**ANNEX 1- TERMS OF REFERENCES (TOR)**

**Project Title:** UNDP/AF project “Developing Climate Resilient Flood and Flash Flood Management Practices to Protect Vulnerable Communities of Georgia “

**Location:** Home based with one mission to Georgia

**Type of Contract:** Individual Contract (IC)

**Position:** International Terminal Evaluator, Team Leader

**Starting Date: 5 December 2016**

**End Date:** **7 February 2017**

1. INTRODUCTION

In accordance with the UNDP and AF M&E policies and procedures, a Terminal Evaluation (TE) of the full-size project “Developing Climate Resilient Flood and Flash Flood Management Practices to Protect Vulnerable Communities of Georgia” is to be undertaken upon completion of implementation. The project started on 01.07.2012 and following no-cost extension, ends on 28.02.2017. This Terms of Reference (ToR) sets out the expectations for this TE. This ToR also sets out the scope of work, deliverables, timeframe and payment terms for International Evaluator, Team Leader.

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

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Project Title:** | **“Developing Climate Resilient Flood and Flash Flood Management Practices to**  **Protect Vulnerable Communities of Georgia”** | | | |
| UNDP Project ID: | 00076540 | Project financing | at endorsement (Million US$) | at TE (Million US$) |
| ATLAS Project ID: | 00060698 | AF financing: | US$ 4,900,000 |  |
| Country: | Georgia | IA/EA own: |  |  |
| Region: | South Caucasus and  Western CIS | Government: |  |  |
| Focal Area: | Tbilisi | Other (UNDP): | US$ 160,000 |  |
|  |  | Total co-financing: |  |  |
| Executing Agency: | Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources Protection of Georgia (MoENRP) through the National Environmental Agency (NEA) | Total Project Cost  in cash: | US$ 5,060,000 |  |
| Other  Partners involved: | Ministry of Infrastructure and regional development (MRDI);  Emergency Management Department;  Pilot municipalities. | Project Document Signature (date project began): | | 11 June 2012 |
|  | Planned closing date:  July 2016 | Revised closing date:  February 2017 |

1. PROJECT BACKGROUND AND OBJECTIVES

The project objective is to improve resilience of highly exposed regions of Georgia to hydro-meteorological threats that are increasing in frequency and intensity as a result of climate change The project will help the governments and the population of the target region of Rioni Basin to develop adaptive capacity and embark on climate resilient economic development.

The project is comprised of three main components:

1. Floodplain development policy introduced to incentivize long term resilience to flood/flash flood risks;
2. Climate resilient practices of flood management developed and implemented to reduce vulnerability of highly exposed communities;
3. Early warning system in place to improve preparedness and adaptive capacity of population.

3 outcomes contribute to this objectives:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Project Components** | **Expected Concrete Outputs** | **Expected Outcomes** |
| 1. Floodplain development policy introduced to improve long term resilience to flood / flash flood risks | 1.1. Hazard and inundation maps produced;  1.2. Reviewed and changed land use regulations (land use planning, including zonings and development controls, e.g. on protection / buffer zones, settlement expansion; economic development categories etc.) to internalize climate change risks into floodplain management and spatial planning.  1.3. New building codes reviewed and streamlined for the housing rehabilitation schemes to flood proof new buildings (e.g. material standards, traditional house raising etc.) taking into account alternative climate change scenarios;  1.4. Targeted training of national and local authorities responsible for climate risk management in advanced methods of forward looking climate risk management planning and flood prevention measures;  1.5. Community-based flood insurance scheme designed and implemented covering highly exposed villages under 6 municipalities. | Floodplain development policies in place to minimize exposure of highly vulnerable people of Rioni river basin to climate change induced flood risks. |
| 2. Climate resilient practices of flood management developed and implemented to reduce vulnerability of highly exposed communities | 2.1. Direct measures of long term flood prevention and risk mitigation designed with participation of local governments and population in 6 municipalities (Lentekhi, Oni, Ambrolauri, Tskaltubo, Samtredia, Tsageri);  2.2. Community-based adaptation measures, such as bank terracing, vegetative buffers, bundles and tree revetments implemented building on an existing municipal employment guarantee scheme;  2.3. Flood plain seasonal productive systems (e.g. short season annual cropping, cattle rearing plots or seasonal pastures, agro-forestry) benefit 200,000 people and improve resilience to flood threat;  2.4. Lessons learned and best practices documented and disseminated to raise awareness of effective climate risk management options for further up-scaling; | Direct investments and local actions in highly exposed and vulnerable communities improve flood management practice on 8,400km2 and build resilience of 200,000 people |
| 3. Early warning system in place to improve preparedness and adaptive capacity of population | 3.1. Long term historical observation data digitized and used in policy formulation and risk management practices;  3.2. Multi hazard risk assessment for the Rioni river basin (floods, flash floods, associated mudflows and landslides, linked with climatic alterations under alternative scenarios);  3.3. Series of targeted training delivered for the NEA staff and partner organizations in the advanced methods of climate change risk assessment and forecasting;  3.4. Essential equipment to increase monitoring and forecasting capabilities in the target basin procured and installed;  3.5. Systems established at the national and sub-national level led by the NEA for long and short term flood forecasting of hydrological risks; including dissemination and communication of forecasts. | Institutional Capacity developed for early warning and timely alert communication to vulnerable communities of the Rioni river basin |

1. TERMINAL EVALUATION APPROACH AND METHOD

The TE will be conducted according to the guidance, rules and procedures reflected in the ‘UNDP Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-supported, GEF-financed Projects’ (2012), henceforth referred to as ‘TE Guidance’.[[1]](#footnote-1) An overall approach and method for conducting project terminal evaluations of UNDP supported AF 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 TE Guidance. A set of questions covering each of these criteria will be provided to the selected evaluator. 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 AF operational focal point, UNDP Country Office, project team, UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based in the region and key stakeholders.

The objective of TE is to provide a comprehensive and systematic account of the performance of project results by assessing its project design, process of implementation, achievements against project objectives endorsed by the UNDP and AF including any agreed changes in the objectives during project implementation and any other results, and draw lessons learned that can both improve the sustainability of benefits from this project, and aid in the overall enhancement of UNDP programming. The project performance will be measured based on the indicators of the project’s logical framework **included in this ToR as Annex V**.

TE has three complementary purposes:

* To evaluate results and impacts, relevance, effectiveness and sustainability
* To suggest recommendations for replication of the project successes
* To document, provide feedback on and disseminate lessons learned

More specifically, the evaluation should assess:

Project concept and design

Assess the project concept and design. Review the problem addressed by the project and the project strategy, encompassing an assessment of the appropriateness of the objectives, planned outputs, activities and inputs as compared to cost-effective alternatives. The executing modality and managerial arrangements should also be judged. Assess the relevance of indicators and review the work plan, planned duration and budget of the project.

Implementation

The evaluation will assess the implementation of the project in terms of quality and timeliness of inputs and efficiency and effectiveness of activities carried out. Also, the effectiveness of management as well as the quality and timeliness of monitoring and backstopping by all parties to the project should be evaluated. In particular, the evaluation is to assess the Project team’s use of adaptive management in project implementation.

Project outputs, outcomes, impact and lessons learned

The evaluation will assess the outputs, outcomes and impact achieved by the project as well as the sustainability of project results. This should encompass an assessment of the achievement of the immediate objectives and the contribution to attaining the overall objective of the project. The evaluation should also assess the extent to which the implementation of the project has been inclusive of relevant stakeholders and to which it has been able to create collaboration between different partners. The evaluation will also examine if the project has had significant unexpected effects, whether of beneficial or detrimental character.

Ratings must be provided on the following performance criteria:

* Monitoring and Evaluation design at entry
* Monitoring and Evaluation Plan Implementation
* Overall quality of M&E
* Relevance
* Effectiveness
* Efficiency
* Overall Project Outcome Rating
* Quality of UNDP Implementation – Implementing Agency (IA)
* Quality of Execution - Executing Agency (EA)
* Overall quality of Implementation / Execution
* Sustainability of Financial resources
* Socio-political Sustainability
* Institutional framework and governance sustainability
* Environmental sustainability
* Overall likelihood of sustainability

The completed Required Ratings table (as found in the TE Guidance) must be included in the evaluation executive summary. The obligatory rating scales can be found in the TE Guidance.

1. OBJECTIVES OF TERMINAL EVALUATION

The TE must provide evidence based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The evaluation is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with Government Counterparts, including project six (6) target municipalities, UNDP Country Office, Project Team, UNDP-AF Regional Technical Adviser based in the region and key stakeholders.

Engagement of stakeholders is an important aspect of TE. Stakeholder involvement should include interviews with stakeholders who have project responsibilities, executing agencies, senior officials and task team/component leaders, key experts and consultants in the subject area, Project Board, project stakeholders, local government and CSOs, etc. Additionally, the TE should include field missions to Tbilisi and project sites in project six (6) target municipalities - Oni, Ambrolauri, Lentekhi, Tsageri, Tskaltubo and Samtredia.

Interviews will be held with the following organizations and individuals as a minimum:

1. UNDP Country Office management and relevant Programme staff
2. UNDP/AF project staff;
3. Executing agency (NEA)
4. National Project Director and relevant staff of MoENRP, MRDI and NEA
5. Project Board members and partners: Emergency Management Department, USAID project IWRM. MRDI; Target municipalities.

TE should include evaluation of all relevant sources of information, such as the project document, project reports – including Annual PPRs, AF Tracking Tools, project budget revisions, progress reports, project files, national strategic and legal documents, Mid-term Evaluation (MTE) report and any other materials that the team considers useful for this evidence-based evaluation. A list of documents that the project team and UNDP Country Office will provide for review is **included in this ToR in Annex II**.

The TE report shall be a separate document which will contain the recommendations and conclusions. Respective Report template is **included in this ToR as Annex III**.

The report will be intended to meet the needs of all the related parties (AF, UNDP, project partners, local communities and other related parties in Georgia and foreign countries).

1. DETAILED SCOPE OF THE TERMINAL EVALUATION

The TE will assess the following four categories of project progress. Each category is required to be rated overall progress using a six-point rating scale **outlined below and included in this ToR under Rating section**.

**i. Project Strategy**

Project design:

* Evaluate the problem addressed by the project and the underlying assumptions. Review the effect of any incorrect assumptions or changes to the context to achieving the project results as outlined in the Project Document.
* Evaluate the relevance of the project strategy and assess whether it provides the most effective route towards expected/intended results.
* Evaluate how the project addressed country priorities.
* Evaluate the extent to which relevant gender issues were raised in the project design.
* Evaluate if there are major areas of concern.

Results Framework/Logframe:

* Evaluate if the project’s objectives and outcomes or components are clear, practical, and feasible within its time frame.
* Examine if progress so far has led to catalyse beneficial development effects (i.e. income generation, gender equality and women’s empowerment, improved governance etc...) that should be included in the project results framework.
* Ensure broader development and gender aspects of the project are being monitored effectively.

**ii. Progress Towards Results and Impacts**

Progress Towards Outcomes Analysis:

* Evaluate the outputs and progress toward outcomes achieved so far and the contribution to attaining the overall objective of the project
* Examine whether progress so far has led to potentially adverse environmental and/or social impacts/risks that could threaten the sustainability of the project outcomes. Evaluate if these risks were managed, mitigated, minimized or offset.
* Evaluate the extent to which the implementation of the project has been inclusive of relevant stakeholders and to which it has been able to create collaboration between different partners, and how the different needs of male and female stakeholders has been considered. Identify opportunities for stronger substantive partnerships

**iii. Project Implementation and Adaptive Management**

Management Arrangements:

* Review and evaluate overall effectiveness of project management as outlined in the Project Document.
* Review and evaluate the quality of execution of the Executing Agency/Implementing Partner(s).
* Review and evaluate the quality of support provided by the AF Partner Agency (UNDP).

Work Planning:

* Review any delays in project start-up and implementation, identify the causes and examine if they have been resolved.
* Are work-planning processes results-based?
* Examine the use of the project’s results framework/logframe as a management tool and review any changes made to it since project start. Ensure any revisions meet UNDP-AF requirements and evaluate the impact of the revised approach on project management

Finance and co-finance:

* Consider the financial management of the project, with specific reference to the cost-effectiveness of interventions.
* Review and evaluate the changes to fund allocations as a result of budget revisions and assess the appropriateness and relevance of such revisions.
* Evaluate if project budget and duration were planned in cost effective way.
* Review and evaluate if the project had an appropriate financial controls, including reporting and planning, that allow management to make informed decisions regarding the budget and allow for timely flow of funds.
* Complete the co-financing monitoring table **included in this ToR in Annex II.**

Mainstreaming:

* UNDP supported 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 SDGs, poverty alleviation, improved governance, the prevention and recovery from natural disasters, and gender.

Project-level Monitoring and Evaluation Systems:

* Evaluate the monitoring tools currently being used: Do they provide the necessary information? Do they involve key partners? Do they use existing information? Are they efficient? Are they cost-effective? Are additional tools required?
* Ensure that the monitoring system, including performance indicators meet UNDP-AF minimum requirements. Develop SMART indicators as necessary.
* Examine the financial management of the project monitoring and evaluation budget. Are sufficient resources being allocated to monitoring and evaluation? Are these resources being allocated effectively?

Stakeholder Engagement:

* Project management: Has the project developed and leveraged the necessary and appropriate partnerships with direct and tangential stakeholders?
* Participation and country-driven processes: Do local and national government stakeholders support the objectives of the project? Do they continue to have an active role in project decision-making that supports efficient and effective project implementation?
* Participation and public awareness: To what extent has stakeholder involvement and public awareness contributed to the progress towards achievement of project objectives?

Reporting:

* Assess how adaptive management changes have been reported by the project management and shared with the Project Board.
* Assess how well the Project Team and partners undertake and fulfil AF reporting requirements (i.e. how have they addressed poorly-rated PPRs, if applicable)
* Assess how lessons derived from the adaptive management process have been documented, shared with key partners and internalized by partners.

Communications:

* Review and evaluate project communication with stakeholders. Does this communication with stakeholders contribute to their awareness of project outcomes and activities and investment in the sustainability of project results?
* Review and evaluate external project communication: Are proper means of communication established or being established to express the project progress and intended impact to the public (is there a web presence, for example? Or did the project implement appropriate outreach and public awareness campaigns?)
* Evaluate and summarize the project’s progress towards results in terms of contribution to sustainable development benefits, as well as global environmental benefits.

**iv. Sustainability, replication and scaling up**

* Validate whether the risks identified in the Project Document, PPRs, and the ATLAS Risk Management Module are the most important and whether the risk ratings applied are appropriate and up to date. If not, explain why. Describe the replication and scaling up potential of the project.
* In addition, assess the following risks to sustainability:

Financial risks to sustainability:

* What is the likelihood of financial and economic resources not being available once the AF assistance ends (consider potential resources can be from multiple sources, such as the public and private sectors, income generating activities, and other funding that will be adequate financial resources for sustaining project’s outcomes)?

Socio-economic risks to sustainability:

* Are there any social or political risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project outcomes? What is the risk that the level of stakeholder ownership (including ownership by governments and other key stakeholders) will be insufficient to allow for the project outcomes/benefits to be sustained? Do the various key stakeholders see that it is in their interest that the project benefits continue to flow? Is there sufficient public/stakeholder awareness in support of the long term objectives of the project? Are lessons learned being documented by the Project Team on a continual basis and shared/ transferred to appropriate parties who could learn from the project and potentially replicate and/or scale it in the future?

Institutional Framework and Governance risks to sustainability:

* Do the legal frameworks, policies, governance structures and processes pose risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project benefits? While assessing this parameter, also consider if the required systems/mechanisms for accountability, transparency, and technical knowledge transfer are in place.

Environmental risks to sustainability:

* Are there any environmental risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project outcomes?

**Conclusions, Lessons Learned & Recommendations**

The TE Report must include section setting out the TE’s evidence-based conclusions, in light of the findings. Recommendations should be succinct suggestions for critical intervention that are specific, measurable, achievable, and relevant. Recommendations should include aspects of enhanced sustainability, national ownership and exit strategy. Analysis of the lessons learned is an important part of the terminal evaluation report. The lessons learned section/annex should analyze the lessons learned and best practices generated by the project, including but not limited to project’s contribution to SDGs, gender equality, replication and scaling up potential.

**Rating**

The TE Report should include ratings of the project’s results and brief descriptions of the associated achievements in a TE Ratings & Achievement Summary Table in the Executive Summary of the TE report. Following rating scales should be used:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Ratings for Progress Towards Results: (one rating for each outcome and for the objective)** | | |
| 6 | Highly Satisfactory (HS) | The objective/outcome is achieved or exceeds all its end-of-project targets, without major shortcomings. The progress towards the objective/outcome can be presented as “good practice”. |
| 5 | Satisfactory (S) | The objective/outcome is achieved most of its end-of-project targets, with only minor shortcomings. |
| 4 | Moderately Satisfactory (MS) | The objective/outcome is achieved most of its end-of-project targets but with significant shortcomings. |
| 3 | Moderately Unsatisfactory (HU) | The objective/outcome is achieved of its end-of-project targets with major shortcomings. |
| 2 | Unsatisfactory (U) | The objective/outcome is not achieved of most of its end-of-project targets. |
| 1 | Highly Unsatisfactory (HU) | The objective/outcome has failed to achieve any of its end-of-project targets. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Ratings for Project Implementation & Adaptive Management: (one overall rating)** | | |
| 6 | Highly Satisfactory (HS) | Implementation of all three components – management arrangements, work planning, finance and co-finance, project-level monitoring and evaluation systems, stakeholder engagement, reporting, and communications – is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management. The project can be presented as “good practice”. |
| 5 | Satisfactory (S) | Implementation of most of the three components is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management except for only few shortcomings. |
| 4 | Moderately Satisfactory (MS) | Implementation of some of the three components is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management, with some components’ significant shortcomings. |
| 3 | Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU) | Implementation of some of the three components is not leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management, with most components’ shortcomings. |
| 2 | Unsatisfactory (U) | Implementation of most of the three components is not leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management. |
| 1 | Highly Unsatisfactory (HU) | Implementation of none of the three components is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Ratings for Sustainability: (one overall rating)** | | |
| 4 | Likely (L) | Negligible risks to sustainability, with key outcomes on track to be achieved by the project’s closure and expected to continue into the foreseeable future |
| 3 | Moderately Likely (ML) | Moderate risks, but expectations that at least some outcomes will be sustained due to the progress towards results on outcomes at the Midterm Evaluation |
| 2 | Moderately Unlikely (MU) | Significant risk that key outcomes will not carry on after project closure, although some outputs and activities should carry on |
| 1 | Unlikely (U) | Severe risks that project outcomes as well as key outputs will not be sustained |

Detailed methodology and work plan should be developed during the preparatory phase of the TE. The TE tools and techniques may include, but not limited to:

* Desk review;
* Interviews with major stakeholders, including UNDP/AF project implementing and executing agencies, government representatives, etc.
* Field visits to the project sites;
* Questionnaires;
* Participatory techniques and other approaches for gathering and analysis of data.

1. TEAM COMPOSITION FOR TERMINAL EVALUATION

TE Evaluation will be undertaken and led by one independent International Evaluator, Team Leader and will be assisted by the National Consultant, Team Member. The International Evaluator, Team Leader, will not have participated in the project preparation and/or implementation, and should not have conflict of interest with project related activities.

1. DUTIES, REQUIRED QUALIFICATION AND COMPETENCIES FOR TEAM LEADER

Duties and Responsibilities:

* Desk review of documents, development of draft methodology, detailed work plan and TE outline;
* Briefing with UNDP CO, agreement on the methodology, scope and outline of the TE report;
* Interviews with project implementing partner (executing agency), relevant Government, NGO and donor representatives, Project CTA and UNDP/AF Regional Technical Advisor;
* Field visit to the project pilot municipalities/project sites and interviews with respective local authority representatives;
* Debriefing with UNDP CO;
* Development and submission of the first TE report draft;
* Finalization and submission of the final TE report through incorporating suggestions received on the draft report;

Required Qualification and Competencies:

* A Master’s degree or equivalent in Natural Resource Management, Natural Sciences, Environmental Economics/Policy and/or other closely related field;
* Previous experience with result-based management evaluation methodologies;
* Experience applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios;
* Competence in adaptive management, as applied to conservation or natural resource management;
* Work experience in relevant technical areas for at least seven (7) years;
* Experience of working CIS region will be an asset;
* Project evaluation/review experiences within United Nations system will be an asset;
* Experience working with the AF and/or evaluations will be an asset;
* Excellent communication skills;
* Demonstrable analytical skills;
* Fluency in English both written and spoken and good technical writing skills.

1. TIMEFRAME FOR TERMINAL EVALUATION / TEAM LEADER

The total duration of the TE should be from 5 December 2016 to 7 February 2017. Determined evaluation period for Team Leader includes in total 25 work days, including one (1) mission with up to 9 travel days to Georgia. Timeframe should be according to the following plan:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Activity** | **Evaluation Timeframe and Number of Work Days for Team Leader** |
| Preparatory Phase | (5 - 11 December 2016 period) (3 work days) |
| Evaluation mission and debriefing | (12 - 23 December 2016 period) (7 work days with up to 9 Travel days) |
| Draft evaluation report | (24 December 2016 – 12 January 2017) (10 work days) |
| Finalisation of final report | (no later than 7 February 2017) (5 work days) |

1. **IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS**

The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation resides with the UNDP Country Office (UNDP CO) in Tbilisi, Georgia. The UNDP CO will contract the consultants and ensure the timely provision of travel costs and travel arrangements within the country for the evaluation team. The project team will be responsible for liaising with the evaluation team to set up stakeholder interviews, arrange field visits with missions to Tbilisi, Georgia including the following target municipalities in Rioni river basin: Oni, Ambrolauri, Tsageri, Lentekhi, Tskaltubo and Samtredia.

1. **TERMINAL EVALUATION DELIVERABLES FOR TEAM LEADER**

Team Leader will report to UNDP Energy and Environment Team Leader, Project RTA and Project Manager.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Deliverable | Content | Timing | Responsibilities |
| Inception Report | clarifies timing and method of evaluation | No later than 1 week before the evaluation mission | submits to UNDP Country Office |
| Presentation | Initial Findings | End of evaluation mission | To project management and UNDP Country Office |
| Draft Report | Full report (**template included in this ToR as Annex 3**) | Within 3 weeks of the evaluation mission | Sent to UNDP CO, reviewed by RTS, ICTA |
| Final Report | Revised report with audit trail detailing how all received comment have (and have not) been addressed in the final evaluation report). | Within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft | Sent to UNDP CO |

**Key Products Expected from the TE**

* Detailed methodology, work plan and outline;
* Terminal Evaluation Report, including Conclusions and Recommendations for a strategy for future replication of the project approach, as well as Lessons Learned;
* Description of best practices, and an “action list” in a certain area of particular importance for the project.

The Draft and Final Report should be prepared in the format as provided as a template **included in this ToR hereto**. **The draft report** will be presented to UNDP/AF not later than **12 January 2017**. **The final report** will be prepared on the basis of the comments to be obtained from the parties related. The deadline for the final report is **7 February 2017**. The report will be presented electronically and in hard copy, in English, and will be translated by the project into Georgian language for distribution to national counterparts.

1. **PAYMENT MODALITY FOR TEAM LEADER**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **%** | **Milestone** |
| 100% of travel costs (including living allowance, ticket cost and any other travel related transfer costs) | Upon arrival in Tbilisi, Georgia |
| 50% of consultation fee | Upon approval of 1st draft terminal evaluation report |
| 50% of consultation fee | Upon approval of final terminal evaluation report |

**Annex II**

**List of Documents**

1. Project Document
2. AF Project Performance Reports (PPRs) & AF Tracking Tool
3. Quarterly progress reports and work plans of the various implementation task teams
4. Audit reports
5. The Expert Reports
6. Mid-Term Evaluation Report
7. M & E Operational Guidelines, all monitoring reports prepared by the project; and
8. Financial and Administration guidelines.

The following documents will also be available:

1. Project operational guidelines, manuals and systems
2. Minutes of the Project Board Meetings
3. Maps
4. The AF Operations guidelines; and
5. UNDP Monitoring and Evaluation Frameworks

Other relevant project related documents will be provided upon need and request.

**Co-financing table**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Sources of Co-financing[[2]](#footnote-2) | Name of Co-financer | Type of Co-financing[[3]](#footnote-3) | Amount Confirmed at CEO endorsement / approval | Actual Amount Materialized at Midterm | Actual Amount Materialized at Closing |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | TOTAL |  |  |  |

Explain “Other Sources of Co-financing”:

**Annex III**

**Table of Contents for the Terminal Evaluation Report**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **i.** | **Opening page:**   * Title of UNDP supported AF financed project * UNDP and AF project ID#s. * Evaluation time frame and date of evaluation report * Region and countries included in the project * 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** |
| **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** |
| **3.1** | Progress toward Results and impact:   * Project Design * Progress * Impact |
| **3.2** | Adaptive Management:   * Work planning * Finance and co-finance * Monitoring systems * Risk management * Reporting |
| **3.3** | Management Arrangements:   * Overall project management * Quality of executive of Implementing Partners * Quality of support provided by UNDP  |  |  | | --- | --- | | **4.** | **Sustainability, replication and scaling up**  **5. 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 * Lessons learned | | **6.** | **Annexes**   * ToR * Itinerary * List of persons interviewed * Summary of field visits * List of documents reviewed * Questionnaire used and summary of results * Co-financing table | |

1. The guidance document for UNDP-supported GEF financed projects can be used for AF financed projects as well. The document is available via this [link](http://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=2&ved=0CCUQFjAB&url=http%3A%2F%2Fweb.undp.org%2Fevaluation%2Fdocuments%2Fguidance%2Fgef%2Fundp-gef-te-guide.pdf&ei=TR5JVZfCFYadgwTrvIH4Bw&usg=AFQjCNGsRhcXqiAAWwMGYKwml2H4hQ8d8Q&bvm=bv.92291466,d.eXY&cad=rja). [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Sources of Co-financing may include: Bilateral Aid Agency(ies), Foundation, GEF Agency, Local Government, National Government, Civil Society Organization, Other Multi-lateral Agency(ies), Private Sector, Other [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Type of Co-financing may include: Grant, Soft Loan, Hard Loan, Guarantee, In-Kind, Other [↑](#footnote-ref-3)