	A - Review Framework B - Draft data collection tools C - Completed assessment of the Project Design Quality D - List of documents and individuals to be consulted during the main review phase E - List of individuals and documents consulted for the inception report		

Annex 4: Guidance on the Structure and Contents of the Main Review Report

*NOTE: The final product is called a **Review Report** (and not an Evaluation Report). Review Consultants are kindly advised to refer the reader to paragraphs in different parts of the report instead of repeating material.*

See the SharePoint link shared with you containing a suite of tools, templates and guidance notes. Please make a fresh download for every new Terminal Review as we update these materials regularly.

Preliminaries	<i>Title page</i> – Name and number of the reviewed project, type of review (mid-term or terminal), month/year review report completed, UNEP logo. Include an appropriate cover page image. <i>Disclaimer text to be included</i> – “This report has been prepared by an external consultant as part of a Terminal Review, which is a management-led process to assess performance at the project’s operational completion. The UNEP Evaluation Office provides templates and tools to support the review process and provides a formal assessment of the quality of the Review report, which is provided within this report’s annexed material. The findings and conclusions expressed herein do not necessarily reflect the views of Member States or the UNEP Programme Senior Management.” <i>Acknowledgements</i> – This is a maximum of two paragraphs. At the end of acknowledgements name the Project Manager and Fund Management Officer. <i>Short biography of the consultant(s)</i> – giving relevant detail of experience and qualifications that make the consultant a suitable candidate for having undertaken the work. (Max 1 paragraph) <i>Contents page</i> – including chapters, tables and annexes <i>Abbreviations table</i> – only use abbreviations for an item that occurs more than 3 times within the report. Introduce each abbreviation on first use and ensure it is in the table. Where an abbreviation has not been used recently in the text, provide its full version again. The Executive Summary should be written with <u>no abbreviations</u>. <i>Paragraph numbering</i> – All paragraphs should be numbered, starting from the Executive Summary <i>Header/footer</i> – Name of reviewed project, type of review and month/year review report completed. Page numbers, header and footer do not appear on the title page (Cover page, prelims and style sheet/Main Review Report template available)
Project Identification Table	An updated/completed version of the Project Identification Table. This can be extracted and updated from the TORs.
Executive Summary (Kindly avoid all abbreviations in the Executive Summary)	The summary should be able to stand alone as an accurate summary of the main review product. It should include a concise overview of the review object; clear summary of the review objectives and scope; overall project performance rating and key features of performance (strengths and weaknesses) against exceptional criteria (plus reference to where the project performance ratings table can be found within the report); summary of the main findings of the exercise, including a synthesis of main conclusions (which include a summary response to key strategic review questions) and selected lessons learned and recommendations. (Max 4 pages) .
I. Introduction	A <u>brief</u> introduction, identifying institutional context of the project (sub-programme, Division/Branch, regions/countries where implemented) and coverage of the review; date of Project Review Committee approval and project document signature); results frameworks to which it contributes (e.g. Expected Accomplishment in UNEP’s Programme Of Work); project duration and start/end dates; number of project phases completed and anticipated (where appropriate); implementing partners; total secured budget and whether the

	project has been reviewed/evaluated in the past (e.g. mid-term, part of a synthesis evaluation, evaluated by another agency, etc) Concise statement of the purpose of the review and the key intended audience for the findings. (Max 1 page)
II. Review Methods	This section is the foundation for the review's credibility, which underpins the validity of all its findings. The data collection section should include: a description of review methods and information sources used, including the number and type of respondents; justification for methods used (e.g. qualitative/quantitative; electronic/face-to-face); any selection criteria used to identify respondents, case studies or sites/countries visited; strategies used to increase stakeholder engagement and consultation; details of how data were verified (e.g. triangulation, review by stakeholders etc). The methods used to analyse data (e.g. scoring; coding; thematic analysis etc) should be described. It should also address limitations to the review such as: inadequate review budget to complete the TOR; low or imbalanced response rates across different groups; gaps in documentation; extent to which findings can be either generalised to wider review questions or constraints on aggregation/disaggregation; any potential or apparent biases; language barriers and ways they were overcome. Ethics and human rights issues should be highlighted including how anonymity and confidentiality were protected, methods and strategies used to reach and include the views and feedback of marginalised or potentially disadvantaged groups and strategies used to include divergent views. E.g. <i>'Throughout this review process and in the compilation of the Final Review Report efforts have been made to represent the views of both mainstream and more marginalised groups. Data were collected with respect for ethics and human rights issues. All pictures were taken, and other information gathered after prior informed consent from people, all discussions remained anonymous and all information was collected according to the UN Standards of Conduct'</i>. (Max 3 pages)
III. The Project	
A. Context	Overview of the main issue that the project is trying to address, its root causes and consequences on the environment and human well-being (i.e. synopsis of the problem and situational analyses). Include any socio-economic, political, institutional or environmental contextual details relevant to the project's stated intentions. Can include a map (geo-referenced) of the intervention locations. The section should identify any specific external challenges faced by the project (e.g. conflict, natural disaster, political upheaval etc). (1 page)
B. Results Framework	Summary of the project's results hierarchy as presented in the Review Inception Report ²⁹ (or as further revised during the Review process). (1 page)
C. Stakeholders³⁰	Description of groups of targeted stakeholders organised according to relevant common characteristics such as: interest/influence; roles/responsibilities or contributions/benefits etc. Key change agents should be identified, and due

²⁹ During the Review Inception phase the formulation of planned project outputs and expected outcomes should have been confirmed and presented. The project should be assessed against its intended results, but these may have needed to be rephrased, re-aligned etc to make them consistent with UNEP results definitions²⁹ and to create the Theory of Change (TOC). Where the articulation of the project's results framework, including outputs, outcomes, long term impacts and objectives/goals, needed to be revised, a simple table should have been provided in the Inception Report showing the original version and the revisions proposed for use in the Review. [This table should be annexed to the Main Review Report.](#)

³⁰ Evaluation Office of UNEP identifies stakeholders broadly as all those who are affected by, or who could affect (positively or negatively) the project's results. At a disaggregated level key groups should be identified, such as: implementing partners; government officials and duty bearers (e.g. national focal points, coordinators); civil society leaders (e.g. associations and networks) and beneficiaries (e.g. households, tradespeople, disadvantaged groups, members of civil society etc.). UNEP recognizes the nine major groups as defined in Agenda 21: Business and Industries, Children & Youth, Farmers, Indigenous People and their Communities, Local Authorities, NGO's, the Scientific & Technological Community, Women, Workers and Trade Unions.

	attention given to gender and under-represented/marginalised groups, including those living with disabilities. (½ page)
D. Project implementation structure and partners	A description of the implementation structure with diagram (implementing and executing agencies) and a list of key project partners, including their role in project delivery and performance (½ page narrative + table/diagram)
E. Changes in design during implementation	Any key events that affected the project's scope or parameters should be described in brief in chronological order, including: costed/no-cost extensions; formal revisions to the project's results; additional funding and when it was secured etc. (½ page)
F. Project financing	Completed tables of: (a) budget at design and expenditure by components (b) planned and actual sources of funding/co-financing should be provided. (template available)
IV. Theory of Change	
Reconstructed Theory of Change of the project at Review	Where the project results as stated in the project design documents (or formal revisions³¹ of the project design) are not an accurate reflection of the project's intentions or do not follow UNEP's definitions of different results levels, project results may need to be re-phrased or reformulated. In such cases, a summary of the project's results hierarchy should be presented for: a) the results as stated in the approved/revised Prodoc logframe/TOC and b) as formulated in the TOC at Review³². <i>The two results hierarchies should be presented as a two-column table to show clearly that, although wording and placement may have changed, the results 'goal posts' have not been 'moved'. (see sample table I: Justification for Reformulation of Results Statements below).</i> This section should include a description of how the <i>TOC at Review</i> was reconstructed (who was involved, which source documents were used, formal revisions, need for reconstruction etc.) The <i>TOC at Review</i> should be presented clearly in both diagrammatic and narrative forms. A clear articulation of each major causal pathway (starting from outputs to long term impact), including explanations of all drivers and assumptions as well as the expected roles of key actors should be provided. The insights gained by preparing the TOC at Review should be identified (e.g. gaps or disconnects in the project's logic that were identified; added value or UNEP comparative advantages that were highlighted; lessons in project design that became apparent etc). Work to promote human rights and gender equality is central to the aims of UNEP but does not always appear within results frameworks. The TOC should include assumptions/drivers relating to human rights and gender equality and the TOC narrative should discuss how greater equality and inclusivity was expected to be achieved by the project. For example, if the project document includes commitments to gender equality/gender strategies etc, these should be identified as drivers. <u>If the project document is silent, then the UN expectations on human rights and gender equality should be included as assumptions.</u> (3 pages + diagram)
IV. Review Findings	
Refer to the TOR for descriptions of the nature and scope of each criterion	This chapter is organized according to the review criteria presented in the TORs and reflected in the project performance ratings table. The Review Findings section provides a summative analysis of all triangulated data relevant to the parameters of the criteria. Review findings should be objective, relate to the review objectives/questions, be easily identifiable and clearly stated and

³¹ Revisions to results may be formalized through official communication between the project team and the funding partner (e.g. Steering Committee minutes; email exchange with the donor; GEF Project Implementation Review report; email confirming adoption of revisions after a Mid-Term Review, etc.)

³² During the Inception Phase of the evaluation process a *TOC at Evaluation Inception* is created based on the information contained in the approved project documents (these may include either logical framework or a TOC or narrative descriptions), formal revisions and annual reports, etc. During the evaluation process this TOC is revised based on changes made during project implementation and becomes the *TOC at Evaluation*.

	supported by sufficient evidence. This is the main substantive section of the report and incorporates indicative evidence ³³ as appropriate. “Factors Affecting Performance” should be discussed as appropriate in each of the review criteria as cross-cutting issues (see section IV. I below). Ratings are provided at the end of the assessment of each review criterion and the complete ratings table is included under the conclusions section (V. A) below.
A. Strategic Relevance	Integrated analysis of all dimensions evaluated under Strategic Relevance.
B. Quality of Project Design	Summary of the strength and weaknesses of the project design.
C. Nature of the External Context	Summary of any key external features of the project’s implementing context that may have been reasonably expected to limit the project’s performance (e.g. conflict, natural disaster, unanticipated political upheaval ³⁴). The overall effects of highly unfavourable or unfavourable external events on the project’s performance should be described.
D. Effectiveness: i. Availability of outputs ii. Achievement of project outcomes iii. Likelihood of impact	Integrated analysis, guided by the causal pathway represented by the <i>TOC at Review</i>, of all evidence relating to the achievement of results. Change processes explained and the roles of key actors, as well as drivers and assumptions, should be explicitly discussed under the following sub-headings: - Availability of outputs - Achievement of project outcomes - Likelihood of impact The effects of the intervention on differentiated groups, including those with specific needs due to gender, vulnerability, disability or marginalisation, should be discussed explicitly. These may be positive or negative effects.
E. Financial Management	Integrated analysis of all dimensions evaluated under financial management: <i>adherence</i> to UNEP’s policies and procedures; <i>completeness</i> of financial information, including the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used and <i>communication</i> between financial and project management staff. The completed ‘financial management’ table should be included in this section or as an Annex (template available)
F. Efficiency	This section should contain a well-reasoned assessment of efficiency under the primary categories of cost-effectiveness and timeliness including: • Implications of delays and no cost extensions • Time-saving measures put in place to maximise results within the secured budget and agreed project timeframe • Discussion of how the project during implementation made use of/built on pre-existing institutions, agreements and partnerships, data sources, synergies and complementarities with other initiatives, programmes and projects etc. • The extent to which the management of the project, or the method of carrying out activities by partners, minimised UNEP’s environmental footprint.
G. Monitoring and Reporting	Integrated analysis of all dimensions evaluated under Monitoring and Reporting, including: • Monitoring design and budgeting (<i>including SMART³⁵ results with measurable indicators, resources for Mid Term Evaluation/Review, plans for collection of disaggregated data etc.</i>) • Monitoring of project implementation (<i>including use of monitoring data for adaptive management</i>)

³³ This may include brief quotations, anecdotal experiences, project events or descriptive statistics from surveys etc. The anonymity of all respondents should be protected.

³⁴ Note that ‘political upheaval’ does not include regular national election cycles, but unanticipated unrest or prolonged disruption. The potential delays or changes in political support that are often associated with the regular national election cycle should be part of the project’s design and addressed through adaptive management of the project team.

³⁵ SMART refers to results that are specific, measurable, achievable, relevant and time-oriented. Indicators help to make results measurable.

	Project reporting (e.g. <i>UNEP reporting systems; gender disaggregated data, consideration of vulnerable/marginalised groups, including those living with disabilities</i>).
H. Sustainability	Discussion of the key conditions or factors that are likely to undermine or contribute to the persistence of those benefits achieved at the <u>project outcome level</u> are identified and discussion, including: - Socio-political Sustainability - Financial Sustainability - Institutional Sustainability (<i>including issues of partnerships</i>)
I. Factors Affecting Performance	Where possible, these factors are not discussed in stand-alone sections but are integrated in criteria A-H as appropriate. <u>Where the factors have not been discussed in the main body of the report, summary paragraphs should be given.</u> A rating is given for each of these factors in the Project Performance Ratings Table, please see the Review Criteria Ratings in the suite of tools provided through a SharePoint link.
V. Conclusions and Recommendations	
A. Conclusions	This section should summarize the main conclusions of the review following a logical sequence from cause to effect. The conclusions should highlight the main strengths and weaknesses of the project, preferably starting with the positive achievements and a short explanation of how these were achieved, and then moving to the less successful aspects of the project and explanations as to why they occurred. Human rights and gender dimensions of the intervention (e.g. how these dimensions were considered, addressed or impacted on) should be discussed explicitly. Answers to the key strategic review questions including an answer to the questions on Core Indicator Targets, stakeholder engagement, gender responsiveness, safeguards and knowledge management, required for the GEF portal, should be provided in Annex 1 below (see table II on GEF Portal Inputs) All conclusions should be supported with evidence that has been presented in the review report and can be cross-referenced to the main text using paragraph numbering. The conclusions section should end with the overall assessment of the performance of the project, followed by the ratings table. The conclusions section should not be a repeat of the Executive Summary but focuses on the main findings in a compelling story line that provides both evidence and explanations of the project's results and impact. (Max 2 pages)
B. Lessons Learned	Both positive and negative lessons are expected and duplication with recommendations should be avoided. Lessons learned should be anchored in the conclusions of the review, with cross-referencing to appropriate paragraphs in the review report where possible. Lessons learned are rooted in real project experiences, i.e. based on good practices and successes which could be replicated in similar contexts. Alternatively, they can be derived from problems encountered and mistakes made which should be avoided in the future. Lessons learned must have the potential for wider application and use and should briefly describe the context from which they are derived and those contexts in which they may be useful. Specific lessons on how human rights and gender equity issues have been successfully integrated into project delivery and/or how they could have been taken into consideration, should be highlighted.
C. Recommendations	All recommendations should be also anchored in the conclusions of the report, with paragraph cross-referencing where possible. Recommendations are <u>proposals for specific actions to be taken by identified people/position-holders to resolve concrete problems affecting the project or the sustainability of its results</u>. They should be feasible to implement within the timeframe and resources available (including local capacities), specific in terms of who would do what and when, and set a measurable performance target in

	order that the project team/Head of Branch/Unit can monitor and assess compliance with the recommendations. Structure the recommendation as a SMART (Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant, and Time-oriented recommendation), followed by a summary of the finding that supports it (this is the challenge/ problem identified and needs to be addressed) and an indication of the priority level, type of recommendation, responsibility, and proposed timeframe. Also, in some cases, the same challenge/problem can lead to separate recommendations (prescribed actions) to be addressed by different groups e.g. Project or Partners recommendations. In cases where the recommendation is addressed to a third party, compliance can only be monitored and assessed where a contractual/legal agreement remains in place. Without such an agreement, the recommendation should be formulated to say that UNEP project staff should pass on the recommendation to the relevant third party in an effective or substantive manner. The effective transmission by UNEP of the recommendation will then be monitored for compliance. Address the strengthening of human rights and gender dimensions of UNEP interventions, in (at least) one recommendation. Alternatively, include human rights and gender-related practice carried out by the intervention as a lesson learned. See template for recommendations in document 'In Report Template Presenting Recs and LL' and the "Recommendations Quality Guidance Note"
Annexes (The Project Design Quality assessment table is not needed in the final review report as it is annexed in the Inception Report)	These may include additional material deemed relevant by the Review Consultant(s) but must include: 1. Response to stakeholder comments received but not (fully) accepted by the Review Consultant, where appropriate. 2. Review itinerary, containing the names of locations visited and the names (or functions) and of people met/interviewed. A total gender disaggregation figure to be provided. <i>(A list of names and contact details of all respondents should be given to the Project Manager for dissemination of the report to stakeholders but contact details should not appear in the report).</i> 3. Summary of co-finance information and a statement of project expenditure by activity or component. 4. Review Brief <i>(where agreed with the Project Manager)</i>: A short (2-page) presentation of review findings and lessons to support the dissemination of learning to a wide range of audiences. <i>(Samples and a template can be provided by the EOU).</i> 5. Any other communication and outreach tools used to disseminate results (e.g. power point presentations, charts, graphs, videos, case studies, etc.). 6. List of documents consulted. 7. Brief CV(s) of the Review Consultant(s). 8. Review TORs (without annexes). 9. Quality Assessment of the Review Report (final only) will be added by the UNEP Evaluation Office as the final annex.

Important note on report formatting and layout

Reports should be submitted in Microsoft Word .doc or .docx format. Use of Styles (Headings etc.), page numbering and numbered paragraphs is compulsory from the very first draft report submitted. Consultants should make sure to gather media evidence, especially photographs, during the assignment and insert a sample in the final report in the appropriate sections. All media collected during the assignment shall become property of the Evaluation Office of UNEP; which shall ensure that the authors are recognised as copyright owners. The reviewer(s) grants permission to the Evaluation Office of UNEP to reproduce the photographs in any size or quantity for use in official publications. The reviewer(s) shall seek permission before taking any

photographs in which persons are recognisable and to inform them that the photographs may be used in UNEP official publications.

Table I: Justification for Reformulation of Results Statements

Formulation in original project document(s)	Formulation for Reconstructed ToC at Review Inception (RTOC)	Justification for Reformulation
LONG TERM IMPACT		
INTERMEDIATE STATES		
PROJECT OUTCOMES		
OUTPUTS		

Table II: GEF portal inputs

The following table contains text to be uploaded to the GEF Portal. It will be drawn from the Review Report, either as copied or summarised text. In each case, references should be provided for the paragraphs and pages of the report from which the responses have been copied or summarised.

Question: What was the performance at the project's completion against Core Indicator Targets? (For projects approved prior to GEF-7 ³⁶ , these indicators will be identified retrospectively and comments on performance provided ³⁷).
Response: (Might be drawn from Monitoring and Reporting section)
Question: What were the progress, challenges and outcomes regarding engagement of stakeholders in the project/program as evolved from the time of the MTR? (This should be based on the description included in the Stakeholder Engagement Plan or equivalent documentation submitted at CEO Endorsement/Approval)
Response: (Might be drawn from Factors Affecting Performance section)
Question: What were the completed gender-responsive measures and, if applicable, actual gender result areas? (This should be based on the documentation at CEO Endorsement/Approval, including gender-sensitive indicators contained in the project results framework or gender action plan or equivalent)
Response: (Might be drawn from Factors Affecting Performance section)
Question: What was the progress made in the implementation of the management measures against the Safeguards Plan submitted at CEO Approval? The risk classifications reported in the latest PIR report should be verified and the findings of the effectiveness of any measures or lessons learned taken to address identified risks assessed. (Any supporting documents gathered by the Consultant during this review should be shared with the Task Manager for uploading in the GEF Portal)
Response: (Might be drawn from Factors Affecting Performance section)

³⁶ The GEF is currently operating under the seventh replenishment period of the GEF Trust Fund covering the period July 1, 2018 to June 30, 2022. The GEF Portal Reporting Guide for FY20 Reporting Process indicates that GEF-6 projects that have yet to map existing indicators to GEF-7 Core Indicators need to do so at MTR stage or (if already there) at the time of the TE.

³⁷ This is not applicable for Enabling Activities

Question: What were the challenges and outcomes regarding the project's completed Knowledge Management Approach, including: Knowledge and Learning Deliverables (e.g. website/platform development); Knowledge Products/Events; Communication Strategy; Lessons Learned and Good Practice; Adaptive Management Actions? <i>(This should be based on the documentation approved at CEO Endorsement/Approval)</i>
Response: <i>(Might be drawn from Factors Affecting Performance section)</i>
Question: <i>What are the main findings of the evaluation?</i>
Response: