**Terminal Evaluation Terms of Reference**

INTRODUCTION

In accordance with UNDP and GEF M&E policies and procedures, all full and medium-sized UNDP supported 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 the**Strengthening climate information and early warning systems (SCIEWS) in Africa for climate resilient development and adaptation to climate change –** Uganda (PIMS 5094)

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

Project Summary Table

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Project Title: | **Strengthening climate information and early warning systems in Africa for climate resilient development and adaptation to climate change** | | | | | |
| GEF Project ID: | | 4993 |  | *at endorsement (Million US$)* | | *at completion (Million US$)* |
| UNDP Project ID: | | 5094 | GEF financing: | US $ 4,000,000 | |  |
| Country: | | UGANDA | IA/EA own: |  | |  |
| Region: | | EAST AFRICA | Government: | US$ 17,800,000 | |  |
| Focal Area: | | Climate Change Adaptation | Other: | US$ 1,960,000 | |  |
| FA Objectives, (OP/SP): | | Increase adaptive capacity to respond to the impact of climate change, including variability, at local, national, regional and global level | Total co-financing: UNDP | US$ 3,900,000 | |  |
| Executing Agency: | | Ministry of Water and Environment (MWE) | Total Project Cost: | US$ 27,664,000 | |  |
| Other Partners involved: | | Ministry of Agriculture, Ministry of Local Government, Office of the Prime Minster (OMP) | Project Doc Signature: 23 January 2014 | | |  |
| (Operational) Closing Date: | | Proposed:  December 2017 | Actual:  30 June 2018 |

Objective and Scope

The project was designed: “to strengthen the weather, climate and hydrological monitoring capabilities, early warning systems and available information for responding to extreme weather and planning adaptation to climate change in Uganda.”

It aimed to avail the country with the opportunity to better manage climate hazards, food security and agricultural production, scarce and dwindling water resources and make its socioeconomic development process less vulnerable to climate-related risks by:

1. *Enhancing the* ***capacity of hydro-meteorological services and networks*** *to monitor and predict weather and climate events and associated risks e.g. floods, droughts and severe storms;*
2. *Developing* ***effective and efficient ways of packaging weather and climate information****, including contextualising with other environmental and socio-economic data to produce early warnings/alerts and advisories; and*
3. *Supporting* ***improved and timely preparedness and response to weather and climate information and early warnings****, including efficient delivery mechanisms using radio and telecommunications networks*

As climate change unfolds globally, the frequency and intensity of climate related disasters is expected to increase. Uganda is one of the countries in Africa that has been considered vulnerable to the increasing frequency and severity of droughts, floods and severe storms (hail, thunder, lightning and violent winds), and their impacts on sectors such as agriculture, fisheries, as well as infrastructure. Such climate-related hazards are having increasingly adverse effects on the country and future climate change is likely to further exacerbate the situation. A large proportion of the Ugandan population has a low capacity to adapt to climate change. Climate change impacts are likely to be particularly negative on Uganda’s rural population because of their high dependence on rain-fed agriculture and natural resource-based livelihoods. Uganda’s capacity to adapt to climate-related hazards should therefore be developed to limit the negative impacts of climate change and effectively address the country’s socio-economic and developmental challenges.

These changes in climate and weather conditions required reliable and timely early warning information to enable planning at both the policy and end-user levels. It is for this reason that the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) in Uganda with funding from the Global Environment Facility (GEF) has since 2013 been supporting the Government of Uganda to improve on the infrastructure and systems for improving the weather, climate, disaster preparedness and disaster management in the country. The GoU/UNDP’s “Strengthening Climate Information and Early Warning System (SCIEWS) project in Uganda” has been implemented by the Ministry of Water and Environment’s Uganda National Meteorological Authority (UNMA) and the Department of Water Resource Management (DWRM), in collaboration with key responsible partners including: the Department of Relief, Disaster Preparedness and Management (DRDPM) in the Office of the Prime Minister (OPM); the Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industries and Fisheries (MAAIF), the Ministry of Local Governments; the Uganda Communications Commission (UCC), and the Ministry of Finance Planning and Economic Development as the Donor Coordinator. The project has been implemented across the country, with pilot testing of its results in 28 Districts from four sub-regions of Elgon, Karamoja, Teso and Lango mostly in Eastern Uganda.

During implementation, over ten consultancies were undertaken to inform project planning as well as to enrich systems development. A mid-term evaluation of the project was undertaken in 2016 and a Financial Audit in the first quarter of 2017.

The project has two main Outcomes:

**Outcome 1: Enhanced capacity of the DoM and DWRM to monitor and forecast extreme weather, hydrology and climate change.**

**Outcome 2: Efficient and effective use of hydro meteorological and environmental information for making early warnings and long-term development plans.**

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 main objective of the evaluation is 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 ([*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, the GEF Operational Focal Point, UNDP Country Office, Project Management Team, UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based in the region and key stakeholders. The evaluator is expected to conduct a field mission to UGANDA, including the following project sites and partners:

Gulu, Kitgum, Adjumani, Lira, Kotido, Arua, Nebbi, Pakwach, Mayuge, Jinja, Tororo, Sironko, Bulambuli, Soroti, Serere, Entebbe, Kampala, Lugazi(Sezibwa), Kabarole, Hoima, Masindi, Kisoro, Rakai, Mbarara, Kabale, Ntungamo, Kasese, Kamwenge, Bushenyi*.* Interviews will be held with the following organizations and individuals at a minimum: Staff of Uganda national Meteorological authority (UNMA), Directorate of water resources management (DWRM), Local Government staff at the Districts where the equipment were installed and sub-national activities undertaken, Staff of Civil aviation Authority(CAA), farmers and other beneficiaries of the Early warning information in the pilot Districts, The Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries(MAAIF), Ministry of Local Government, The GEF Focal Person in the Ministry of Finance Planning and Economic Development (MAAIF), The Uganda Communications Commission (UCC); Makerere University (WIMEA project), the private sector (Total Uganda, Mobile Telecom. Companies, SCOUL, FIT Uganda).

The evaluator will review all relevant institutional information, such as the project document, project reports – including Annual Performance Reports for the past four years, project budget revisions, midterm review, progress reports, and GEF focal area tracking tools, project files, national strategic and legal documents, reports of consultancies undertaken 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 on the criteria set out in the Project’s 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 / co-finance

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 also be assessed and explained. Report and recommended follow up actions from the recent Financial Audit exercises will also be evaluated. The evaluator(s) will receive assistance from the Country Office (CO) and Project Team to obtain financial data 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, climate action and gender.

Impact

The evaluators will assess the extent to which the project is achieving impacts or progressing towards the achievement of its goals. 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**. Conclusions should build on findings and be based in evidence. Recommendations should be prioritized, specific, relevant, and targeted, with suggested implementers of the recommendations. Lessons should have wider applicability to other initiatives across the region, the area of intervention, and for the future.

Implementation arrangements

The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation resides with the UNDP Uganda Country Office, with the support from the Project Management Unit. 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 team of Evaluators, to set up stakeholder interviews, arrange field visits, coordinate with the Government etc.

evaluation timeframe

The total duration of the evaluation will be 30 working days (within April-June 2018) according to the following plan:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Activity | Timing | Completion Date |
| Preparation/Inception | *4* days | By 5th April 2018 |
| Evaluation Mission | *14* days | By 30th April 2018 |
| Draft Evaluation Report | *10* days | By 15th May 2018 |
| Final Report | *2* days | By 30th May 2018 |

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. | Evaluator submits to UNDP CO |
| **Presentation** | Initial Findings | End of evaluation mission | To Project Management, UNDP CO |
| **Draft Final Report** | Full report, (per annexed template) with annexes | Within 3 weeks of the evaluation mission | Sent to CO, reviewed by RTA, PCU, GEF OFPs |
| **Final Report\*** | Revised report | Within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft | 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.*

Composition of the team of evaluators:

The evaluation team will comprise 1 international and 1 national consultants. The consultants shall have prior experience in evaluating similar projects. Experience with GEF financed projects is an advantage. The International Consultant will be the team leader and the national consultant will be the national counterpart to bring in the local content. The selected evaluators should not have participated in the project preparation and/or implementation and should not have conflict of interest with project related activities.

The International and Local Consultants must have the following qualifications:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| International | | National | Points |
| PhD or Master’s degree in: Natural Resources Management; or Development Studies; or Social Sciences; or related fields; Minimum 7 years of relevant professional experience | | Master’s degree in: Natural Resources Management; or Development Studies; or Social Sciences; or related fields; Minimum 5 years of relevant professional experience | 15 |
| Previous experience with results‐based assessment, monitoring and evaluation methodologies | | Previous experience with results‐based assessment, monitoring and evaluation methodologies | 25 |
| Technical knowledge in the targeted focal area(s); Familiarity with Climate and Early Warning systems, Disaster Risk management and response; | | Technical knowledge in the targeted focal area(s); Familiarity with Climate and Early Warning systems, Disaster Risk management and response; | 25 |
| Experience working in Africa | | Experience working in Uganda | 15 |
| Knowledge of UNDP and GEF, with understanding and experience of UNDP and UN evaluation frameworks. | | Knowledge of UNDP and GEF, with understanding and experience of UNDP and UN evaluation frameworks | 10 |
| Language: proficiency in both spoken and written English. | Language: proficiency in both spoken and written English, with fluency in one of the local languages. | | 10 |
| Total | | | **100** |

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 |
| *20%* | Upon presentation of an acceptable Inception Report |
| *40%* | Following submission and approval of the 1ST draft Terminal Evaluation Report |
| *40%* | 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 the 15th March 2018. Applicants are required to submit applications together with their CV for these positions, in English, stating the e‐mail and phone contact. Shortlisted candidates will be required to submit the price offer 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.

Annex A: **THE SCIEWS PROJECT’S RESULTS FRAMEWORK**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **This project will contribute to achieving the following Country Programme Outcome as defined in CPAP or CPD:** Natural and Energy resources are used and managed in a manner that is sustainable and contributing to growth and poverty reduction. | | | | | |
| **Country Programme Outcome Indicators:** i) number of institutions integrating environment, climate change and energy access in development plans (disaggregated by level i.e. national/ Local Government); ii) % of targeted Environment, natural resources management and Climate change adaptation/ mitigation pilot initiatives (innovative practices) implemented %; and iii) number of policies and strategies reviewed/ developed to draft stage. | | | | | |
| **Primary applicable Key Environment and Sustainable Development Key Result Area:** 3. Promote climate change adaptation | | | | | |
| **Applicable SOF (e.g. GEF) Strategic Objective and Program:**  Climate Change Adaptation Objective 2 **“**Increase adaptive capacity to respond to the impact of climate change, including variability, at local, national, regional and global level” | | | | | |
| **Applicable SOF (e.g. GEF) Expected Outcomes:**  Outcome 2.1: “Increased knowledge and understanding of climate variability and change-induced risks at country level and in targeted vulnerable areas; and  Outcome 2.2: “Strengthened adaptive capacity to reduce risks to climate-induced economic losses.” | | | | | |
| **Applicable SOF (e.g. GEF) Outcome Indicators:**   * Relevant risk information disseminated to stakeholders; * Type and scope of monitoring systems in place; and * % of population covered by climate change risk reduction measures. | | | | | |
|  | **Indicator** | **Baseline** | **Targets End of Project** | **Source of verification** | **Risks and Assumptions** |
| **Project**  **Objective**[[3]](#footnote-3)**:** To strengthen the weather, climate and hydrological monitoring capabilities, early warning systems and available information for responding to extreme weather and planning adaptation to climate change in Uganda. | 1: Capacity as per capacity assessment scorecard (see Annex 7).  2: Domestic finance committed to  DoM, DWRM  and other relevant institutions to monitor extreme weather and climate change. | 1; Average capacity scorecard rating of **77** across men and women (Annex 7).  2: Annual budget of  **US$1,500,000** and **$ 450,000**  allocated to  DoM and  DWRM  Respectively to monitor extreme weather and climate change. | 1: CCA capacity scorecard rating is increased to an average of**143** for both men and women (Annex 7).  **2: >20%** increase in domestic financing committed to DoM, DWRM and other  Relevant institutions to monitor extreme weather and climate change (including equipment operation and maintenance) | 1: Capacity assessment scores based on focus group interviews with climate monitoring and EWS-  related stakeholders; consultant reports.  1: Review of DoM and DWR manual budget. | Risk: Delayed implementation of  Baseline projects by the Government and donors negatively affects LDCF project outcomes.  Assumption: Baseline projects are implemented according to the timeline identified in the PPG phase of the LDCF project, and achieve the desired outcomes and objective.  Risk: Installed hydro meteorological equipment fails because it is vandalized or not maintained.  Assumption: Communities living  nearby installed hydro meteorological equipment commits to taking active measures to prevent the equipment from being vandalized; and the equipment is adequately maintained by the responsible institution.  Risk: Climate shocks occurring during the design and implementation phase of the LDCF project result in  disruptions to installed equipment |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |  | and severely affect communities, prior to the EWSs being established.  Assumption: Any climate shocks occurring whilst the EWSs are being established will not be so severe as to result in a relocation of the communities where the effectiveness of the EWSs will be tested.  Risk: Local information technology and telecommunications  Infrastructure restricts the transfer of data from installed equipment to necessary recipients, and restricts communication amongst key role players and end-users. Assumption: Information technologies and telecommunications systems implemented or used, where such suitable system already exist, through the LDCF project are best suited to the local context and do not restrict the transfer and communication of information.  Risk: Procurement and installation of hydro meteorological equipment, including hardware and software, is delayed because of  Complications with the release of funds and/or national procurement procedures.  Assumption: UNDP CO and HQ  Will co-ordinate with the IP to ensure effective administrative planning meaning the equipment is procured and installed in a timely manner. |
| **Outcome: 1** Enhanced  capacity of the  DoM(UNMA) and DWRM to  Monitor and forecast extreme weather, hydrology and climate change. | 1. % of national coverage of climate/weather and hydrological infrastructure. | 1. DoM 66– **10%** national coverage of operational manual (**9 %**) and automatic (**1%**) weather (synoptic, agro/hydro meteorological) stations (Annex 8).  1.DWRM**–**  **28%** national coverage of operational surface hydrometric stations (**24%**) and automatic weather stations (**4%**) (Annex 8)67. | 1. DoM68–**47%**  national coverage of operational manual (**26%**) and automatic (**33%**) weather (synoptic, agro-/hydro meteorological) stations 69 (Annex 8).  1.DWRM70 – **50%**  National coverage of operational surface hydrometric stations (**50%**) and automatic weather and water level stations (**19%**)71 (Annex 8).  Number and Type (operation stations)  Automatic weather | 1. Field inspection of AWS sites; review of climate monitoring database. | Risk: Delayed implementation of  Baseline projects by the Government and donors negatively affects LDCF project outcomes.  Assumption: Baseline projects are implemented according to the timeline identified in the PPG phase of the LDCF project, and achieve the desired outcomes and objective.  Risk: Installed hydro meteorological equipment fails because it is vandalized or not maintained.  Assumption: Communities living  nearby installed hydro meteorological equipment commits to taking active measures to prevent the equipment from being vandalized; and the equipment is adequately maintained by the responsible |
| **Outcome 2: Efficient and effective use of hydro-meteorological and environmental information for making early warnings and long-term development plans.** | 1. % of population with access to improved climate information and drought, flood and severe storm warnings (disaggregated by gender).   2. Sector-specific policies, annual budgets and development plans that integrate climate information (type and level of development plans). | 1.3% of men and 3% women with access to improved climate information and flood, drought and severe weather warnings (to be confirmed during project inception).  Male: 920,000  Female: 1,010,000 | 1. 12% of men and 12% women with access to improved climate information and flood, drought and severe weather warnings (to be confirmed during project inception).   Male: 3,300,000  Female: 3,700,000    2. Three (3) sector specific policies (including the National Policy for Disaster Preparedness and Management), investment plans and annual budgets and 10 District development plans. | Progress reports.  Reports from IPs and RPs.  Reports from consumers such as CAA.  Reports from LGs especially production officers | Women being marginalized in some communities not to attend social gatherings where such information could be disseminated.  Use of inappropriate tools to disseminate the climate weather information.  Failure by IPs to have the data made available in usable forms by local communities i.e. data not being well transcribed and translated. |

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

1. National Development Plan II;
2. Climate Change Policy and Disaster Preparedness and Management Bill;
3. The Uganda National Meteorological Authority Act 2012;
4. GEF Project Information Form (PIF)
5. CEO Endorsement request
6. The SCIEWS Uganda Project Document;
7. Project Inception Report
8. GEF Focal Area Tracking Tools at baseline, at mid-term, and at terminal points
9. Monitoring and Evaluation Framework of the project;
10. National and Sub-National Workshop Reports;
11. Consultancy Reports (including Household Baseline survey and Mid-Term Review);
12. Progress reports (Annual, GEF’s PIRs);
13. Minutes of Steering Committee meetings
14. Reports of Field Monitoring Visits;
15. Reports on South-South Cooperation Visits;
16. Audit Report

Annex C: Evaluation Questions

| **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? | | | | |
|  | * Why is the hydro-meteorological service relevant to the development of the country? |  |  |  |
|  | * Have the objectives of the project been aligned to the National Development Plan’s goal on climate change adaptation? |  |  |  |
|  | * Were the technology transfer targets met in terms of both outcomes and outputs? |  |  |  |
|  | * Were the early warning products demanded for and utilized as planned? |  |  |  |
|  | * How were products from the weather and climate early warning systems utilized both at the National and the sub-National levels |  |  |  |
| Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved? | | | | |
|  | * To what extent have project key objectives, goal and project specific outputs and outcomes been achieved? |  |  |  |
|  | * To what extent were the project financial resources available and appropriately utilized? Appraise the value for money in the utilization of resources? |  |  |  |
|  | * What relationships and partnerships were most effective in terms of delivering expected results? Specifically assess the strengths and weaknesses of direct and tangential partnership arrangements of the project with stakeholders in delivering project objectives? |  |  |  |
|  | * Assess the role of the project in contributing to gender concerns/equality and the empowerment of women? |  |  |  |
|  | * What is the level of awareness of the population about weather and climate being disseminated via the hydromet stations? |  |  |  |
|  | * What were the unintended consequences of this project? |  |  |  |
| Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards? | | | | |
|  | * To what extent did the funding, staff, time and other resources contribute to or hinder the achievement of the results. |  |  |  |
|  | * Was ‘Value for money’ achieved? |  |  |  |
|  | * What changes in the environment and Development Objectives have taken place during implementation and how were they managed? |  |  |  |
| Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, social-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results? | | | | |
|  | * What project sustainability measures were put in place and what factors are likely to affect project sustainability?  How well has the project used the information generated by the performance indicators during project implementation to adapt and improve the project? |  |  |  |
|  | * To what extent are capacities (technological, human, financial) built during the project likely to sustain operations of the hydro-met services in the country? |  |  |  |
|  | * How willing and able are the responsible partners to own the investments made through the early warning systems project? |  |  |  |
|  | * What are the indications that the project’s outcomes are being mainstreamed into the National as well as UNDP’s thematic priorities? |  |  |  |
| **Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward, reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status?** | | | | |
|  | * What are the evidences that the project’s outcomes are contributing to better preparation of the country to cope with natural disasters? |  |  |  |
|  | * Are there any changes in people’s lives intended or unintended to which project interventions can be shown to have contributed |  |  |  |

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 shortcomings  4: Moderately Satisfactory (MS)  3. Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): significant shortcomings  2. Unsatisfactory (U): major problems  1. 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 risks  1. 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[[4]](#footnote-4)**

**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[[5]](#footnote-5)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **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[[6]](#footnote-6)) |
| **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[[7]](#footnote-7)) |
| **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 * *Annexed in a separate file:* TE Audit Trail * *Annexed in a separate file:* Terminal GEF Tracking Tool (if applicable) |

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: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Annex H: TE Report audit trail

The following is a template for the evaluator to show how the received comments on the draft TE report have (or have not) been incorporated into the final TE report. This audit trail should be included as an annex in the final TE report.

**To the comments received on (*date*) from the Terminal Evaluation of (*project name*) (UNDP *PIMS #)***

*The following comments were provided in track changes to the draft Terminal Evaluation report; they are referenced by institution (“Author” column) and by comment number (“#” column):*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Author** | **#** | **Para No./ comment location** | **Comment/Feedback on the draft TE report** | **Evaluator response and actions taken** |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

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. A [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. The Report length should not exceed *40* pages in total (not including annexes). [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. UNDP Style Manual, Office of Communications, Partnerships Bureau, updated November 2008 [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. 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-7)