



# Guidelines for conducting a SIP project terminal evaluation

Terminal Evaluation of the Project under the Specific International Programme of the  
Minamata Convention on Mercury

Project Title and Project Reference Number

20XX – 20XX

## 1. PROJECT INFORMATION

<b>1.1. Implementing Government and Implementing Government Institution</b>	Implementing Government		
	Implementing Government Institution		
	<input type="checkbox"/> Mr. <input type="checkbox"/> Ms.	Project Focal Point	
	Functional Title		
	Section / Department		
	Address		
	Telephone		
	E-mail		
<b>1.2. Project Title</b>			

[As per SSFA or PCA]		
<b>1.3. Budget USD</b>	Specific Trust Fund (MCP Budget)	Applicant Country Contribution [if any]
<b>1.4. Start Date</b>		
<b>1.5. End Date</b>		
<b>1.6. Evaluation Date</b>		

**2. SUMMARY OF ACHIEVEMENTS AND OVERVIEW OF REPORT**

---

<b>2.1. Project summary</b>	
<b>2.2. About this Evaluation</b>	<i>Describe the terminal evaluation objectives, the duration of the data collection period as guided by the terminal evaluation schedule.</i>

**3. INTRODUCTION**

---

<b>3.1. Institutional context of the project</b>	<i>Outline the Division/Branch/Unit, regions/countries that implemented the project.</i>
<b>3.2. Convention Articles to which the project contributed</b>	
<b>3.3. Overall project outcome</b>	
<b>3.4. Summary of Project Outputs</b>	<i>Describe the project outputs planned in the logframe vis a vis the project outputs achieved.</i>

#### 4. REVIEW METHODOLOGY

---

<b>4.1. Data collection</b>	<i>Describe the evaluation methods and information sources used.</i>
<b>4.2. Addressing Limitations</b>	<i>Describe the strategies employed to address any potential or actual limitations in the evaluation process.</i>

#### 5. THE PROJECT CONTEXT AND RESULTS MONITORING FRAMEWORK

---

<b>5.1. Project Context</b>	<i>Describe the rationale of the project intervention clearly stating the problem(s) the project intended to address.</i>
<b>5.2. Geographic coverage</b>	<i>Country or countries in the case of a regional project.</i>
<b>5.3. Results monitoring Framework</b>	<i>Present the project results monitoring framework (i.e. the results hierarchy as presented in the logical framework including the corresponding data sources/verification methods). It may be useful to attach the full project logframe including its indicators and means of verification as an annex.</i>
<b>5.4. Project implementation structure and stakeholder engagement</b>	<i>Present the implementing institutions and supporting implementing partners and their respective roles in ensuring successful project delivery. Define how different stakeholder groups were involved in the project and the roles they played and the resultant benefits to the project in achieving desired results. Comment on the value of collaborations if any.</i>
<b>5.5. Project change management</b>	<i>Describe any changes made to project plans to adapt to evolving needs, including approved budget revisions, if any.</i>
<b>5.6. Gender Strategies</b>	<i>Describe how the project implemented its gender strategies.</i>

#### 6. REVIEW FINDINGS

---

<b>6.1. Project design quality</b>	<i>Discuss the strength and weakness of the project design in relation to the project context (i.e. both a project specific situational analysis and in relation to the broader mandates of the Minamata Convention).</i>
------------------------------------	---

<b>6.2. Relevance</b>	<i>How aligned is the project with the broader environmental/chemical mandates within the region/country/sector? How is the intervention aligned with the mandates of the Minamata Convention and other global environmental and sustainable development blueprints such as the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals?</i>
<b>6.3. Coherence</b>	<i>How well does the intervention fit in the country, sector etc? How does the project complement other ongoing or completed efforts within the country/sector? How did the project optimize through synergizing and avoiding duplication of effort with such efforts?</i>
<b>6.4. Efficiency</b>	<i>How well did the project deliver in relation to the available resources? Comment on timeliness and cost effectiveness, the delivery process, and the quality of results. How well did the project conduct timely tracking of results and progress towards project objectives and how well was the quality of data and information presented?</i>
<b>6.5. Effectiveness</b>	<i>Did the intervention achieve its objectives? How well did the project achieve its desired outcomes? Assess both the quality and quantity of achievements as they apply. Comment on any project revisions and their effect on achieving results.</i>
<b>6.6. Impact</b>	<i>What difference does the intervention make? Discuss the potential and achieved long lasting positive benefits of the project. If not already attained, assess the likelihood of the intended, positive impacts becoming a reality. Assess the likelihood that the intervention may lead, or contribute to, unintended negative effects (e.g. effect on livelihood of vulnerable groups).</i>
<b>6.7. Sustainability of outcomes</b>	<i>To what extent will the net benefits of the intervention continue? Describe the socio-political, financial and institutional sustainability achievements. Assess the plans for project continuity following project closure through any commitments made including legal and policy enforcement. Comment on the nature of any relationships and collaborative partnerships that were developed through SIP support and how their continuity will be sustained.</i>
<b>6.8. Factors and processes affecting project performance and cross-cutting issues</b>	<i>Include nature of external context; financial management; monitoring and reporting.</i>

## 7. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

---

<b>7.1. Conclusion</b>	<i>Provide a summary of the evaluation findings in a logical manner from cause to effect. Highlight the major strengths and weaknesses of the project with an evidence base including how the positive outcomes were achieved, and what</i>
------------------------	---

	<i>hindered the achievement of the less successful aspects. This should include if any the effect of the COVID-19 pandemic.</i>
<b>7.2. Lessons Learnt</b>	<i>Provide the positive and negative lessons learnt.</i>
<b>7.3. Recommendations</b>	<i>Provide recommendations for addressing any programming challenges, scaling up, and ensuring sustainability of achieved results or any other recommendations within the context of the Minamata Convention's capacity building and technical assistance support towards implementing the mandates of the Convention.</i>