TERMS OF REFERENCE

**FOR THE TERMINAL EVALUATION OF THE GEF SCCF PROJECT**

**Adaptation to Climate Change in the Nile Delta through Integrated Coastal Zone Management Project in Egypt (ACCNDP)**

**PURPOSE:**

In accordance with applicable policies for UNDP/GEF projects, all GEF-funded projects implemented by UNDP are subjected to a mid-term and a Terminal independent evaluation. The purpose for this independent Terminal Evaluation (TE) is to undertake at the end of the last year of implementation an evaluation will determine whether the project has achieved its intended outcomes. The TE will focus on the effectiveness, efficiency and timeliness of project implementation; will highlight issues requiring actions for implementation of similar programmes; and will present the lessons learned about project design, implementation and management. Findings of this TE will be incorporated as recommendations for enhanced implementation of similar projects. The evaluation is to be undertaken in accordance with the “GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy” (see <http://www.thegef.org/gef/sites/thegef.org/files/documents/ME_Policy_2010.pdf> and in accordance to UND ethical code of conduct, Annex 1

**Project Description**

The dominant feature of Egypt’s Northern Coastal Zone is the low lying delta of the River Nile, with its large cities, industry, agriculture and tourism. The Delta and the narrow valley of the Nile comprise 5.5% of the total area of Egypt but over 95% of its people of which 25% live in the Low Elevation Coastal Zone (LECZ) areas. Due to the concentration of much of Egypt’s infrastructure and development along the low coastal lands and the reliance on the Nile delta for prime agricultural land, coastal inundation or saline intrusion caused by anthropogenic climate change induced sea-level rise will have a direct and critical impact on Egypt’s entire economy. In addition to the current trends, Egypt’s Mediterranean coast and the Nile Delta have been identified as highly vulnerable to climate change induced Sea Level Rise (SLR). The GEF/SCCF project (ACCNDP) aimed to integrate the management of SLR risks into the development of Egypt’s Low Elevation Coastal Zone (LECZ) in the Nile Delta by strengthening the regulatory framework and institutional capacity to improve resilience of coastal settlements and development infrastructure, implement innovative and environmentally friendly measures that facilitate/promote adaptation in the Nile Delta, and establish a monitoring and assessment framework and knowledge management systems on adaptation

**Evaluation Audience**

This TE of the UNDP/SCCF/GEF Project is initiated by UNDP as the GEF Implementing Agency. It aims to determine the achievement of the intended outcomes. It aims to provide the Egyptian Implementing Agency, The Ministry of Water Resources and Irrigation, UNDP-Egypt Country Office and UNDP-GEF at all levels with strategy and policy options learnt for replicating and upscaling the results.

The TE will also highlight lessons learned about project design, implementation and management.

**Evaluation objectives and scope**

The overall purpose of the evaluation is to measure the effectiveness and efficiency of project activities in relation to the stated objective, identify lessons learnt and to produce possible recommendations on how to expand and upscale the best climate change adaptation practices. The TE serves as an agent of change and plays a critical role in supporting future climate change adaptation programming in the country. Its main objectives are:

* To document the lessons learnt on project management and monitoring functions of the climate change adaptation projects;
* To document the lessons learnt for enhancing accountability for the achievement of the climate change adaptation objectives;
* To enhance organizational and development learning;
* To enable informed decision-making for future climate change adaptation programming;

Particular emphasis should be put on the current project results and the extent of achieving all the outcomes in the given timeframe, taking into consideration the speed, at which the project is implemented. More specifically, the evaluation should assess:

1. **Project design and its relevance** The evaluator will assess the project design. S/he should review the problem addressed by the project and the project strategy, encompassing an assessment of the appropriateness of the objectives, outcomes, outputs, planned activities and inputs as compared to cost-effective alternatives. in relation to:

a) Development priorities at the national level;

b) Stakeholders – assess if the specific needs were met;

c) Country ownership / drivenness – participation and commitments of government, states, local authorities, and communities;

d) UNDP mission to promote assisting the country to build its capacities in the focal area of adaptation to climate change;

e) Meeting the SCCF adaptation guidelines: Demonstrating increases in adaptive capacity and resilience for climate change;

1. **Project outcomes, outputs and indicators**

The evaluation will assess the outcomes, outputs, and indicators achieved by the project as well as the likely inroads to sustainability of project results. This should encompass the following:

Attainment of objectives and planned results:

* Evaluate how, and to what extent, the stated project objectives are being achieved; taking into account the “achievement indicators”. In addition, the team will assess the indicators matrix as to its utility for determining sustainability and replicability impact.
* Assess the level to which the project has followed guidelines of the SCCF Strategic Priority on Adaptation and recommend ways to further strengthen this linkage.

Achievement of outputs and activities:

* Assess the scope, quality and usefulness of the project outputs produced so far in relation to its expected results.
* Assess the feasibility and effectiveness of the work plan in implementing the components of the project.
* Assess the quality, appropriateness and timeliness of the project with regard to:
  + Satisfying the following GEF objectives;
  + Delivering global environmental benefits; and
  + Achieving financial and environmental sustainability for the project intervention.

1. **Management arrangements** focused on project implementation:
2. General implementation and management: evaluate the adequacy of the project, implementation structure, including the effectiveness of the Project Board, partnership strategy and stakeholder involvement from the aspect of compliance to UNDP/GEF requirements and also from the perspective of “good practice model” that could be used for replication;

Financial accountability and efficiency - assess efficiency against the so far achieved results, including an assessment of the National Implementation Modality and the cost effectiveness of the utilization of SCCF resources and actual UNDP co-financing for the achievement of project results; Assess the contribution of in-kind co-financing to project implementation and to what extend the project has been able to leverage additional funding so far.

1. Monitoring and evaluation on project level: assess the adoption of the monitoring and evaluation system during the project implementation, focusing to relevance of the performance indicators, that are Specific; Measurable; Achievable and Attributable; Relevant and Realistic and time bound (SMART indicators)
2. Assess to what extend the recommendations of the midterm review has been taken into consideration
3. **Timeframe:** Assess the time taken for implementing the project’s activities; Considering the difficulties faced project that delayed its implementation.
4. **Overall success** of the project with regard to the following criteria:
5. *Sustainability* - assessment of the prospects for benefits/activities continuing after the end of the project,
6. *Changes:* Assess any changes that may have resulted from the project implementation and its impact.
7. *Contribution to capacity development* - extent to which the project has empowered target groups and have made possible for the government and local institutions to use the positive experiences; ownership of projects’ results;
8. *Replication* – analysis of replication potential of the project positive results in country and in the region,
9. *Synergies:* with other similar projects, funded by the government or other donors.

In addition to a descriptive assessment, all criteria should be rated using the following divisions: Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S), Marginally Satisfactory (MS), and Unsatisfactory (US) with an explanation of the rating.

**Issues of special consideration**

The Evaluation Report will present the experience and recommendations for the benefit of design and implementation of other climate change adaptation projects. Especially, the aspects of developing soft engineering solutions to complement hard structures for protection of low lying lands in the Nile Delta Coastal Zone including assessment of acceptance of the solutions, professional capacity built on design and implementation, rationale and performance for the piloted system, usefulness of ICZM planning as a tool for climate change adaptation of coastal zones, national observation system, shall be assessed

The Evaluation Report will present recommendations and lessons of broader applicability for follow-up and future support of UNDP and/or the Government, highlighting the best and worst practices in addressing issues relating to the evaluation scope.

1. **Evaluation methodology**

An outline of an evaluation approach is provided below; however it should be made clear that the evaluator is responsible for revising the approach as necessary. Any changes should be in-line with international criteria and professional norms and standards (as adopted by the UN Evaluation Group –, <http://www.uneval.org/document/detail/21>. They must be also cleared by UNDP before being applied by the evaluation team.

The evaluation must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful. It must be easily understood by project partners and applicable to the remaining period of project duration.

The evaluation should provide as much gender disaggregated data as possible.

The Evaluator will take place mainly in the field. The evaluation team is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with the UNDP Country Office, Shore Protection Authority and National Water Research Center, Egyptian Environmental Affairs Agency and other key stakeholders.

The Evaluator is expected to consult all relevant sources of information, such as the project document, project reports – incl. Annual Reports (PIRs), project budget revision, progress reports, project files, national strategic and legal documents, and any other material that the team may consider useful for evidence based assessment.

The Evaluator is expected to use interviews as a means of collecting data on the relevance, performance and success of the project. The evaluation team is also expected to visit the project sites.

The methodology to be used by the evaluation team should be presented in the report in detail. It shall include information on:

* Documentation reviewed;
* Interviews;
* Field visits;
* Questionnaires;
* Participatory techniques and other approaches for the gathering and analysis of data.

Although the evaluator should feel free to discuss with the authorities concerned, all matters relevant to its assignment, it is not authorized to make any commitment or statement on behalf of UNDP, GEF, SCCF or the project management.

The Evaluator should reflect sound accounting procedures and be prudent in using the resources of the evaluation.

1. **DeliverableS**

The output of the mission will be the Evaluation Report in English. The length of the Report should not exceed 30 pages in total (not including the annexes).

Initial draft of the Evaluation Report will be circulated for comments to UNDP (both CO and Istanbul Regional Office), Ministry of Water Resources and Irrigation and the Project Manager. After incorporation of comments, the Evaluation Report will be finalized.

The Evaluation Report template following the GEF requirements is attached in [Annex 2](#Annex1) of this TOR.

1. **Timing and duration**

The evaluation will be conducted by one evaluator. The man-days of the evaluation will be 18 days, to start mid-October 2017 according to the following plan:

(i) 4 days preparation and pre-reading (ii) 7 working days on the mission, including travel (iii) 5 days report writing (iv) 2 day to amend and revise report

(Home based desk review (4 working days):

* Collection of and acquaintance with the project document and other relevant materials with information about the project;
* Familiarization with relevant coastal protection framework and climate change impacts in Egypt;
* Design the detailed evaluation scope and methodology (including the methods for data collection and analysis);
* Reading PIRs and other project relevant reports
* Set up the mission dates and detailed mission programme preparation in cooperation with the Project manager and UNDP CO. The Project manager will organize the schedule of the mission and will arrange transportation for the consultant; will arrange for translation/interpretation when necessary
* Communication with the project staff to clarify matters

1. Mission to Egypt (7 working days)

* Briefing with the PMU
* Visits to project sites
* Meeting with the National Project Manager, Project Board members and stakeholder groups
* Presentation of main findings to UNDP and project management on the final day of the field visit.

1. Elaboration of the draft report -home based:

* Additional desk review

1. The write of the Report (5+2 working days).

* Completing of the draft report
* Sharing the draft report for comments and suggestions
* Additional information and further clarification with UNDP, project management and Project staff
* Incorporation of comments and additional findings into the draft report
* Finalization of the report

The draft Evaluation report shall be submitted to UNDP for review within **15 working days after the mission**. UNDP and the stakeholders will submit comments and suggestions within **15 working days** after receiving the draft.

1. **Required qualification**

* University degree in civil/coastal engineering, or environment related issues;
* Recent experience with result-based management evaluation methodologies;
* Recent experience in evaluation of international donor driven projects;
* Recognized expertise in the field of climate change adaptation issues.
* Work experience in the above relevant areas for at least 8 years;
* Conceptual thinking and analytical skills;
* Project evaluation experiences within United Nations system will be considered an asset;
* Excellent English communication skills;
* Computer literacy;

The Evaluator must be independent from both the policy-making process and the delivery and management of assistance. Therefore applications will not be considered from evaluators who have had any direct involvement with the design or implementation of the project, or have conflict of interest with project related activities. This may apply equally to evaluators who are associated with organizations, or entities that are, or have been, involved in the delivery of the project. Any previous association with the project, the Executing of national implementing Agency or other partners/stakeholders must be disclosed in the application. This applies equally to firms submitting proposals as it does to individual evaluators.

If selected, failure to make the above disclosures will be considered as grounds for immediate contract termination, without recompense. In such circumstances, all notes, reports and other documentation produced by the evaluator will be retained by UNDP.

**Application process**

Applicants are requested to send in electronic versions:

Current and complete C.V. in English with indication of the e-mail and phone contact

Price offer indicating the total cost of the assignment (including the daily fee, per diem and travel costs)

to:

Ms Heba Helmy

Programme Assistant

UNDP Egypt

[heba.helmy@undp.org](mailto:mariam.kirollous@undp.org)

Due to the large number of applicants, UNDP regrets that it is unable to inform unsuccessful candidates about the outcome or status of the recruitment process.

**UNDP is an equal opportunity employer and all qualified candidates are encouraged to apply.**

**10 Annexes**

[Annex](#Annex2) 1 Ethical Code of Conduct for UNDP Evaluations

[Annex 2](#Annex1) Evaluation Report: Sample Outline – Minimum GEF Requirements

[Annex 2b](#Annex1b) Explanation on Terminology Provided in the GEF Guidelines to Terminal Evaluations

## Annex 1

## Ethical Code of Conduct for UNDP Evaluations

Evaluations of UNDP-supported activities need to be independent, impartial and rigorous. Each evaluation should clearly contribute to learning and accountability. Hence evaluators must have personal and professional integrity and be guided by propriety in the conduct o their business.

Evaluators:

Must present information that is complete and fair in its assessment of strengths and weaknesses so that decisions or actions taken are well founded

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.

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.

Evaluations sometimes uncover evidence of wrongdoing. 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.

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.

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 limitations, findings and recommendations.

Should reflect sound accounting procedures and be prudent in using the resources of the evaluation.

**Annex 2**

**EVALUATION REPORT: SAMPLE OUTLINE**

**Minimum GEF Requirements**

**Executive summary**

* Brief description of the project
* Context and purpose of the evaluation
* Main conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned

**Introduction**

* Project background
* Purpose of the evaluation
* Key issues addressed
* The outputs of the evaluation and how will they be used
* Methodology of the evaluation
* Structure of the evaluation

## The Project and its development context

* Project start and its duration
* Implementation status
* Problems that the project seek to address
* Immediate and development objectives of the project
* Main stakeholders
* Results expected
* An analysis of the situation with regard to the outcomes, the outputs and the partnership strategy;

**Findings**

**Project formulation**

* Implementation approach
* Analysis of Logical Framework Matrix- LFM (Project logic/strategy, indicators)
* Country ownership/Driveness
* Stakeholder participation
* Replication approach
* Cost-effectiveness
* UNDP comparative advantage
* Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector
* Management arrangements

**Implementation**

* Implementation approach
* LFM used during implementation as a management and M&E tool
* Effective partnership arrangements established for implementation
* Feedback from M&E activities used for adaptive management
* Financial planning
* Monitoring and evaluation
* Execution and implementation modalities
* Management by the UNDP country office
* Coordination and operation issues
* Identification and management of risks (adaptive management)

**Results**

* Attainment of objective
* Prospects of sustainability
* Contribution to upgrading skills of the national staff

**Conclusions and recommendations**

* Corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project
* Actions to strengthen or reinforce benefits from the project
* Proposals for future directions underlining main objectives
* Suggestions for strengthening ownership, management of potential risks

**Lessons learned**

* Good and bad practices and lessons learned in addressing issues relating to effectiveness, efficiency and relevance.

**Annexes**

* TOR
* Itinerary
* List of persons interviewed
* Summary of field visits
* List of documents reviewed
* Questionnaire used and summary of results

**Annex 2b**

**Explanation on Terminology Provided in the GEF Guidelines to Terminal Evaluations**

**Implementation Approach** includes an analysis of the project’s logical framework, adaptation to changing conditions (adaptive management), partnerships in implementation arrangements, changes in project design, and overall project management.

Some elements of an effective implementation approach may include:

* The logical framework used during implementation as a management and M&E tool
* Effective partnerships arrangements established for implementation of the project with relevant stakeholders involved in the country/region
* Lessons from other relevant projects (e.g., same focal area) incorporated into project implementation
* Feedback from M&E activities used for adaptive management.

**Country Ownership/Driveness** is the relevance of the project to national development and environmental agendas, recipient country commitment, and regional and international agreements where applicable. Project Concept has its origin within the national sectoral and development plans

Some elements of effective country ownership/driveness may include:

* Project Concept has its origin within the national sectoral and development plans
* Outcomes (or potential outcomes) from the project have been incorporated into the national sectoral and development plans
* Relevant country representatives (e.g., governmental official, civil society, etc.) are actively involved in project identification, planning and/or implementation
* The recipient government has maintained financial commitment to the project
* The government has approved policies and/or modified regulatory frameworksin line with the project’s objectives
* Project’s collaboration with industry associations

**Stakeholder Participation/Public Involvement** consists of three related and often overlapping processes: information dissemination, consultation, and “stakeholder” participation. Stakeholders are the individuals, groups, institutions, or other bodies thathave an interest orstake in the outcome of the GEF-financed project. The term also applies to those potentially adversely affected by a project.

Examples of effective public involvement include:

Information dissemination

* Implementation of appropriate outreach/public awareness campaigns

Consultation and stakeholder participation

* Consulting and making use of the skills, experiences and knowledge of NGOs, community and local groups, the private and public sectors, and academic institutions in the design, implementation, and evaluation of project activities

Stakeholder participation

* Project institutional networks well placed within the overall national or community organizational structures, for example, by building on the local decision making structures, incorporating local knowledge, and devolving project management responsibilities to the local organizations or communities as the project approaches closure
* Building partnerships among different project stakeholders
* Fulfillment of commitments to local stakeholders and stakeholders considered to be adequately involved.

**Sustainability** measures the extent to which benefits continue, within or outside the project domain, from a particular project or program after GEF assistance/external assistance has come to an end. Relevant factors to improve the sustainability of project outcomes include:

* Development and implementation of a sustainability strategy**.**
* Establishment of the financial and economic instruments and mechanisms to ensure the ongoing flow of benefits once the GEF assistance ends (from the public and private sectors, income generating activities, and market transformations to promote the project’s objectives).
* Development of suitable organizational arrangements by public and/or private sector**.**
* Development of policy and regulatory frameworks that further the project objectives**.**
* Incorporation of environmental and ecological factors affecting future flow of benefits.
* Development of appropriate institutional capacity (systems, structures, staff, expertise, etc.) **.**
* Identification and involvement of champions (i.e. individuals in government and civil society who can promote sustainability of project outcomes)**.**
* Achieving social sustainability, for example, by mainstreaming project activities into the economy or community production activities**.**
* Achieving stakeholders consensus regarding courses of action on project activities.

**Replication approach**, in the context of GEF projects, is defined as lessons and experiences coming out of the project that are replicated or scaled up in the design and implementation of other projects. Replication can have two aspects, replication proper (lessons and experiences are replicated in different geographic area) or scaling up (lessons and experiences are replicated within the same geographic area but funded by other sources). Examples of replication approaches include:

* Knowledge transfer (i.e., dissemination of lessons through project result documents, training workshops, information exchange, a national and regional forum, etc).
* Expansion of demonstration projects.
* Capacity building and training of individuals, and institutions to expand the project’s achievements in the country or other regions.
* Use of project-trained individuals, institutions or companies to replicate the project’s outcomes in other regions.

**Financial Planning** includes actual project cost by activity, financial management (including disbursement issues), and co-financing. If a financial audit has been conducted the major findings should be presented in the TE.

Effective financial plans include:

* Identification of potential sources of co-financing as well as leveraged and associated financing*[[1]](#footnote-1)*.
* Strong financial controls, including reporting, and planning that allow the project management to make informed decisions regarding the budget at any time, allows for a proper and timely flow of funds, and for the payment of satisfactory project deliverables
* Due diligence due diligence in the management of funds and financial audits.

*Co financing includes:* Grants, Loans/Concessional (compared to market rate), Credits, Equity investments, In-kind support, other contributions mobilized for the project from other multilateral agencies, bilateral development cooperation agencies, NGOs, the private sector and beneficiaries. Please refer to Council documents on co-financing for definitions, such as GEF/C.20/6.

*Leveraged resources* are additional resources—beyond those committed to the project itself at the time of approval—that are mobilized later as a direct result of the project. Leveraged resources can be financial or in-kind and they may be from other donors, NGO’s, foundations, governments, communities or the private sector. Please briefly describe the resources the project has leveraged since inception and indicate how these resources are contributing to the project’s ultimate objective.

**Cost-effectiveness** assesses the achievement of the environmental and developmental objectives as well as the project’s outputs in relation to the inputs, costs, and implementing time. It also examines the project’s compliance with the application of the incremental cost concept. Cost-effective factors include:

* Compliance with the incremental cost criteria (e.g. GEF funds are used to finance a component of a project that would not have taken place without GEF funding.) and securing co-funding and associated funding.
* The project completed the planned activities and met or exceeded the expected outcomes in terms of achievement of Global Environmental and Development Objectives according to schedule, and as cost-effective as initially planned.
* The project used either a benchmark approach or a comparison approach (did not exceed the costs levels of similar projects in similar contexts)

**Monitoring & Evaluation**. Monitoring is the periodic oversight of a process, or the implementation of an activity, which seeks to establish the extent to which inputs, work schedules, other required actions and outputs are proceeding according to plan, so that timely action can be taken to correct the deficiencies detected. Evaluation is a process by which program inputs, activities and results are analyzed and judged explicitly against benchmarks or baseline conditions using performance indicators. This will allow project managers and planners to make decisions based on the evidence of information on the project implementation stage, performance indicators, level of funding still available, etc, building on the project’s logical framework.

Monitoring and Evaluation includes activities to measure the project’s achievements such as identification of performance indicators, measurement procedures, and determination of baseline conditions. Projects are required to implement plans for monitoring and evaluation with adequate funding and appropriate staff and include activities such as description of data sources and methods for data collection, collection of baseline data, and stakeholder participation. Given the long-term nature of many GEF projects, projects are also encouraged to include long-term monitoring plans that are sustainable after project completion.

1. Please refer to Council documents on co-financing for definitions, such as GEF/C.20/6. The following page presents a table to be used for reporting co-financing. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)