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| ***TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR THE TERMINAL EVALUATION OF THE STRENGTHENING THE RESILIENCE OF OUR ISLANDS AND OUR COMMUNITIES TO CLIMATE CHANGE IN THE COOK ISLANDS-SRIC-CC (PIMS 4569)*** |
| 1. **Introduction:**   This is the Terms of Reference (ToR) for the UNDP-AF Terminal evaluation (TE) of the full-sized project titled ***Strengthening the resilience of our islands and our communities to climate change in the Cook Islands*** (PIMS 4569) implemented through the Office of the Prime Minister (OPM) -Climate Change Coordination Unit, which is to be undertaken in quarter one of 2018.  Project Summary Table   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | Project Title: |  | | | | | | | AF Project ID: | | COK/MIE/Multi/2011/1/PD |  | *at endorsement (Million US$)* | | *at MTE (Million US$)* | | UNDP Project ID: | | 00079524 | AF financing: | 5,381,600 | | 5,381,600 | | Country: | | Cook Islands | IA/EA own: |  | |  | | Region: | | Asia Pacific | Government: |  | | 633,678.57 | | Focal Area: | | CCA | Other: |  | |  | | FA Objectives, (OP/SP): | | Multisector | Total co-financing: |  | | 633,678.57 | | Executing Agency: | | Office of the Prime Minister- Climate Change Division | Total Project Cost: | 5,381,600 | | 6,015,278.57 | | Other Partners involved: | |  | ProDoc Signature (date project began): | | | 1 May 2012 | | (Operational) Closing Date: | | Proposed: 1 May 2012 | Actual: 1 May 2018 | |
| 1. **Project Description or Context and Background:**   The objective of the programme is to strengthen the ability of all Cook Island communities, and the public service, to make informed decisions and manage anticipated climate change driven pressures (including extreme events) in a pro-active, integrated and strategic manner. In achieving this objective, the programme will support, at the national, sectoral, and island levels, implementation of the Cook Islands’ new National Adaptation Plan (NAP) for DRM and CCA.  The programme consists of the 4 components with specific outputs/ outcome as per following:  **Component 1. Strengthening and implementing climate change adaptation and disaster risk reduction at national level**   * Output 1.1 Staff of national agencies and organisations on the NCCCT trained and working in ways that improve coordination and delivery of CCA and DRM initiatives on the ground in the Pa Enua. * Output 1.2 National and sector policies, related instruments, and work programmes enhanced in ways that support CCA and DRM in the Pa Enua, consistent with island development plans. * Output 1.3 Fully operational climate early warning and information systems.   **Component 2. Strengthening capacities for climate change adaptation and disaster risk reduction in the Pa Enua**   * Output 2.1. Integrated climate change adaptation and disaster risk reduction action plans for each of the 11 inhabited Pa Enua, including harmonization with island development plans. * Output 2.2. In each of the 11 inhabited Pa Enua, island councils, administrators, technical officers, farmers, fishers, households and business owners trained in planning and undertaking integrated climate change adaptation and disaster risk reduction initiatives, consistent with the island development plans.   **Component 3. Implementing climate change adaptation and disaster risk reduction measures in the Pa Enua**   * Output 3.1. Small grants to the 11 Pa Enua and their communities, to implement CCA and DRR within the framework of integrated island- and community-level DRR and CCA action plans and the island strategic development plans. * Output 3.2. Climate-resilient agricultural and fisheries practices implemented in at least 5 Pa Enua, including Manihiki, Aitutaki, Mangaia, Atiu, and Mauke. * Output 3.3. Water capture, storage and groundwater management capacities are enhanced in at least 7 islands, including Pukapuka, Nassau, Mitiaro, Palmerston, Aitutaki, Atiu, Mangaia and Rarotonga, through community-based actions and infrastructure climate-proofing projects * Output 3.4. Coastal protection enhanced in at least 3 Pa Enua, including, Rakahanga, Aitutaki, and Palmerston. * Output 3.5. Resilience of tourism enterprises to climate change enhanced in at least 3 Pa Enua, including Manihiki, Aitutaki, and Atiu. * Output 3.6. Health support and vector-borne disease control techniques introduced in at least 5 Pa Enua to address climate-induced health risks, including Pukapuka, Mangaia, Mauke, Mitiaro and Palmerston.   **Component 4. Climate change adaptation knowledge management**   * Output 4.1 Lessons learned and best practices improve the effectiveness of initiatives to enhance the resilience of Pa Enua and other vulnerable communities. * Output 4.2 raining materials incorporating climate change issues developed and used for training of field staff, students and other key players.   The project is implemented, as Executing Agency, Climate change Coordination Unit and Emergency Management Cook Islands (Both in the Central Policy and Planning Unit), Office of the Prime Minister. The project has an active PMU that coordinate and implement the project activities with a Project Manager.  The TE will be conducted according to the guidance, rules and procedures established by UNDP and the AF.  The objectives of the evaluation are to assess the achievement of project results, and to draw lessons that can both improve the sustainability of benefits from this project, and aid in the overall enhancement of UNDP programming. |
| 1. **Scope of Work:**   The objective of this consultancy is to undertake the Terminal Evaluation of the Adaptation Fund project- Strengthening the resilience of our islands and our communities to climate change in the Cook Islands.  Evaluation approach and method  An overall approach and method[[1]](#footnote-1) 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 UNDP Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-supported, GEF-financed Projects. A set of questions covering each of these criteria have been drafted and are included with this TOR (*fill in [Annex C](#_TOR_Annex_C:)*) The evaluator is expected to amend, complete and submit this matrix as part of an evaluation inception report, and shall include it as an annex to the final report.  The evaluation must provide evidence‐based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The evaluator is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with government counterparts, in particular the AF/GEF operational focal point, UNDP Country Office, project team, UNDP AF/GEF Technical Adviser based in the region and key stakeholders. The evaluator is expected to conduct a field mission to Cook Islands including the following project sites *(Mangaia and Aitutaki).* Interviews will be held with the following organizations and individuals at a minimum:  **Rarotonga;**   1. Ms. Bredina Drollet – Chief of Staff, OPM 2. Mr. Wayne King, Director – Climate Change Cook Islands – all projects 3. Mr. Mia Teaurima SRIC-CC Programme Manager – all projects 4. Mr. William Tuivaga – (Former) SRIC-CC Programme Manager – all projects 5. Mrs Melina Tuiravakai – Project Business Development and Communications Coordinator 6. Mr. Otheniel Tangianau – Director Pa Enua Governance – Water projects and CSDP development projects 7. Mr. Mrs. Anne-Herman Fua - CSDP Development project 8. Ms. Ana Tiraa, Former Director Climate Change Cook Islands – all projects 9. Mr. Teariki Vakalalabure, CEO – Business Trade & Investment Board 10. Mr. Patrick Arioka, Policy Development Officer – Ministry of Agriculture 11. Ms. Celine Dyer, Climate Change Cook Islands – Training projects 12. Mr. Charles Carlson, Director – Emergency Management Cook Islands – Geo Portal Project, DRM Project and Teacher Learning Resource Kit Project. 13. Mr. Arona Ngari, Director Cook Islands Meteorological Services – CLEWS Project 14. Ms. Elizabeth Munro, Environment Officer – National Environment Services – P3D Project 15. Mrs Pua Ngamata – Hunter, Director ICT – Rauti Para Project 16. Dr. Teina Rongo, Former technical advisor to Climate Change Cook Islands (CCCI) – Coral monitoring project 17. Mrs Lavinia Tama – Rasmussen – DCD Manager, Finance of SRIC-CC. 18. Mrs Elizabeth Wright – Koteka – Former Chief of Staff for OPM   **Aitutaki Pa Enua**   1. All SRIC-CC projects - Aitutaki Island Mayor – Mr. Teupoo Bishop 2. All SRIC-CC projects - Aitutaki Island Executive Officer – Tuaine George 3. Protocol - Audience with the Aitutaki Island Council 4. Mr. Pepe – Agriculture Manager 5. Mrs Koi Bishop, Women’s Development Officer 6. Mrs Tapita 7. Tracey Spiers – Principal of Araura College, Rautipara Workshop 8. Mr Retire Puapii - Principal of Araura Primary School, Coastal Protection   **Mangaia Pa Enua**   1. All SRIC-CC projects - Mangaia Island Mayor – Mr. Tere Atariki 2. All SRIC-CC projects - Mangaia Island Executive Officer – Anthony Whyte 3. Protocol - Audience with the Mangaia Island Council 4. Mr. Makiroa Beniamina – Mangaia Youth Agriculture project 5. Ms. Rourumaru Papatua – Youth Project beneficiary 6. Ms. Desiree Harry– Youth Project beneficiary 7. Mrs Mamaiti Peraua, Mangaia Agriculture project 8. Mr. Steaven Atariki & Mr. Joseph Moeauri – Youth Project beneficiary 9. Mr. Aerenga Matapo – Tamarua Fishing Club project 10. Mr. Poroa Arokapiti – Mangaia Fishing Club 11. Honorable Tetangi Matapo (Mrs), - Member of Parliament for Tamarua Village – Tamarua Water Tanks Project 12. Mr. Daddy Mauriaiti – Village Elder – Ivirua Village – Ivirua Water Tanks Project 13. Mrs Doreen Atingakau – Tikuramarumaru Vainetini Project 14. Mrs Rurutaura Atingakau, Raurau Akamatutu Workshop Project 15. Mr Michael Papatua – P3D Model 16. Mrs Tuaine Tuara – Business Development Workshop   The evaluator will review all relevant sources of information, such as the project document, project reports – including Annual APR/PIR, project budget revisions, midterm review, progress reports, AF focal area tracking tools, project files, national strategic and legal documents, and any other materials that the evaluator considers useful for this evidence-based assessment. A list of documents that the project team will provide to the evaluator for review is included in [Annex B](#_TOR_Annex_B:) of this Terms of Reference.  Evaluation Criteria & Ratings  An assessment of project performance will be carried out, based against expectations set out in the Project Logical Framework/Results Framework (see [Annex A](#_TOR_Annex_A:)), which provides performance and impact indicators for project implementation along with their corresponding means of verification. The evaluation will at a minimum cover the criteria of: **relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact.** Ratings must be provided on the following performance criteria. The completed table must be included in the evaluation executive summary. The obligatory rating scales are included in  [Annex D](#_TOR_Annex_D:).   |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **Evaluation Ratings:** | | | | | **1. Monitoring and Evaluation** | ***rating*** | **2. IA& EA Execution** | ***rating*** | | M&E design at entry | 6 point scale | Quality of UNDP Implementation | 6 point scale | | M&E Plan Implementation | 6 point scale | Quality of Execution - Executing Agency | 6 point scale | | Overall quality of M&E | 6 point scale | Overall quality of Implementation / Execution | 6 point scale | | **3. Assessment of Outcomes** | **rating** | **4. Sustainability** | **rating** | | Relevance | 2 point scale | Financial resources: | 4 point scale | | Effectiveness | 6 point scale | Socio-political: | 4 point scale | | Efficiency | 6 point scale | Institutional framework and governance: | 4 point scale | | Overall Project Outcome Rating | 6 point scale | Environmental : | 4 point scale | |  |  | Overall likelihood of sustainability: | 4 point scale |   Project finance / cofinance  The Evaluation will assess the key financial aspects of the project, including the extent of co-financing planned and realized. Project cost and funding data will be required, including annual expenditures. Variances between planned and actual expenditures will need to be assessed and explained. Results from recent financial audits, as available, should be taken into consideration. The evaluator(s) will receive assistance from the Country Office (CO) and Project Team to obtain financial data in order to complete the co-financing table below, which will be included in the terminal evaluation report.   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | Co-financing  (type/source) | UNDP own financing (mill. US$) | | Government  (mill. US$) | | Partner Agency  (mill. US$) | | Total  (mill. US$) | | | Planned | Actual | Planned | Actual | Planned | Actual | Actual | Actual | | Grants |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | Loans/Concessions |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | * In-kind support |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | * Other |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | Totals |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |   Mainstreaming  UNDP supported AF financed projects are key components in UNDP country programming, as well as regional and global programmes. The evaluation will assess the extent to which the project was successfully mainstreamed with other UNDP priorities, including poverty alleviation, improved governance, the prevention and recovery from natural disasters, and gender.  Impact  The evaluators will assess the extent to which the project is achieving impacts or progressing towards the achievement of impacts. Key findings that should be brought out in the evaluations include whether the project has demonstrated: a) verifiable improvements in ecological status, b) verifiable reductions in stress on ecological systems, and/or c) demonstrated progress towards these impact achievements.[[2]](#footnote-2)  Conclusions, recommendations & lessons  The evaluation report must include a chapter providing a set of **conclusions**, **recommendations** and **lessons**. Conclusions should build on findings and be based on 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. |
| 1. **Expected Outcomes and Deliverables:**   The evaluation consultant 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. *(*12/02/2018*)* | Evaluator submits to UNDP CO | | **Presentation** | Initial Findings | End of evaluation mission  *(*23/03/2018*)* | To project management, UNDP CO | | **Draft Final Report** | Full report, (per annexed template) with annexes | Within 3 weeks of the evaluation mission *(*30/03/2018*)* | Sent to CO, reviewed by RTA, PCU, AF/GEF OFPs | | **Final Report\*** | Revised report | Within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft  *(*06/04/2018*)* | 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. (see **Annex H**) |
| 1. **Institutional Arrangement**:   The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation resides with the UNDP MCO in Samoa. The UNDP Samoa MCO will contract the evaluators and ensure the timely provision of per diems and travel arrangements within the country for the evaluator. The Project Team will be responsible for liaising with the Evaluators team to set up stakeholder interviews, arrange field visits, coordinate with the Government etc. |
| 1. **Duration of the Work**:   The total duration of the evaluation will be *30* days according to the following plan:   |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | **Activity** | Timing | Completion Date | | **Preparation** | *03* days | *1/02/2018 – 12/02/2018* | | **Evaluation Mission** | *15* days | *05/05/2018 - 23/03/2018* | | **Draft Evaluation Report** | *10* days | *15/03/2018 - 30/03/2018* | | **Final Report** | *02* days | *30/03/2018 - 5/04/2018* |   *\* The indicated max duration takes into account consultant’s initial desk review and quality check of the final report from UNDP MCO, as well as potential delays due to unforeseen circumstances, not included as deliverables in the table above* |
| 1. **Duty Station:**   Home-based with travel to Cook Islands. It is expected that the consultant will spend 15 (working) days on mission in Cook Islands. |
| 1. **Competencies:**  * Demonstrates commitment to the Gov. of Samoa mission, vision and values. * Displays cultural, gender, religion, race, nationality and age sensitivity and adaptability * Focuses on result for the client and responds positively to feedback * Consistently approaches work with energy and a positive, constructive attitude * Demonstrates openness to change and ability to manage complexities * Good inter-personal and teamwork skills, networking aptitude, ability to work in multicultural environment |
| * **Qualifications of the Successful Contractor**:   The evaluation team will be composed of *1 international evaluator.* The consultant shall have prior experience in evaluating similar projects. Experience with AF financed projects is an advantage. The evaluator selected should not have participated in the project preparation and/or implementation and should not have conflict of interest with project related activities.  The consultant must present the following qualifications:   * Masters Degree in Climate change related discipline, environment, disaster risk management, social sciences or closely related field. (15%) * Minimum *10* years of relevant professional experience working in climate change adaptation, disaster risk management and related fields; (20%) * Experience working with AF or GEF evaluations; (15%) * Demonstrated knowledge of UNDP and AF; (10%) * Previous experience with results‐based monitoring and evaluation methodologies; (15%) * Technical knowledge in the targeted focal area(s): Climate Change Adaptation, Disaster Risk Management and related fields; (10%) * Project evaluation experiences within United Nations system will be considered an asset; (15%)   **Evaluation criteria: 70% Technical, 30% financial combined weight:**  Technical Evaluation Criteria (based on the information provided in the CV and the relevant documents must be submitted as evidence to support possession of below required criteria):   * Masters Degree in Climate change related discipline, environment, disaster risk management, social sciences or closely related field. (15%) * Minimum *10* years of relevant professional experience working in climate change adaptation, disaster risk management and related fields; (20%) * Experience working with AF or GEF evaluations; (15%) * Demonstrated knowledge of UNDP and AF; (10%) * Previous experience with results‐based monitoring and evaluation methodologies; (15%) * Technical knowledge in the targeted focal area(s): Climate Change Adaptation, Disaster Risk Management and related fields; (10%) * Project evaluation experiences within United Nations system will be considered an asset; (15%) |
| 1. **Scope of Bid Price & Schedule of Payments**:  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | DELIVERABLES | DUE DATE (%) | AMOUNT IN USD TO BE PAID AFTER CERTIFICATION BY UNDP OF SATISFACTORY PERFORMANCE OF DELIVERABLES | | Upon submission and approval of the TE Inception Report | 12th February 2018 (10%) | $xxx | | Upon submission and approval of the 1st draft terminal evaluation report | 30th March 2018 (40%) | $xxx | | Upon submission and approval (UNDP-CO and UNDP RTA) of the final terminal evaluation report | 06th April 2018 (50%) | $xxx | | TOTAL | 100% | $xxx | |
| 1. **Recommended Presentation of Proposal**:   Given below is the recommended format for submitting your proposal. The following headings with the required details are important. Please use the template available (Letter of Offer to complete financial proposal)  CVs with a proposed methodology addressing the elements mentioned under deliverables must be submitted by **26th January 2018** electronically via email: [procurement.ws@undp.org](mailto:procurement.ws@undp.org). Incomplete applications will not be considered and only candidates for whom there is further interest will be contacted. Proposals must include:   * **CV** or P11 form addressing the evaluation criteria and why you consider yourself the most suitable for this assignment. The selected candidate must submit a signed P11 prior to contract award. * **3 professional references most recent** * **A brief methodology** on how you will approach and conduct the work, * **Financial Proposal** specifying the daily rate and other expenses, if any * **Letter of interest and availability specifying the available date to start and other details**   Queries about the consultancy can be directed to the UNDP Procurement Unit [procurement.ws@undp.org](mailto:procurement.ws@undp.org) |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **ANNEX A: Project Logical Framework**   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **Project Strategy** | **Indicator** | **Baseline** | **Achievement Rating** | **End of Project Target** | **Key Progress Achievement**  **at MTE level** | **Assumptions** | **MTE Comments** | | **Objective**  **To strengthen the ability of all Cook Island communities and the public service to make informed decisions and manage anticipated climate change driven pressures (including extreme events) in a pro-active, integrated and strategic manner** | Number of households in the Pa Enua and Rarotonga target villages (Ruaau and Akaoa) and the number of public officers dealing with Pa Enua sustainable development who have enhanced adaptive capacity to respond to climate-induced risks.  SMART. NO GENDER. Amendment: include gender disregarded data (number of women dealing with Pa Enua sustainable …) | Past climate change assessments and panning processes (principally attached to the National Communications process and a few projects) have raised awareness amongst community members and public officers on climate change, but responses are limited to a few projects and ad-hoc coping measures by communities. As a result communities lack adequate capacity to adapt to climate-induced impacts affecting food and water supply, coastal ecosystems, tourism and related livelihood activities. | MS | By the end of the programme at least 1600 households and 100 public officers in the Pa Enua have increased their adaptive capacity | **1.** Focal points have been appointed and fully assumed planning and coordination of SRIC CC activities on all 11 inhabited Pa Enua.  **2.** Water storage tanks were installed at 300 households, providing 6000 L additional water storage capacity per household (total 1.8 M litres) in 3 Pa Enua (Atiu , Aitutaki and Palmerston).  **3.** Community Sustainable Development Plans (Island level) with CCA and DRR aspects integrated have been have been completed for 8 Pa Enua (Penryhn, Pukapuka, Nassau, Rakahanga, Atiu, Mitiaro, Mauke and Palmerston). CSDP in Mangaia has been completed and also publicly launched. CSDP for Aitutaki is under development. | Availability of necessary expertise and experience to undertake activities required to integrate climate risk management in relevant policies and other instruments.  Still valid, and the risk remain moderate due to the limited (in term of available human resources) national expertise.  Political will and commitment by senior government officials to integrate climate risk management.  Low risk as political engagement was recorded to be present.  Strong coordination amongst climate change and disaster risk reduction stakeholders in country.  This assumption remains moderate as coordination is still being developed.  Strong community leadership and support for, and engagement in project activities in the Pa Enua.  Low risk as community leaders and members are showing high engagement in programme activities. | The programme is on‐track to meet its overall objective, but still at low risk to underperform in two components (1 and 1). Further to a slow start, the project is contributing in stimulating innovative approaches towards climate change adaptation for all Cook Islands, and in mainstreaming climate change adaptation into government priorities. | | **Outcome 1**  **Efficient and effective support at national level for disaster risk reduction and adaptation initiatives in the Pa Enua** | Number of national policies and related instruments enhanced in ways that support CCA and DRR.  SMART. Amendment: please change/ specify ‘enhanced’ i.e. including specific CCA and DRR.  Number of government staff with job descriptions that make reference to climate and disaster risk management and who have received relevant training.  SMART. | Relevant national policy instruments, coordination mechanisms and institutions do not address climate risks in an adequate manner  Climate and disaster risk management are seen as the sole responsibility of the National Environment Service and Emergency Management Cook Islands | MU | 1. At least four relevant national level policy instruments, and coordination mechanisms addressing have integrated climate risk management.  2. At least 75 government staff with responsibilities for sustainable development in the Pa Enua have job descriptions that make reference to climate and disaster risk management  Amendment: at least 50 government staff.  3. At least 100 government staff with responsibilities for sustainable development in the Pa Enua will have received formal training in climate and disaster risk management | **1. Preparatory assessments to the National CC-DRM Policy a systematic gap analysis has been carried out on 11 sectoral and related national policies, with the results captured in recommendation reports.**  **2. Over 40 officers of Island Administrations were involved in CSDP related trainings and consultations, 30 gov. staff received initial training on user aspects of a Teachers’ Resource Kit on CC and DRM launched, and round 30 health officers were involved in initial trainings related to the vector-borne disease control actions being rolled out in the Pa Enua**  **3. Implementation plan is developed for the sourcing and installation of Automated Weather Stations (AWS) and related info system. A web portal is under development to disseminate climate early warning information.** | Political will and commitment, and availability of necessary expertise and experience, to undertake activities required to integrate climate risk management in relevant policies and other instruments.  This assumption is still valid, and the risk is still moderate as national expertise is scarce.  Appropriate staff members are selected for training by their host agencies.  The MTE suggests identifying via interviews and discussion with senior government staff, core staff willing to be trained during the 2 years.  Very low staff turnover resulting in sustained capacity of government and partner institutions  This assumption is still valid, and it poses a moderate risk. | This outcome performance is moderately unsatisfactory, as the programme has mainly focused on outcome 3. This MTE strongly suggests focusing starting on Q1-2016 on CCA and DRR mainstreaming efforts for two selected national development policy (i.e. agriculture and infrastructure/water) .The MTE also suggests that selected technical standards/codes, policy and plans concerning agriculture, water and tourism to be reviewed, and ‘entry-points’ for policy development and for CCA and DRR mainstreaming of the climate change (CC) to be identified. The MTE also suggests identifying core government staff willing to be trained over the next two years (2016-17). | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Outcome 2**  **Key players in Pa Enua development have the capacity to reflect disaster risk management and adaptation considerations when planning, making decisions and during operations** | SRIC Focal Points for each inhabited Pa Enua appointed and funded.  SMART. NO GENDER. Please add No of women as focal points. | | There are no individuals in the Pa Enua who have formal responsibilities for, and oversight of, climate risk assessment and management in the context of sustainable island development. | | MU | By the end of year 1 of the programme SRIC Focal Points appointed and fully operational in 11 inhabited Pa Enua. | 1. Focal points have been appointed and fully assumed planning and coordination of SRIC CC activities on all 11 inhabited Pa Enua. | Suitably qualified personnel available in each inhabited Pa Enua.  This assumption is still valid, even though current focal points are motivated, and posess some key skills for agriculture and water  SRC Focal Points establish effective working relationships with island administrations, councils and community leaders.  The MTE suggests further training | This output activity is progressing moderately unsatisfactory. The MTE suggests further supporting the appointed focal points by regular training activities for M&E, and reporting. |
| Prepare integrated climate change adaptation and disaster risk reduction action plans for each of the 11 inhabited Pa Enua.  SMART. NO GENDER. Amendment. Please add ‘plans that include gender dimension’. | | No Pa Enua has a climate change adaptation and disaster risk reduction action plan or any other formal mechanism for addressing climate and disaster risks in a pro-active, integrated and strategic manner | |  | By the end of the 3rd year, integrated climate change adaptation and disaster risk reduction action plans approved for each of the 11 inhabited Pa Enua, and harmonized with island development plans.  Amendment: this target is very ambitious considering the current programme performance and logistical constrains. The MTE suggests adjusting the target to 7 Pa Enua. | 1.Community Sustainable Development Plans (Island level) with CCA and DRR aspects integrated have been have been completed for 8 Pa Enua (Penryhn, Pukapuka, Nassau, Rakahanga, Atiu, Mitiaro, Mauke and Palmerston). CSDP in Mangaia has been completed and also publicly launched. CSDP for Aitutaki is under development. | Political will and commitment to ensure plans are prepared in a fully participatory manner.  Considering the overall interest and attention to the programme objectives, this assumption poses a low risk.  Strong community leadership and support for, and engagement in project activities in the Pa Enua.  The community leadership is present, but requires constant support by the programme to guarantee further engagement in programme activities.  Availability of necessary expertise and experience to undertake activities required to prepare integrated climate change adaptation and disaster risk reduction action plans.  This assumption is still valid. The programme should consider hiring a short-term international expert to begin the action plan development. | The programme has not significantly advanced towards the achievement of this output. Considering the remaining programme timeframe, the MTE strongly suggests engaging a team of 1 national and 1 international consultant to develop the conceptual framework of 5 action plans during Q1-2016. This team should be focus on setting up the conceptual framework of document selection and revision at the provincial and national level for each action plan. The methodological approach to mainstreaming CC risks in the planning process should also be considered. |
| Island stakeholders and key players trained in climate and disaster risk assessment and their management  NO SMART. Amendment. Please specify the island stakeholders. For example: No of islands councils, island chiefs, religious leaders, teachers, farmer and fishing associations. NO GENDER. Please add No of women trained. | | Island stakeholders and key players have little practical understanding of climate and disaster risk assessment, and how this understanding can contribute to sustainable island development | | By the end of the 3rd year at least 500 island stakeholders and key players have been trained in climate and disaster risk assessment and management involving both men and women in an equitable manner. | | 1. A series of community meetings and presentations attached to the CSDP consultation and formulation process covering 10 Pa Enua (Penryhn, Pukapuka, Nassau, Rakahanga, Atiu, Mitiaro, Mauke Palmerston, Mangaia, Aitutaki and involving around 500 households. | Political will and commitment to ensure effective use of climate information, and undertake monitoring of climate impacts on terrestrial, marine, and coastal ecosystems.  This assumption remains very valid, particularly in terms of monitoring efforts. | This output activity is progressing unsatisfactory. The MTE strongly suggests designing a training program (consisting of 4-5 CCA and DRR modules) to be delivered for each Pa Enua during 2016 (4 days/ Pa Enua). |
|  | Number of successfully completed capacity building projects funded by the SRIC Small Grants Programme.  SMART. Amendment. Please specify what ‘successfully’ entails. For example, a minimum of 80% financial delivery rate, a minimum scoring of 80% vs. the projects indicators, interviews and questionnaire to determine the level of capacity acquired (built) towards CCA and DRR planning. | | It is exceedingly difficult for stakeholders in the Pa Enua to access the UNDP/GEF SGP; that programme no longer funds capacity building initiatives | | By the end of the 3rd year, at least 50 initiatives to build capacity in climate and disaster risk assessment and management are funded by the small grants programme, and are completed successfully, involving both men and women in an equitable manner.  Amendment: at least 40 initiatives. | | To date the SRIC CC Programme Management Unit has received 7 applications for support under the SGP, which are currently being evaluated. In the 2nd reporting year, 2 projects (valued at 25k each) are in implementation and 4 projects are ready for procurement. There are discussions between SRIC CC and GEF to merge SRIC CC & GEF SGP. This merger will bring more funding opportunities for the Pa Enua communities. | Efforts to build capacity for grant application and execution are successful.  This assumption should be further analysed in terms of support provided to applicants by the programme team.  The Steering Committee is independent of political and other influences.  This assumption is still valid, and requires further attention in terms of capacity building of the steering committee.  Strong community interest in, support for, and engagement in capacity building activities in the Pa Enua.  The MTE finds a general interests in these activities, therefore this assumption can be considered at low risk/influence. | The programme is satisfactory progressing towards the achievement of this output However, the assessment methodology to determine successful project application and implementation should further be developed based on CCA guidelines under the UNFCCCU and IPPC. The MTE strongly suggests strengthening the current M&E programme to provide further support to on-going project. Finally, the MTE also suggests further technical and management training for the steering committee members, supporting them in their decision-making role. |
| **Outcome 3**  ***Enhanced resilience to climate change, including weather- and climate-related disasters, for all 11 inhabited Pa Enua*** | Increase in the volume (Litres) of water storage capacity in communities affected by climate-induced water shortages.  SMART  Amendment: increase in storage (as measured in litre/person or household) during the dry season from a baseline pre-water tanks introduction. | | *The current estimated total water storage capacity in the 11 Pa Enua is about 7 M L.*  *The current open reservoir of 10 M L in Ruaau, and Akaoa (Rarotonga), is completely dysfunctional and needs to be repaired or replaced by another type of storage facility.*  *The infrastructure (e.g. pumps, pipes, guttering) supplying the storage facilities are in poor status reducing efficiency of supply, needing upgrade and maintenance, to satisfy demand and to face climate-induced disturbances in water supply.* | | *By the end of the programme the water storage capacity is increased by at least 14 M L in affected communities as a result of the water infrastructure adaptation projects implemented in at least 7 islands (Aitutaki, Atiu, Mangaia, Mitiaro, Palmerston, Pukapuka and Nassau and Rarotonga ).*  *Comment: this target should be carefully monitored and eventually reviewed during the Q1-Q2-2016, as 14 M L is ambitious given the current implementation rate and logistic constrains in delivering some of the equipment.* | | 1.Water storage tanks were installed at 300 households, providing 6000 L additional water storage capacity per household (total 1.8 M litres) in 3 Pa Enua (Atiu , Aitutaki and Palmerston).  2. A number of community-led and sector-coordinated concepts and proposal have been received at the PMU to address agricultural and marine related challenges in the Pa enua, which are being assessed and finalized. These initial proposals are expected to involve directly round 150 households in 7 Pa Enua.  3. A recent vulnerability assessment has indicated a particular Pa Enua (Penrhyn) that will require assistance to strengthen their coastal area as storm surge is affecting their road that is approximately 5 meters from the lagoon. PMU is engaged in discussions with the authors of the V&A to identify how this can be addressed. This refers to approximately 2 km of affected coastline for two village communities on Penrhyn. | *Strong island and community interest in, support for, and engagement in capacity building activities in the Pa Enua*  *Island and community interest remain high, and willing to receive various climate change adaptation trainings (planning, techniques, evaluating).*  Island councils and secretaries can identify the need for, and oversee implementation of interventions that address climate and disaster risks in a pro-active, integrated and strategic manner  Island councils and secretaries require more planning and V&A trainings to identify current and emerging CC risks and needs for their respective communities.  *Strong island and community interest in, support for, and engagement in the design and construction of* infrastructure that will not only enhance island and community resilience, but is designed with attention to future climate risks.  *Community interest remains moderate, but could increase to high if further technical support and targeted trainings regarding infrastructure construction are delivered by the programme*  Island councils and secretaries can oversee implementation of infrastructure projects that will enhance island and community resilience.  Island councils and secretaries are willing to perform such tasks, but require initial technical guidance and monitoring by the programme team. | The programme has significantly advanced in the overall achievement of this outcome. However, some activities (i.e. coastal protection, climate-resilient health and fisheries activities) still remain at the planning stage. The MTE also finds that the M&E system for each outcome activities should be reviewed and strengthened (i.e. increase in M&E frequency, data systematization, evaluation and adaptive management) as well as the subsequent communication channels to beneficiaries regarding the outcome activities progress. Finally, MTE finds that this outcome’s activities have been able to engage various stakeholders throughout the various stages of activities implementation, and the programme should capitalize more on such engagement to develop local CC adaptation plans and policies. |
|  | Km of coastline with climate resilient shoreline protection measures introduced  SMART  Amendment: Specify/add what climate resilient measures are e.g. Retention walls, plant (palm) planting, sandbags. | | *Currently coastal protection measures applied by communities are ad-hoc and piecemeal, limited to some vegetation planting along the shore, but lacking the capacity to introduce shoreline protection measures in a planned and systematic way* | | *By the completion of the programme climate resilient shoreline protection measures  are introduced in at least 20 Km of coastline in at least 3 islands (Aitutaki, Palmerston and Rakahanga)*  *Amendment: Ambitious target considering that coastal protection activities have not yet started. The MTE suggests revising to 15 km.* | |  |  |  |
|  | N.of households with enhanced  Capacity to reduce climate-induce disturbances in food supply through applying climate resilient agriculture and fisheries technique  SMART. Amendment: Specify/add what enhanced capacity refers to. e.g. management, planning, monitoring and evaluation capacity of food security trends. | | *Currently the estimated 920 households engaged principally in subsistence agriculture or fishing activities in the 5 islands are ill-prepared to adapt to climate change impacts. They lack the capacity to apply adequate land management, crop cultivation and fisheries techniques, and food storage methods, consequently being affected by climate-induced disturbances of food supply, such as droughts or cyclones* | | *By the end of the programme at least 750 households have increased capacity in applying climate resilient agriculture and fisheries practices in at least 5 islands (Aitutaki, Atiu, Manihiki, Mangaia and Mauke).*  *Achievable, considering the current implementation of agriculture activities in Mangaia As for the fisheries sector, the target should be revised at the end of Q1-2016 further to actual implemented fisheries activities in selected Pa Enua.* | |  |  |  |
|  | N.of households with access to enhanced health services and practices adapting to climate-induced health risks  SMART. Amendment: Specify/add what practices e.g. filter cleaning, water tank maintenance, water testing, beneficiaries interview (women vs. men), etc. | | *The total number of households in these 5 islands is 460. Current prevention activities are limited to occasional cleanup programmes (tutaka) to control areas of stagnant water, while there is inadequate capacity of health staff to diagnose and respond to climate-related illnesses.* | | *By the end of the programme at least 400 households have access to enhanced health services and practices in at least 5 islands (Mangaia, Mauke, Mitiaro, Palmerston and Pukapuka).* | |  |  |  |
|  | N.of local tourism enterprises applying climate resilient management techniques  SMART. Amendment: Specify/add climate resilient management techniques e.g. water rationing policy, beach protection activities. | | *The total number of tourism enterprises in these 3 islands is 67, 54 of these are located in Aitutaki. Currently tourism operators cope with climate-induced impacts (like water shortage, coastal erosion) in an ad-hoc fashion, lack capacity to undertake integrated adaptation measures.* | | *By the end of the programme at least 50 local tourism enterprises apply climate resilient adaptation techniques in at least 3 islands (Aitutaki, Atiu and Manihiki)*  *Amendment: Considering the actual, local tourism enterprise present and the remaining timeframe, please amend to at least 30 local tourism enterprise.* | |  |  |  |
| **Project Strategy** | **Indicator** | **Baseline** | | **Achievement Rating** | **Target** | | **Key Progress Achievement at MTE level** | **Assumptions** | **MTE Comments** |
| **Outcome 4**  **Lessons learned and best practices improve the effectiveness of initiatives to enhance the resilience of Pa Enua and other vulnerable communities** | Number of knowledge materials generated on lessons learned and best practices.  SMART. NO GENDER. Amendment. Please add “No of best practices based on gender prospective”. | There is no systematic programme in the Cook Islands to capture lessons learned and best practices in adaptation, disaster risk reduction, and related projects, and disseminate them for wider use | | MS  MS  MS | At least 5 knowledge materials (experience notes, case studies, photo stories, videos, etc,) are generated per year starting from year 1 of the programme  Amendment: four (4) knowledge materials | | 1. 2 case studies were prepared on the programme: One published in a UNDP-GEF publication: ISLAND INNOVATIONS - Leveraging the Environment for the Sustainable Development of Small Island Developing States. Another case study has been drafted for a UNDP publication on adaptation and local livelihood support (to be published | Locally available printing, video and audio production firms have the ability to engage with the SRIC programme | These outcome’s activities have been implemented (e.g. production and showing of a programme educational video). It is expected that from mid-2016 till the end of the programme. The MTE finds that the programme should develop a communications strategy ensuring that all lesson learnt are efficiently shared at various level nationally and locally. |
|  | Training materials prepared and evaluated  SMART. Amendment: Add Number of training material for climate adaptation techniques in agriculture and fisheries. NO GENDER. Amendment please add “training material including the gender dimension”. | There is a critical lack of training materials for enhancing the capacity of island stakeholders and key players in climate and disaster risk assessment and their management, in adaptation planning, in the use sector-tailored climate information and in implementation of climate-resilient practices | | . | By the end of the programme at least four training packages receive positive evaluations in independent assessments. | | 1. The Learning Needs Assessment completed under the SRIC CC Programme in 2013 is been used plan for and provide tailored training. | Local capacity exists to produce training materials that are of a high standard  Island stakeholders and key players have a high interest in, support for, and engagement in capacity building activities in the Pa Enua. | This output implementation will be starting from Q3-2016. Some limited activities have been implemented, and it has expected that this output would be satisfactorily completed by the end of programme closure. |

|  |
| --- |
| **ANNEX B: List of Documents to be reviewed by the TE evaluator**   1. *Project Document* 2. *Inception Report* 3. *Mid-term Review Report + Management Response* 4. *Project Quarterly Progress Reports for 2013-2017* 5. *Project Performance Reports (PPRs) to the AF* 6. *Audit and Spot Check Reports* 7. *Board Meeting Minutes* 8. *Consultancy Products (reports, technical studies etc)* 9. *Memorandum of Understandings* 10. *Communication Plan + Matrix* 11. *Project Budget Revisions* 12. *AF-Project Tracking Tool* 13. *Contracts for Staff and consultants* 14. Project files, national strategic and legal documents 15. Small Grant Templates and Process 16. Small Grant Database |
| **ToR ANNEX C: Guidelines on Contents for the Midterm Review Report**[[3]](#footnote-3)   | **Evaluation questions** | **Indicators** | **Sources** | **Methodology** | | --- | --- | --- | --- | | Relevance: How does the project relate to the main objectives of the GEF focal area, and to the environment and development priorities at the local, regional and national levels? | | | | | Was/Is the project a good idea given the situation needing improvement? | Strengthened ability of all Cook Islands communities and the public service to make informed decisions and manage anticipated climate change driven pressures in a pro-active, integrated and strategic manner | Annual and Quarterly Reports  Mid-Term Review Report  Media articles/reports | * Individual interviews * Desk reviews * Reports   FGDs | | How have the project beneficiaries been satisfied with the project deliverables and outcomes? Does it deal with target group priorities? Why or why not? | Number of households in the Pa Enua and Rarotonga target villages (Ruaau and Akaoa) and the number of public officers dealing with Pa Enua sustainable development who have enhanced adaptive capacity to respond to climate-induced risks. | * Annual and Quarterly Reports * Field Reports from project personnel   Mid-Term Review Report | * Individual interviews * Desk reviews * Reports   FGDs | | Is project relevant to UNDP/AF focal area and Government of Cook Islands policy and actions related to the climate change? | Number of national policies and related instruments enhanced in ways that support CCA and DRR | * Annual and Quarterly Reports * Field Reports from project personnel * Mid-Term Review Reports   National/Ministerial policy documents/strategic plans | * Individual interviews * Desk reviews * Reports   FGDs | | Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved? | | | | | * Have the planned purpose and component objectives, outputs and activities been achieved? * What are the reported achievements and facts on the ground? | * National level support for efficient and effective DRR and CCA initiatives in the Pa Enua * Integrated CCA and DRR action plans prepared for each of the 11 inhabited Pa Enua * Island stakeholders and key players trained in climate and disaster risk assessment and management * Number of successfully completed capacity building projects funded by SRIC Small Grants Programme   Number of new infrastructure projects that enhance water security in the Pa Enua | * Annual and Quarterly Reports * Field Reports from project personnel * Mid-Term Review Reports   Media articles/reports | * Individual interviews * Desk reviews * Reports   FGDs | | Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards? | | | | | * Were inputs (resources and time) used in the best possible way to achieve the outcomes? * How the realised outputs were delivered or why expected outputs failed in some cases? | * SRIC focal points for each inhabited Pa Enua appointed and funded   Number of successfully completed capacity building projects funded by SRIC Small Grants Programme | * Reports of island councils and secretaries * Annual and Quarterly Reports * Field Reports from project personnel   Mid-Term Review Reports | * Individual interviews * Desk reviews * Reports   FGDs | | What could be done differently to improve implementation, thereby maximizing impact, at an acceptable and sustainable cost? |  |  |  | | Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, social-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results? | | | | | To what extent has the project contributed towards its longer-term goals? What unanticipated positive or negative consequences did the project have? Why did they arise? | Strengthened ability of all Cook Islands communities and the public service to make informed decisions and manage anticipated climate change driven pressures in a pro-active, integrated and strategic manner | * Annual and Quarterly Reports * Mid-Term Review Report   Media articles/reports | * Individual interviews * Desk reviews * Reports   FGDs | | * What has been put in place to ensure continuity of the project (financial, institutional arrangements, socio-economic programs)?   What are the remaining risks to project sustainability? | * Number of government staff with job descriptions that make reference to climate and disaster risk management and who have received relevant training   Island stakeholders and key players trained in climate and disaster risk assessment and their management | * Reports of island councils and secretaries * Annual and Quarterly Reports * Field Reports from project personnel   Mid-Term Review Reports | * Individual interviews * Desk reviews * Reports   FGDs | | Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward, reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status? | | | | | How can the impact be improved? |  |  |  | | How effective was the communication so that other organisations interested are aware? | * Number of knowledge materials generated on lessons learned and best practices   Training materials prepared and evaluated | * Reports of island councils and secretaries * Annual and Quarterly Reports * Field Reports from project personnel * Mid-Term Review Reports   Media articles/reports | * Individual interviews * Desk reviews * Reports   FGDs | | To what extent has better managed, monitored and planned adaptation to climate change impacted environmental stress and/or ecological stress? | Number and type of CCA and DRR initiatives implemented in the framework of integrated village-level adaptation and Island Strategic Development Plans | * Reports of island councils and secretaries * Annual and Quarterly Reports * Field Reports from project personnel   Mid-Term Review Reports | * Individual interviews * Desk reviews * Reports   FGDs | |
| **ANNEX D: Ratings**   |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **Ratings Scales** | | | | | **Ratings for Outcomes, Effectiveness, Efficiency, M&E, I&E Execution** | **Sustainability ratings:** | **Relevance ratings** | | | 6: Highly Satisfactory (HS): The project had no shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives in terms of relevance, effectiveness, or efficiency  5: Satisfactory (S): There were only minor shortcomings  4: Moderately Satisfactory (MS): there were moderate shortcomings  3. Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): the project had significant shortcomings  2. Unsatisfactory (U): there were major shortcomings in the achievement of project objectives in terms of relevance, effectiveness, or efficiency  1. Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): The project had severe shortcomings | 4. Likely (L): negligible risks to sustainability  3. Moderately Likely (ML): moderate risks  2. Moderately Unlikely (MU): significant risks  1. Unlikely (U): severe risks | | 2. Relevant (R)  1.. Not relevant (NR)  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 AGREEMENT FORM**  Evaluators/Consultants:   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, eval- uators 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 |
| **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 County 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 track change comment number (“#” column):*   |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **Author** | **#** | **Para No./ comment location** | **Comment/Feedback on the draft TE report** | **TE team**  **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. The Report length should not exceed *40* pages in total (not including annexes). [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. [www.undp.org/unegcodeofconduct](http://www.undp.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: Marginal Unsatisfactory, 2: Unsatisfactory and 1: Highly Unsatisfactory, see section 3.5, page 37 for ratings explanations. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)