Terminal Evaluation Terms of Reference –international consultnat (team leader)

INTRODUCTION

In accordance with UNDP and GEF M&E policies and procedures, all full and medium-sized UNDP support GEF financed projects are required to undergo a terminal evaluation upon completion of implementation. These terms of reference (TOR) sets out the expectations for a Terminal Evaluation (TE) of theCommunity based Adaptation to Climate Change through Coastal Afforestation in Bangladesh(PIMS #3873)

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

Project Summary Table

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Project Title:  | **Community based Adaptation to Climate Change through Coastal Afforestation in Bangladesh** |
| GEF Project ID: | 3873 |   | *at endorsement (Million US$)* | *at completion (Million US$)* |
| UNDP Project ID: | 00062536 | GEF financing:  | 3.3 | 3.3 |
| Country: | Bangladesh | IA/EA own: | 1.1 | 1.1 |
| Region: | Asia and Pacific | Government: | 1.0 (in kind) | 1.0 (in kind) |
| Focal Area: | Climate Change | Other: | 0 | 3.15 |
| FA Objectives, (OP/SP): | Climate Change Adaptation | Total co-financing: | 1.0 | 1.0 (in kind) |
| Executing Agency: | UNDP | Total Project Cost: | 4.4 | 7.55 |
| Other Partners involved: |       | ProDoc Signature (date project began):  | 30 April 2009      |
| (Operational) Closing Date: | Proposed:April 2013 | Actual:30 June 2015 |

Objective and Scope

The project was designed to: *reduce vulnerability of coastal communities to the impacts of climate change-induced risks in four of the most vulnerable coastal areas of Patuakhali, Bhola, Noakhali and Chittagong Coastal Forest Divisions.* *The project ‘Community-based Adaptation to Climate Change through Coastal Afforestation (CBACC-CF)’ is funded by the Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF) and UNDP Bangladesh. The objective of the CBACC-CF project is to reduce the vulnerability of coastal communities to the impacts of climate change-induced risks, and to strengthen institutional mechanisms to support these communities to adapt to climate change impacts.*

*The project is the second LDCF-funded adaptation project in Asia and innovative in the way that it brings together climate change adaptation and sustainable economic development through coastal afforestation. As a pilot, the project is working across 14kms of Bangladesh’s 710km coastline which is particularly vulnerable to the impacts of climate change. Expected project outcomes are:*

*Outcome 1: Enhanced resilience of vulnerable coastal communities and protective systems to climate risks*

*Outcome 2: Climate risk reduction measures incorporated into coastal area management frameworks*

*Outcome 3: National policies revised to increase climate risk resilience of coastal communities*

*Outcome 4: Learning, evaluation, and adaptive management enhanced*

The TE will be conducted according to the guidance, rules and procedures established by UNDP and GEF as reflected in the UNDP Evaluation Guidance for GEF Financed Projects.

The objectives of the evaluation are to assess the achievement of project results, and to draw lessons that can both improve the sustainability of benefits from this project, and aid in the overall enhancement of UNDP programming.

Evaluation approach and method

An overall approach and method[[1]](#footnote-1) for conducting project terminal evaluations of UNDP supported GEF financed projects has developed over time. The evaluator is expected to frame the evaluation effort using the criteria of **relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and impact,** as defined and explained in the UNDP Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-supported, GEF-financed Projects. A set of questions covering each of these criteria have been drafted and are included with this TOR (*fill in* [*Annex C*](#_TOR_Annex_C:)) The evaluator is expected to amend, complete and submit this matrix as part of an evaluation inception report, and shall include it as an annex to the final report.

The evaluation must provide evidence‐based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The evaluator is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with government counterparts, in particular the GEF operational focal point, UNDP Country Office, project team, UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based in the region and key stakeholders. The evaluator is expected to conduct a field mission to Dhaka*,* including the following project sites: Borguna, Noakhali, Bhola and Chittagong*.* Interviews will be held with the following organizations and individuals at a minimum: Ministry of Environment and Forests (MoEF), Forest Department (FD), Department of Agricultural Extension (DAE), Bangladesh Forest Research Institute (BFRI), Department of Fisheries (DoF), Department of Livestock Services, local administration, community organizations formed through the project and project beneficiaries.

The evaluator will review all relevant sources of information, such as the project document, project reports – including Annual APR/PIR, project budget revisions, midterm review, progress reports, GEF focal area tracking tools, project files, national strategic and legal documents, and any other materials that the evaluator considers useful for this evidence-based assessment. A list of documents that the project team will provide to the evaluator for review is included in [Annex B](#_TOR_Annex_B:) of this Terms of Reference.

Evaluation Criteria & Ratings

An assessment of project performance will be carried out, based against expectations set out in the Project Logical Framework/Results Framework (see  [Annex A](#_TOR_Annex_A:)), which provides performance and impact indicators for project implementation along with their corresponding means of verification. The evaluation will at a minimum cover the criteria of: **relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact.** Ratings must be provided on the following performance criteria. The completed table must be included in the evaluation executive summary. The obligatory rating scales are included in  [Annex D](#_TOR_Annex_D:).

|  |
| --- |
| **Evaluation Ratings:** |
| **1. Monitoring and Evaluation** | ***rating*** | **2. IA& EA Execution** | ***rating*** |
| M&E design at entry |       | Quality of UNDP Implementation |       |
| M&E Plan Implementation |       | Quality of Execution - Executing Agency  |       |
| Overall quality of M&E |       | Overall quality of Implementation / Execution |       |
| **3. Assessment of Outcomes**  | **rating** | **4. Sustainability** | **rating** |
| Relevance  |       | Financial resources: |       |
| Effectiveness |       | Socio-political: |       |
| Efficiency  |       | Institutional framework and governance: |       |
| Overall Project Outcome Rating |       | Environmental : |       |
|  |  | Overall likelihood of sustainability: |       |

Project finance / cofinance

The Evaluation will assess the key financial aspects of the project, including the extent of co-financing planned and realized. Project cost and funding data will be required, including annual expenditures. Variances between planned and actual expenditures will need to be assessed and explained. Results from recent financial audits, as available, should be taken into consideration. The evaluator(s) will receive assistance from the Country Office (CO) and Project Team to obtain financial data in order to complete the co-financing table below, which will be included in the terminal evaluation report.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Co-financing(type/source) | UNDP own financing (mill. US$) | Government(mill. US$) | Partner Agency(mill. US$) | Total(mill. US$) |
| Planned | Actual  | Planned | Actual | Planned | Actual | Actual | Actual |
| Grants  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Loans/Concessions  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| * In-kind support
 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| * Other
 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Totals |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Mainstreaming

UNDP supported GEF financed projects are key components in UNDP country programming, as well as regional and global programmes. The evaluation will assess the extent to which the project was successfully mainstreamed with other UNDP priorities, including poverty alleviation, improved governance, the prevention and recovery from natural disasters, and gender.

Impact

The evaluators will assess the extent to which the project is achieving impacts or progressing towards the achievement of impacts. Key findings that should be brought out in the evaluations include whether the project has demonstrated: a) verifiable improvements in ecological status, b) verifiable reductions in stress on ecological systems, and/or c) demonstrated progress towards these impact achievements.[[2]](#footnote-2)

Conclusions, recommendations & lessons

The evaluation report must include a chapter providing a set of **conclusions**, **recommendations** and **lessons**.

Implementation arrangements

The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation resides with the UNDP CO in Bangladesh. The UNDP CO will contract the evaluators and ensure the timely provision of per diems and travel arrangements within the country for the evaluation team. The Project Team will be responsible for liaising with the Evaluators team to set up stakeholder interviews, arrange field visits, coordinate with the Government etc.

Evaluation timeframe

The total duration of the evaluation will be *25* days over a time period of 10 weeks according to the following plan:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Activity** | Timing | Completion Date |
| **Preparation** | 3 days  | *15-17 October 2015* |
| **Evaluation Mission** | 12 days  | *25- 06 November 2015* |
| **Draft Evaluation Report** | *8* days  | *9-16 November 2015* |
| **Final Report** | *2* days  | *By 25 November 2015* |

Evaluation deliverables

The evaluation team is expected to deliver the following:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Deliverable | Content  | Timing | Responsibilities |
| **Inception Report** | Evaluator provides clarifications on timing and method  | No later than 2 weeks before the evaluation mission: by 15 March 2015 | Evaluator submits to UNDP CO  |
| **Presentation** | Initial Findings  | End of evaluation mission: 26 March 2015 | To project management, UNDP CO |
| **Draft Final Report**  | Full report, (per annexed template) with annexes | Within 2 weeks of the evaluation mission: 15 April 2015 | Sent to CO, reviewed by RTA, PCU, GEF OFPs |
| **Final Report\*** | Revised report  | No later than 2 weeks before the evaluation mission: by 15 March 2015 | Sent to CO for uploading to UNDP ERC.  |

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

Team Composition

The evaluation team will be composed of 1 international and 1 national evaluator. The consultants shall have prior experience in evaluating similar projects. Experience with GEF financed projects is an advantage. The international consultant will serve as the team leader and will be responsible for finalizing the report. The international consultant will have the overall responsibility for developing the evaluation methodology, leading the evaluation, and delivering the key products expected from the evaluation, including coordinating the inputs from the national consultant. The national consultant will provide professional back up and support with local consultations, translation, and arrangement of local meetings.The evaluators selected should not have participated in the project preparation and/or implementation and should not have conflict of interest with project related activities.

The Team members must present the following qualifications:

* Minimum 10 years of relevant professional experience
* Knowledge of UNDP and GEF
* Previous experience with results‐based monitoring and evaluation methodologies;
* Technical knowledge in the targeted focal area(s): with academic (relevant Post Graduate University Degree) and professional background in fields related to Climate Change Adaptation, Disaster Risk Reduction, Community Development or Integrated Coastal Zone Management.
* *Demonstrate ability to assess complex situations, succinctly distil critical issues from a broad array of stakeholder feedback, and draw forward-looking conclusions and recommendations*
* Excellent English writing and communication skills

Evaluator Ethics

Evaluation consultants will be held to the highest ethical standards and are required to sign a Code of Conduct (Annex E) upon acceptance of the assignment. UNDP evaluations are conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the [UNEG 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluations'](http://www.unevaluation.org/ethicalguidelines)

Payment modalities and specifications

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| % | Milestone |
| *10%* | Submission of inception report |
| *40%* | Following submission and approval of the 1st draft terminal evaluation report |
| *50%* | Following submission and approval (UNDP-CO and UNDP RTA) of the final terminal evaluation report  |

Application process

Applicants are requested to apply online (http://jobs.undp.org) by 28 February 2015. Individual consultants are invited to submit applications together with their CV for these positions. The application should contain a current and complete C.V. in English with indication of the e‐mail and phone contact. Shortlisted candidates will be requested to submit a price offer indicating the total cost of the assignment (including daily fee, per diem and travel costs).

UNDP applies a fair and transparent selection process that will take into account the competencies/skills of the applicants as well as their financial proposals. Qualified women and members of social minorities are encouraged to apply.

**DOCUMENTS TO BE INCLUDED WHEN SUBMITTING THE PROPOSALS**

Interested individual Consultants must submit the following documents/information to demonstrate their qualifications:

1. **Proposal**

(i) Explaining why the candidate as the most suitable for the work

(ii) Provide a brief methodology on how he/she will approach and conduct the mentioned task

1. **Financial proposal**
2. **Personal P-11** form including past experience in similar projects and at least 3 references

**FINANCIAL PROPOSAL**

1. Contract based on Lump Sum
2. The Consultant will be paid in lump sum contract in monthly basis based on the report of the supervisor if following documents are delivered and accepted:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Sl no. | Deliverables | Deadline of deliverable | Payment Schedule |
|  | Submission of inception report | Within 2 weeks before the evaluation mission | 10 % of the contracted amount |
|  | Following submission and approval of the 1st draft terminal evaluation report | Within 2 Weeks after completion of Evaluation Mission  | 40 % of the contracted amount  |
|  | Following submission and approval (UNDP-CO and UNDP RTA) of the final terminal evaluation report | End of the assignment  | 50% of the contracted amount  |

1. **Travel:**

DSA will be provided for his travelling outside Dhaka as per rules of UNDP

1. **EVALUATION**

Individual Consultant will be evaluated based on the following methodologies:

Cumulative analysis

When using this weighted scoring method, the award of the contract should be made to the individual Consultant whose offer has been evaluated and determined as:

1. responsive/compliant/acceptable, and
2. Having received the highest score out of a pre-determined set of weighted technical and financial criteria specific to the solicitation.

\* Technical Criteria weight; 70%

\* Financial Criteria weight; 30%

Only candidates obtaining a minimum of 70% point in technical criteria would be considered for the Financial Evaluation

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| ***Criteria*** | ***Weight*** | ***Max. Point*** |
| ***Technical***  | 70% | 70 |
| * Work experience in relevant technical areas specially Climate Change Adaptation, Disaster Risk Reduction, Community Development or Integrated Coastal Zone Management
 | 25% | 25 |
| * Experience in result based management practice, methodologies as well as applying SMART target based evaluation
 | 20% | 20 |
| * Experience in evaluating GEF Funded Project
 | 15% | 15 |
| * Relevant Project Evaluation/Review experiences
 | 10% | 10 |
| ***Financial*** | 30% | 30 |

Annex A: Project Logical Framework

***PART I: Strategic Results Framework (SRF, formerly GEF Logical Framework)***

| ***Project Strategy*** | ***Objectively verifiable indicators*** |
| --- | --- |
| ***Goal*** | ***Promote climate-resilient development in the coastal areas of Bangladesh*** |

| ***Outcome/Output*** | ***Indicator*** | *Baseline* | *Target* | ***Sources of verification***  | ***Risks and Assumptions*** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***Objective – Reduce vulnerability of coastal communities to the impacts of climate change-induced risks in four upazilas in the coastal districts of Barguna and Patuakhali (Western Region), Bhola (Central Region), Noakhali (Central Region), and Chittagong (Eastern Region)*** | *Number of households that have increased adaptive capacity to climate change-induced risks in targeted coastal districts*  | *Coastal communities face climate change risks largely due to lack of adaptive capacity* *Recent scientific findings project 15% increases in salinity, cyclonic events, and inundation of coastal areas, with up to 35 million people becoming climate refugees from the coastal areas by 2050*  | * *By the end of the project, over 80% of households in project communities are able to anticipate climate risks and select the most effective risk reduction options*
* *By the end of the project, at least 75% of MoL and MoEF government officials and coastal management planners in target districts are able to identify climate-induced risks in coastal areas and are capable of prioritizing, planning, and implementing effective adaptation measures with the involvement of communities*
 | *Qualitative-based surveys (QBS)/Interviews/Vulnerability reduction assessment (VRA)**DMB Legislation**End of project evaluation report* | *Stakeholders are able to perceive reductions in vulnerability over the time-scale determined by project duration**Effective coordination between MoL and MoEF exists and institutional linkages with other relevant ministries and institutions is functional and supportive* |
| ***Outcome 1 – Enhanced Resilience of Vulnerable Coastal Communities and Protective Systems to Climate Risks***  | *Percentage of locally designed, sustainable adaptation measures demonstrating effectiveness in reducing climate vulnerability*  | *Disaster management efforts have increased preparedness for cyclones in some areas; however, there is a lack of planned measures and structured analysis of options to adapt to a broader range of both extreme and gradual climate change – induced hazards in coastal areas*  | * *By end of the project, over 80% of the adaptation measures employed by the project demonstrate their effectiveness and sustainability in reducing climate vulnerability in coastal communities*
 | *Project progress reports and end of project evaluation report* | *Communities continue to be supportive of CBA**Extreme climate events have not irreparably destroyed coastal lands in project sites**Corruption does not significantly impede implementation of adaptation measures* *Mangrove and non-mangrove species chosen for afforestation can thrive in project sites* |
| *Output 1.1 –* *Community-Based Adaptation Initiatives Defined for 4 Upazilas* | *Number of CBA plans developed with active participation of local communities for afforestation, livelihood diversification, and local warning systems*  | *Local-level adaptation plans to deal with climate change risks do not exist in target upazilas*  | * *By the end of Year 1, 1 CBA plan on coastal afforestation developed for each target upazila (4 total)*
* *By the end of Year 1, 1 CBA plan on livelihood diversification developed for each target upazila (4 total)*
* *By the end of Year 1, 1 CBA plan on extreme climate warning communications developed for each target upazila (4 total)*
 | *CBA plans**Reports describing community involvement in the process, including: vulnerability and needs assessment reports, feasibility reports, assessment methodologies, and maps* | *Communities are willing to participate and contribute in the assessment and design process of developing CBA plans**FD field staff, Forest Research Institute, and district/ local administrations extend required assistance to project team and communities* |
| *Output 1.2 –* *Climate-Resilient and Community-Based Coastal Afforestation Measures Implemented* | *Number of hectares of mangrove and non-mangrove species planted and continuously maintained by communities**Number of people trained and participating in mangrove nursery and maintenance* | *Coastal afforestation programs have been ongoing since 1960 in some coastal areas (e.g. Coastal Greenbelt Project); however, measures to ensure the sustainability of forested lands are not implemented, and the potential for protection against climate change-induced hazards is not fully realized* | * *By the end of the project, 6000 ha of mangrove species, 600 ha of non-mangrove species, 1000 km of coastal strip, and 100 ha of model demonstration species are planted in each of the target upazilas (6,700 ha and 1,000 km in total)*
* *By the end of the project, 15,000 people trained on mangrove nursery establishment and community-based forest management*
* *By the end of the project, at least 4,000 local people have participated in the management and protection of new plantations financed by the project*
 | *Project progress reports**Independent evaluation reports**Inventory stock list of seedlings**Training protocols* | *Communities will be willing to participate in coastal afforestation activities.**A sufficient number of seedlings survive the nursery stage and can be planted**Land for the pilot areas is not lost to an extreme event during the project* |
| *Output 1.3 –* *Climate-Resilient Livelihood Options Enabled and Promoted* | *Number of households in target upazilas with access to climate-resilient livelihood options*  | *Livelihood programs are ongoing in some coastal areas (e.g. Chittagong); however, they do not take climate change impacts into account and are not integrated with afforestation measures*  | * *By Year 2, at least 60% of villages in the target upazilas promote alternative livelihood options and create conducive structures that enable at least 1,600 households to actively adopt them.*
* *By the end of the project, 400 households in each of the target upazilas have actively expanded their livelihood options through the project (1,600 total)*
 | *Project progress reports**QBS/VRA*  | *Natural resources required for livelihood options are not damaged in extreme events**Government and NGOs continue to be willing to provide required support for livelihood options**Climate-resilient livelihood options provide at least as much income as non-climate-resilient options* |
| *Output 1.4 –* *Warning Communications for Extreme Climate Events Improved* | *Number of communities with effective local warning systems for increasingly frequent climate hazards**Percentage of fishermen able to receive and respond to warning signals from the system in time to avoid human and material losses* | *Basic warning systems for cyclones exist in limited areas (e.g. different colored flags displayed on towers according to sea conditions); however, most communities in the target upazilas have inadequate access to warning information for communicating information to vulnerable fishermen.* | * *By Year 3, assessments of local early warning needs, as required for sustainability of climate-resilient alternative livelihood options, conducted in communities in target upazilas (4 assessments in total)*
 | *Project progress reports, including reports on public awareness campaigns**Mock drill reports**QBS* | *In the event of warnings, safe response actions exist for vulnerable fishermen* *Government and NGOs continue to be willing to provide required support for local warning systems**Infrastructure exists for receiving cyclone warnings from national climate information services at the target district and local levels in a timely manner* |
| ***Outcome 2 – Climate Risk Reduction Measures Incorporated into Coastal Area Management Frameworks*** | *Percentage of national planners, district authorities, and communities able to identify climate risks and prioritize, plan, and implement effective adaptation measures*  | *Coastal development planners currently take certain extreme events into account at the national, district, and local levels, but the capacity to plan for and react to dynamic climate change risks is very low.**There is a lack of an integrated framework and human and institutional capacity for assessing, planning for, and addressing climate change-induced risks at coastal areas.* | * *By the end of the project, at least 75% of MoL and MoEF civil servants at the national level and in targeted districts are able to identify climate risks and prioritize, plan, and implement measures for adaptation in coastal areas*
 | *QBS/interviews**Training reports*  | *MoL and MoEF officials remain supportive to the project’s capacity building initiative**Appropriate staff members undergo training and staff turnover does not negate training benefits* *MoL and MoEF continue to support adaptation within coastal development programs, and to apply and maintain adaptive capacity built during the project* |
| *Output 2.1 – National Planners and Policymakers Trained in Climate-Resilient Coastal Development* | *Number of capacity building materials and tools developed**Number of national training seminars**Percentage of national sectoral planners with improved understanding of climate change risks and adaptation measures* | *Current capacity at the national level relevant to the integrated planning and management of climate change and adaptation issues is limited to a core group of experts within the Climate Change Cell, research institutions, and the NAPA team* | * *By the end of Year 1, 5 briefing notes, 5 fact sheets, and 1 cross-sectoral guideline for climate-resilient coastal planning developed and disseminated*
* *By the end of Year 2, 2 national training seminars for relevant national ministries and organizations on climate-resilient coastal planning conducted (2 total)*
* *By the end of the project, at least 80% of relevant national sectoral planners are able to anticipate climate change-induced risks in their professional sector and advocate/plan for suitable corresponding adaptation measures*
 | *Briefing notes, factsheets, and cross-sectoral guidelines**Capacity assessment report, training reports, and QBS/interviews*  | *Concerned ministries and other stakeholders organizations are willing to participate in capacity development initiatives* *Staff who are unfamiliar with climate change, rather than previously identified “climate change” experts or focal points within ministries, will attend trainings**Stakeholders relevant for decision and policy making in coastal zone management are correctly identified*  |
| *Output 2.2 – District Officials Trained in Facilitating Community-Based Adaptation* | *Number of regular district-level climate change seminars**Number of district officials with a deeper understanding of climate risks and CBA options in their districts**Percentage of district officials able to anticipate climate change risks and facilitate CBA measures in coastal areas* | *Although there is a certain competence in disaster management, especially in response planning, the current capacity of district officials is extremely low with regard to climate change issues*  | * *By the end of Year 3, 3 climate change seminars conducted in each target district (12 total)*
* *By the end of Year 3, at least 20 district officials undertake exposure visits to project villages to enhance knowledge on CBA and sustainable management of protective systems (80 total)*
* *By end of the project, at least 90% of target district officials are able to anticipate climate change risks and facilitate CBA measures in coastal areas*
 | *Training reports and capacity assessment report**Exposure visit reports**QBS/Interviews*  | *Appropriate government officials would be participating in capacity building events and the same officials will be able to attend all three seminars to fully benefit from the training series**CBA measures will have produced replicable successes in time for exposure visits by district officials* |
| *Output 2.3 – Upazila Officials Trained in Promoting and Facilitating Local Climate Risk Resilience* | *Number of local officials and representatives working on coastal management able to support CBA* *Number of sectoral development plans integrating climate-resilient measures**Number of functional “Local Climate Resource and Support Centers”**Number of civil society networks for climate change resilience* | *Current knowledge and capacity is extremely low with regard to address climate change issues, and climate change risks are not integrated into any sectoral development plans at the upazila level* | * *By the end of Year 2, 10 representatives from UzDMCs and UzDCCs in each target upazila trained and able to assess, plan, and implement CBA measures (total 40)*
* *By the end of Year 3, climate resilience integrated into at least 2 sectoral upazila development plans (total 8)*
* *By the end of Year 3, a local institution, such as the UzDMC, acts as the “Local Climate Resource and Support Center” for CBA in each of the target upazilas. The centers will serve the upazila (total 4 centers)*
* *By the end of Year 3, a civil society network is established in each target upazila (4 total)*
 | *QBS/Interviews**Training reports**Sectoral development plans**Independent evaluation reports* | *Government officials and other stakeholders continue to be willing to participate in the training and other capacity building events**At least 8 sectoral upazila development plans will be drafted or revised during the first three years of the project**At least one local institution in target upazilas is willing to act as the Local Climate Resource and Support Center**Staff turnover does not negate training benefits**Champions exist at each upazila who are willing to establish and maintain the civil society networks**The political climate supports a civil society network*  |
| *Output 2.4 – Union Officials and Community-based Organizations Trained in Climate Risk Reduction* | *Number of vulnerable people trained on climate change risks**Number of union-level networks for climate resilience* | *Current knowledge and capacity is extremely low with regard to address climate change issues* | * *By the end of Year 3, 200 vulnerable people (including at least 100 women members of Union Parishads and other groups) in each target upazila trained and able to assess, plan, and implement CBA measures (800 total)*
* *By the end of Year 3, 1 union-level climate change network established to raise community awareness of climate risk reduction, local participation, decision-making, and livelihood security in each upazila (4 total)*
 | *Training reports**QBS/Interviews**Independent evaluation reports* | *At least 800 women and other vulnerable people have the time and willingness to regularly attend capacity building events* *Champions exist at each union who are willing to establish and maintain climate change networks**The political climate supports a civil society network* |
| *Output 2.5 – Community Awareness Campaign Conducted on Climatic Risks and Community-based Adaptation Defined and Implemented* | *Number of Participatory Rural Appraisals (PRA)**Number of households aware of climate change risks and adaptation measures* | *Disaster preparedness programs (e.g. those implemented by the Red Crescent Society and CARE Bangladesh) for cyclones have raised awareness of current risks from extreme climate events. However, there are no climate change-related training and awareness activities currently being implemented in target communities* | * *By the end of Year 2, 1 PRA conducted in each target upazila to improve understanding of capacity needs in target communities on longer-term climatic and environmental changes (4 total)*
* *By the end of Year 3, culturally appropriate tools are developed to raise awareness on climate change impacts on relevant sectors*
* *By the end of Year 3, 25 people, including Red Crescent volunteers and other ward/village members, trained and able to apply PRA methods specifically in climate risk assessment and CBA planning and implementation (100 total)*
* *By the end of the project, at least 80% of households in 4 upazilas are aware of climate change issues and CBA options*
 | *PRA reports**Public awareness materials**Training materials and* *Project progress report**QBA/Interviews**Independent evaluations* | *Community members continue to be willing to learn, disseminate, and use information in training and awareness materials* |
| ***Outcome 3 – National Policies Revised to Increase Climate Risk Resilience of Coastal Communities*** | *Number of policies and government action plans that support climate-resilient development**Percentage of civil servants reporting that policies have been revised to improve climate resilience in coastal communities* | *Currently there is a national coastal management policy and land use policy, in addition to several others that affect coastal development; however, they do not address climate change and adaptation issues in an integrated manner* | * *By the end of the project, at least 2 national policies or action plans on coastal management and 2 on land use are revised to promote sustainable, climate-resilient development*
* *By end of project, at least 75% of national-level civil servants in the MoL and MoEF report that the policies of those ministries have been adjusted to improve climate resilience in coastal communities*
 | *Policies, action plans, policy briefings, and communication reports* *QBS/Interviews* | *Policy stakeholders are willing to make changes in policy and action plans, based on emerging issues and communities’ needs* *The government remains stable and climate change remains a policy priority throughout the project* |
| *Output 3.1 –* *Policy Effects on Livelihood Resilience Analyzed and Policy Recommendations Developed*  | *Number of policy reviews**Number of policymakers receiving background notes and policy recommendations on climate-resilient livelihoods* | *There has been no systematic examination of relevant coastal management policies’ impacts regarding climate change resilience at the community level* | * *By the middle of Year 2, 1 comprehensive review of policies that support or impede climate-resilient livelihoods in coastal communities conducted*
* *By the middle of Year 3, at least 75% of policymakers in the MoA, MoEF, MoFL, MoFDM, MoL, MoLGRDC, and MoWR receive policy recommendations on impacts of various sectoral policies on the resilience of livelihoods in coastal areas*
 | *Policy review report**Background notes and policy recommendations**QBS/Interview**Climate resilient development guidelines*  | *Policy stakeholders remain supportive of revising policies to support climate resilience at the community level and are willing to receive input from local levels**Capacity to undertake policy review exists**Community members provide accurate information on policy impacts on livelihoods* |
| *Output 3.2 –* *Land Use Policies Promote Sustainability of Protective Systems in Coastal Areas* | *Number of land use policy reviews**Number of land use policies promoting sustainability of coastal protective ecosystems**Number of coastal zoning regulations that incorporate climate change issues* | *Several policies regarding coastal land use exist; however, they do not take climate change risks into account and do not promote sustainability of protective ecosystems* | * *By the middle of Year 2, 1 review of impacts of existing land use policies on the sustainability of protective greenbelt structures produced*
* *By the end of the project, at least 1 land use policy or action plan is revised to reflect policy recommendations and promotes sustainability of coastal protective ecosystems in each target district (4 total)*
* *By the end of the project, at least 2 coastal zoning regulations promote resilient livelihoods and sustainability of protective systems*
 | *Policy review report**Land use policies**Coastal Land Use Zoning Project zoning regulations* | *Government remains stable and ensuring climate-resilient land use policies remains a priority**Good cooperation between MoL and MoEF continues**Corruption does not impede revision and passage of policies, action plans, or zoning regulations that promote resilient livelihoods and sustainability of protective ecosystems*  |
| *Output 3.3 – Coordination Mechanism for Climate-Resilient Policy Development and Coastal Planning Established* | *Number of institutional assessments conducted**Number of documented agreements between MoL and FD* *Number of coordination meetings supporting climate-resilient policy development at district levels* | *MoL coastal land use zoning projects are ongoing. Cooperation between the MoL and FD, MoEF, presents opportunities to include climate change and adaptation issues in the zoning plan* *The current agreement between the MoL and FD for mangrove afforestation in newly accreted coastal lands does not adequately ensure the forests’ sustainability, since the land is distributed for settlement and farming purposes after the mangroves mature.* | * *By the end of Year 1, 1 assessment conducted of institutional roles and coordination regarding coastal zone management in target districts*
* *By the end of Year 2, 1 agreement achieved and documented between the MoL and FD that ensures sustainability of protective ecosystems in newly accreted coastal lands target districts*
* *During Years 2, 3, and 4 of the project, 1 coordination meeting for the District Steering Committee and organizations listed in Table 1 held each quarter in target districts*
* *By the end of the project, at least 80% of government officials and representatives of coastal management organizations attending quarterly coordination meetings report comprehensive information support on climate resilience and coordination with other organizations in coastal development planning*
 | *Institutional assessment report**Agreement, such as an MOU, between MoL and FD**QBS/Interviews**Coastal development policies and planning documents**Quarterly coordination meeting minutes* | *Coastal Land Use Zoning project and the MoL continue to be supportive of including climate change issues in zoning regulations* *Competing priorities do not impede development of an agreement between the MoL and FD for sustainable protective ecosystems**Sectoral planners attend coordination meetings consistently to ensure continuous and effective information sharing* |
| ***Outcome 4 – Learning, Evaluation, and Adaptive Management Enhanced*** | *Number of proposals, papers, and other documents that incorporate learning from the project* | *Development projects currently do not systematically benefit from learning practices and project lessons on community-based adaptation.*  | * *By the end of the project, at least 4 proposed or ongoing coastal afforestation, livelihoods, or CBA programs draw on lessons and knowledge generated through the project*
 | *ALM platform**Proposals, papers, and other documents* | *The ALM is operational and circumstances in coastal areas of Bangladesh apply to other coastal afforestation, livelihoods, and CBA initiatives* |
| *Output 4.1 –* *Project Lessons Captured in, and Disseminated through, the Adaptation Learning Mechanism* | *Number of contributions by the project to the ALM* | *No contribution by Bangladesh to the ALM on coastal afforestation and other CBA initiatives* | * *By the end of the project, all project monitoring and evaluation reports are screened for inclusion in the ALM*
* *By the end of the project, key project lessons are captured and disseminated through the ALM*
 | *ALM platform* | *The ALM is operational to facilitate learning* |
| *Output 4.2 –* *Project Knowledge Shared with Other Regions and Countries Facing Climate-Induced Coastal Hazards* | *Number of organizations and individuals actively involved in knowledge transfer activities within and outside of Bangladesh* | *No systematic knowledge transfer on coastal afforestation and climate-resilient livelihoods initiatives within Bangladesh and from Bangladesh to other countries* | * *By the end of the project, 1 national and 1 international workshop on coastal afforestation and other climate-resilient livelihoods conducted (2 total) with at least 100 participants each*
 | *Workshop proceedings* | *Other regions and countries believe experiences from the project will be valuable for future coastal afforestation and climate-resilient livelihoods* |
| *Output 4.3 –* *Project Knowledge Incorporated into Other Coastal Afforestation and Livelihoods Programs in Bangladesh* | *Number of follow-up/replication projects within Bangladesh designed on the basis of project lessons**Number of follow-up/replication projects outside of Bangladesh designed on the basis of project lessons**Number of research initiatives based on project insights and lessons*  | *No coastal afforestation and coastal afforestation, livelihoods, and CBA initiatives within or outside Bangladesh have drawn on lessons from the project* | * *By the end of the project, at least 2 follow-up/replication project within Bangladesh are designed on the basis of project lessons*
* *By the end of the project, at least 2 follow-up/replication projects outside of Bangladesh are informed by project lessons*
* *By the end of the project, at least 3 new research initiatives for coastal adaptation draw on knowledge gaps identified during the project.*
 | *Project documents* | *Project lessons apply to proposed or ongoing coastal afforestation, livelihoods, and CBA initiatives in other regions within and outside Bangladesh* |

Annex B: List of Documents to be reviewed by the evaluators

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Sl. #* | *Documents*  |
| *A* | *Project Document* |
| *1* | *CBACC-CF (2009)* |
|  | *CEO endorsement template* |
| *B* | *UNDP-related Documents*  |
| *1* | *Country Programme Action Plan (CPAP) 2006 - 2010* |
| *2* | *United Nations Development Assistance Framework for the People’s Republic of Bangladesh 2006-2010* |
|  |  |
| *C* | *Government Documents*  |
| *1* | *National Adaptation Progamme of Action Plan (NAPA)*  |
| *2* | *Bangladesh Climate Change Strategy and Action Plan 2009* |
|  |  |
| *D* | *UNDP/GEF Guidance Documents*  |
| *1* | *The Evaluation Policy of UNDP*  |
| *2* |  *UPDATED RESULTS-BASED MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK FOR THE LEAST DEVELOPED COUNTRIES FUND (LDCF) AND THE SPECIAL CLIMATE CHANGE FUND (SCCF) AND ADAPTATION MONITORING AND ASSESSMENT TOOL* |
| *3* | *GEF Tracking Tools for Strategic Objective 1 and Strategic Objective 2* |
|  | *GEF PROGRAMMING PAPER FOR FUNDING THE IMPLEMENTATION OF**NAPAS UNDER THE LDC TRUST FUND* |
|  |  |
| *E* | *Key Project Outputs*  |
| *1* | *Adaptation Management Plans, developed for Four Coastal Upazilas* |
| *2* | *Project Progress Reports (PIR 2010-13, Quarterly Progress Reports, ANNUAL Progress reports)* |
| *3* | *Project Inception Report, Community Risk and Training Need Assessment Report, Participatory Climate Vulnerability Assessment Reports of all Project Sites, Status Reports on Training Workshops, conducted in Four Coastal Districts and Four Coastal Upazilas* |
| *4* | *Minutes of Project Board Meetings*  |
| *5* | *Minutes of Project Steering Committee Meetings*  |
| *6* | *Back to Office Reports / Field Monitoring Reports of UNDP staff* |
|  |  |
| *F* | *Audiovisual Productions* |
| *1* | *Arrowheads TV Production, Himalayan Meltdown, 2011* |
| *2* | *UNDP BGD Flip-Cam Production, Coastal Afforestation, 2010* |
|  |  |
| *G* | *Mid Term Evaluation Report (MTR)* |

Annex C: Evaluation Questions

*This is a generic list, to be further detailed with more specific questions by CO and UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based on the particulars of the project.*

| **Evaluative Criteria Questions** | **Indicators** | **Sources** | **Methodology** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Relevance: How does the project relate to the main objectives of the GEF focal area, and to the environment and development priorities at the local, regional and national levels?  |
|  | * Was the project consistent with the main objectives of GEF focal area and the national priorities outlined in NAPA 2005?
 |  |  |  |
|  | * Were the local adaptation management plans prepared through the project follows national priorities?
 |  |  |  |
|  | * Were the local adaptation management plans integrated into the local level annual development plans?
 |  |  |  |
| Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved? |
|  | * Were the targeted beneficiaries became resilient to climatic shocks and at what extent?
 |  |  |  |
|  | * Were the project interventions designed and implemented effectively to address local needs?
 |  |  |  |
|  | * How effective were the capacity building activities?
 |  |  |  |
| Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards? |
|  | * Does the project interventions ensure the best value for money?
 |  |  |  |
|  | * Does the project interventions benefited people who are extremely vulnerable to climate change affects in the project sites?
 |  |  |  |
|  | * Does the project sites represent the most vulnerable area criteria used by the project and whether that fits well with national vulnerability analysis?
 |  |  |  |
|  Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, social-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results? |
|  | * Are the interventions promoted by the project like FFF sustainable at long run and specifically without project support?
 |  |  |  |
|  | * How well the beneficiaries grasped the knowledge promoted by the project to ensure that they will act similarly while the project will not be there?
 |  |  |  |
|  | * To what extent, local and national institutions own the project?
 |  |  |  |
| **Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward, reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status?**  |
|  | * How functioning the coastal green belts created by the project are?
 |  |  |  |
|  | * Did the project reduced dependence of the coastal communities to natural resources through alternate livelihood support?
 |  |  |  |

Annex D: Rating Scales

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| ***Ratings for Outcomes, Effectiveness, Efficiency, M&E, I&E Execution*** | ***Sustainability ratings:***  | ***Relevance ratings*** |
| 6: Highly Satisfactory (HS): no shortcomings 5: Satisfactory (S): minor shortcomings4: Moderately Satisfactory (MS)3. Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): significant shortcomings2. Unsatisfactory (U): major problems1. Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): severe problems | 4. Likely (L): negligible risks to sustainability | 2. Relevant (R) |
| 3. Moderately Likely (ML):moderate risks | 1.. Not relevant (NR) |
| 2. Moderately Unlikely (MU): significant risks1. Unlikely (U): severe risks | ***Impact Ratings:***3. Significant (S)2. Minimal (M)1. Negligible (N) |
| *Additional ratings where relevant:*Not Applicable (N/A) Unable to Assess (U/A |

Annex E: Evaluation Consultant Code of Conduct and Agreement Form

**Evaluators:**

1. Must present information that is complete and fair in its assessment of strengths and weaknesses so that decisions or actions taken are well founded.
2. Must disclose the full set of evaluation findings along with information on their limitations and have this accessible to all affected by the evaluation with expressed legal rights to receive results.
3. Should protect the anonymity and confidentiality of individual informants. They should provide maximum notice, minimize demands on time, and respect people’s right not to engage. Evaluators must respect people’s right to provide information in confidence, and must ensure that sensitive information cannot be traced to its source. Evaluators are not expected to evaluate individuals, and must balance an evaluation of management functions with this general principle.
4. Sometimes uncover evidence of wrongdoing while conducting evaluations. Such cases must be reported discreetly to the appropriate investigative body. Evaluators should consult with other relevant oversight entities when there is any doubt about if and how issues should be reported.
5. Should be sensitive to beliefs, manners and customs and act with integrity and honesty in their relations with all stakeholders. In line with the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights, evaluators must be sensitive to and address issues of discrimination and gender equality. They should avoid offending the dignity and self-respect of those persons with whom they come in contact in the course of the evaluation. Knowing that evaluation might negatively affect the interests of some stakeholders, evaluators should conduct the evaluation and communicate its purpose and results in a way that clearly respects the stakeholders’ dignity and self-worth.
6. Are responsible for their performance and their product(s). They are responsible for the clear, accurate and fair written and/or oral presentation of study imitations, findings and recommendations.
7. Should reflect sound accounting procedures and be prudent in using the resources of the evaluation.

**Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form[[3]](#footnote-3)**

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

**Name of Consultant:** \_\_     \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**Name of Consultancy Organization** (where relevant)**:** \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**I confirm that I have received and understood and will abide by the United Nations Code of Conduct for Evaluation.**

Signed at *place* on *date*

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Annex F: Evaluation Report Outline[[4]](#footnote-4)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **i.** | Opening page:* Title of UNDP supported GEF financed project
* UNDP and GEF project ID#s.
* Evaluation time frame and date of evaluation report
* Region and countries included in the project
* GEF Operational Program/Strategic Program
* Implementing Partner and other project partners
* Evaluation team members
* Acknowledgements
 |
| **ii.** | Executive Summary* Project Summary Table
* Project Description (brief)
* Evaluation Rating Table
* Summary of conclusions, recommendations and lessons
 |
| **iii.** | Acronyms and Abbreviations(See: UNDP Editorial Manual[[5]](#footnote-5)) |
| **1.** | Introduction* Purpose of the evaluation
* Scope & Methodology
* Structure of the evaluation report
 |
| **2.** | Project description and development context* Project start and duration
* Problems that the project sought to address
* Immediate and development objectives of the project
* Baseline Indicators established
* Main stakeholders
* Expected Results
 |
| **3.** | Findings (In addition to a descriptive assessment, all criteria marked with (\*) must be rated[[6]](#footnote-6))  |
| **3.1** | Project Design / Formulation* Analysis of LFA/Results Framework (Project logic /strategy; Indicators)
* Assumptions and Risks
* Lessons from other relevant projects (e.g., same focal area) incorporated into project design
* Planned stakeholder participation
* Replication approach
* UNDP comparative advantage
* Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector
* Management arrangements
 |
| **3.2** | Project Implementation* Adaptive management (changes to the project design and project outputs during implementation)
* Partnership arrangements (with relevant stakeholders involved in the country/region)
* Feedback from M&E activities used for adaptive management
* Project Finance:
* Monitoring and evaluation: design at entry and implementation (\*)
* UNDP and Implementing Partner implementation / execution (\*) coordination, and operational issues
 |
| **3.3** | Project Results* Overall results (attainment of objectives) (\*)
* Relevance(\*)
* Effectiveness & Efficiency (\*)
* Country ownership
* Mainstreaming
* Sustainability (\*)
* Impact
 |
| **4.**  | Conclusions, Recommendations & Lessons* Corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project
* Actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the project
* Proposals for future directions underlining main objectives
* Best and worst practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance and success
 |
| **5.**  | Annexes* ToR
* Itinerary
* List of persons interviewed
* Summary of field visits
* List of documents reviewed
* Evaluation Question Matrix
* Questionnaire used and summary of results
* Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form
 |

Annex G: Evaluation Report Clearance Form

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

Evaluation Report Reviewed and Cleared by

UNDP Country Office

Name: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

UNDP GEF RTA

Name: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

1. For additional information on methods, see the [Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results](http://www.undp.org/evaluation/handbook), Chapter 7, pg. 163 [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. A useful tool for gauging progress to impact is the Review of Outcomes to Impacts (ROtI) method developed by the GEF Evaluation Office:  [ROTI Handbook 2009](http://www.thegef.org/gef/sites/thegef.org/files/documents/M2_ROtI%20Handbook.pdf) [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. The Report length should not exceed *40* pages in total (not including annexes). [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. UNDP Style Manual, Office of Communications, Partnerships Bureau, updated November 2008 [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. Using a six-point rating scale: 6: Highly Satisfactory, 5: Satisfactory, 4: Marginally Satisfactory, 3: Marginally Unsatisfactory, 2: Unsatisfactory and 1: Highly Unsatisfactory, see section 3.5, page 37 for ratings explanations. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)