**Terminal Evaluation Terms of Reference**

**For the procurement of a Lead Consultant for terminal evaluation of Strengthening Climate Information and Early Warning System for Climate Resilient Development and adaptation to Climate Change Project**

.

**GENERAL INFORMAION**

**Project/Program Title:** Strengthening Climate Information and Early Warning System in Malawi for Climate Resilient Development and Adaptation to Climate Change Project

**Post Title:** International Consultant

**Duty Station:** Malawi

**Expected Places of Travel:** Selected 5 beneficiary districts

**Duration:** Twenty-five working days

**Expected Start Date:** Immediately after Concluding Contract Agreement

INTRODUCTION

In accordance with UNDP and GEF M&E policies and procedures, all full and medium-sized UNDP support GEF financed projects are required to undergo a terminal evaluation upon completion of implementation. These terms of reference (TOR) sets out the expectations for a Terminal Evaluation (TE) of the “Strengthening climate information and early warning systems in Eastern and Southern Africa for climate resilient development and adaptation to climate change – Malawi” project, (PIMS # 5092).

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

Project Summary Table

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Project Title:  |  |
| GEF Project ID: | 4994 |   | *at endorsement (Million US$)* | *at completion (Million US$)* |
| UNDP Project ID: | PIMS 5092Atlas ID 00077203 | GEF financing:  | 3,600,000 | 0.00 |
| Country: | Malawi | IA/EA own: | 6,100,000 | 0.00 |
| Region: | Africa | Government: | 3,838,300 | 0.00 |
| Focal Area: | Climate Change adaptation | Other: | 1,356,607 | 0.00 |
| FA Objectives, (OP/SP): | CCA-2Increase adaptive capacity to respond to the impacts of climate change, including variability, at local, national, regional and global levelCCA-3Promote transfer and adoption of adaptation technology | Total co-financing: | 11,294,907 | 0.00 |
| Executing Agency: | Department of Disaster Management Affairs | Total Project Cost: | 14,894,907 | 0.00 |
| Other Partners involved: | Ministry of Environment and Climate Change Management (Department of Climate Change and Meteorological Services, Environment Affairs Department, Department of Forestry, Department of Surveys), Ministry of Water Development and Irrigation (Department of Water Resources), and Ministry of Agriculture and Food Security (MoAFS. | ProDoc Signature (date project began):  | 6 December 2013 |
| (Operational) Closing Date: | Proposed:31 December 2017 | Actual:31 December 2017 |

Objective and Scope

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

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

**BACKGROUND**

Malawi’s economy is reliant on agriculture, with more than 80% of the population relying on rainfed agriculture for livelihood. In the recent past, Malawi’s uncertainty has been increasing attributable to increasing climate related extremes of drought and flooding. Number of vulnerable districts to climate change has been increasing with time, from 6 in 2006 (NAPA, 2006) to 15 in 2015 (Malawi National Disaster Risk Management Policy, 2015). In 2015/2016 and 2016/2017 rainfall seasons, Malawi declared two consecutive state of national disasters both related to climate change. More floods have occurred between 2000 and 2016 than 1970 to 2000, and an example of the loss that arose from 2015/2015 floods was estimated at $494 million. An annual average of food insecure people rose from 350,000 between 2007 to 2011 to 1,700,000 over 2012-2014, and the population which was declared food insecure in 2016/2017 season was estimated at 6.5 million, which is almost one third of the population. Climate change is also affecting other sectors of the economy in Malawi; water supply, hydro electricity generation, drying of rivers and important lakes like Lake Chilwa, destruction of transport and communication infrastructure and the country is experiencing increasing humanitarian needs.

Demand for climate information is paramount for development planning, and this project was designed to improve the climate information and Early Warning Systems (EWS) which was limited in the ability to monitor and forecast weather conditions, communicate warnings, respond to disasters, and plan for long-onset changes. Improving climate information and EWS components requires investment in infrastructure and technical capacity which is in a challenge particularly where national resources are limited. The project was designed to provide support in capacity building and infrastructure development that enhances appropriate planning and adjustment of farming and fishing practices respectively thereby reducing vulnerability. Similarly, flood warnings will enable local communities to move to locations of safety with their possessions, stored food and livestock.

The goal of the project was to strengthen the weather, climate and hydrological monitoring capabilities, early warning systems and delivery of available information for responding to extreme weather and planning adaptation to climate change in Malawi. The project had two expected Outcomes:

1. Enhanced capacity of the Department of Climate Change and Meteorological Services (DCCMS) and Department of Water Resources (DWR) to monitor and forecast extreme weather, hydrology and climate change.
2. Efficient and effective use of hydro-meteorological and environmental information for making early warnings and long-term development plans.

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, in particular the GEF operational focal point, UNDP Country Office, project team, UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based in the region and key stakeholders. The evaluator is expected to conduct a field mission whose location will be sampled among the following districts; Karonga, Rumphi, Nkhatabay, Salima, Nkhotakota, Dedza, Mangochi, Zomba, Phalombe, Chikwawa and Nsanje).

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

Evaluation Criteria & Ratings

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

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

Project finance / cofinance

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

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

Mainstreaming

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

Impact

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

Conclusions, recommendations & lessons

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

Implementation arrangements

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

Evaluation timeframe

The total duration of the evaluation will be *25* working days, according to the following plan over a period of not more than 6weeks

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Activity** | Timing | Completion Date |
| **Preparation** | 4 days  | *TBD* |
| **Evaluation Mission** | *12*days  | *TBD* |
| **Draft Evaluation Findings Report** | *5*days | *TBD* |
| **Final Report** | *4*days  | *TBD* |

Evaluation deliverables

The evaluation team is expected to deliver the following:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Deliverable | Content  | Timing | Responsibilities |
| **Inception Report** | Evaluator provides clarifications on their understanding of the task, 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, Malawi Government, 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.

Team Composition

This evaluation will be conducted by a team of two evaluators; International lead Consultant and National Consultant who will be a team member. The Team leader will have the overall responsibility for the conduct of the evaluation exercise as well as quality and timely submission of reports (inception, draft, final etc). The team Leader will be accountable to UNDP for the delivery results on this assignment.

**Academic Qualifications and experience requirements:**

* A Master’s degree in Climate Change, Environmental Sciences, Natural Resources Management, Agriculture, Land Management, Water Resources Management, Meteorology or other closely related field (20 points)
* Knowledge of UNDP and GEF programming and procedures (25 points)
* Previous experience with results‐based monitoring and evaluation methodologies (20 points)
* Technical knowledge in climate change adaptation focal area (hydrological and meteorological systems) with minimum of 5 years work experience (20 points)
* Experience in gender mainstreaming in project planning and implementation (10 points).
* Fluency in local languages of Malawi is required (5 points)

Evaluator Ethics

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

Payment modalities and specifications

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| % | Milestone |
| *10%* | Submission of Terminal Evaluation Inception Report |
| *40%* | Following submission and approval of the 1ST draft terminal evaluation report |
| *50%* | Following submission and approval (UNDP-CO and UNDP RTA) of the final terminal evaluation report  |

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

|  |
| --- |
| Interested individual consultants must submit the following documents/information to demonstrate their qualifications:1. Proposal:(i) Explaining why they are the most suitable for the work(ii) Provide a brief methodology on how they will approach and conduct the work (if applicable)2. Financial proposal3. Personal CV including past experience in similar projects and at least 3 reference**s** |

**FINANCIAL PROPOSAL**

|  |
| --- |
| The financial proposal shall specify a total lump sum amount, and payment terms around specific and measurable (qualitative and quantitative) deliverables (i.e. whether payments fall in installments or upon completion of the entire contract). Payments are based upon output, i.e. upon delivery of the services specified in the TOR.  In order to assist the requesting unit in the comparison of financial proposals, the financial proposal will include a breakdown of this lump sum amount (including travel, per diems, and number of anticipated working days).**Travel;**All envisaged travel costs must be included in the financial proposal.  |

EVALUATION

*Cumulative analysis: The award of the contract will be made to the individual consultant whose offer has been evaluated and determined as:*

 *(a) responsive/compliant/acceptable, and*

*(b) Having received the highest score out of a pre-determined set of weighted technical and financial criteria specific to the solicitation. \* Technical Criteria weight; 70 %\* Financial Criteria weight; 30 %. Only candidates obtaining a minimum of 70 % point would be considered for the Financial Evaluation.*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| ***Criteria*** | ***Weight*** | ***Max. Point*** |
| ***Technical*** | *70* | 1. *Points*
 |
| Criteria A: Technical knowledge;1. A Master’s degree in Climate Change, Environmental Sciences, Natural Resources Management, Agriculture, Land Management, Water Resources Management, Meteorology or other closely related field (20 points)
2. Knowledge of UNDP and GEF programming and procedures (25 points)
 | *45* |  |
| Criteria B: Contextual experience and experience1. Previous experience with results‐based monitoring and evaluation methodologies (20 points)
2. Technical knowledge in climate change adaptation focal area (hydrological and meteorological systems) with minimum of 5 years work experience (20 points)
3. Experience in gender mainstreaming in project planning and implementation (10 points).
4. Fluency in local languages of Malawi is required (5 points)
 | *55*  |  |
| ***Financial*** | *30* | *30* |

Application process

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

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

Annex A: Project Logical Framework

|  |
| --- |
| **This project will contribute to achieving the following Country Programme Outcome as defined in CPAP or CPD:** National policies, local and national institutions effectively support equitable and sustainable economic growth and food security by 2016. |
| **Country Programme Outcome Indicators:** 1.3.1 Environment, natural resources, climate change and disaster risk management mainstreamed in policies, development plans and programmes at national level and implemented in 14 disaster-prone districts; 1.3.2 Data and knowledge on the impact of climate change, environmental degradation and natural disasters collected and made accessible to decision makers and government, private sector and civil society; and 1.3.3 Coordination mechanisms and implementation arrangements for climate change, environment, natural resources, and disaster risk management established and used at national level and disaster-prone districts. |
| **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:** 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 Malawi. | 1. Capacity as per capacity assessment scorecard (Annex 12).
2. Domestic finance committed to DoDMA, DCCMS and DWR to monitor extreme weather and climate change.
 | 1. Average CCA capacity scorecard rating of **72** across men and women (Annex 12).2. Annual budget of USD allocated to DoDMA, DCCMS and DWR[[3]](#footnote-3). | 1. CCA capacity scorecard rating is increased to an average of **121**for both men and women (Annex 12).2.**>20%** increase in domestic financing committed to DoDMA, DCCMS and DWR to monitor extreme weather and climate change (including equipment operation and maintenance)[[4]](#footnote-4). | 1. Focus group interviews with climate monitoring and EWS-related stakeholders; consultant reports.2. Review of DoDMA, DCCMS and DWR annual budgets. | 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 vandalised or not maintained.Assumption: Communities living nearby installed hydro-meteorological equipment commit to taking active measures to prevent the equipment from being vandalised; 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 exists, by 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 that equipment is procured and installed in a timely manner. |
| **Outcome 1:**Capacity of the Department of Climate Change and Meteorological Services (DCCMS) and Ministry of Irrigation, Agriculture and Water Development (MoIAWD) to monitor and forecast extreme weather and climate change enhanced. | 1. Percentage of national coverage of climate monitoring network (fully operational).2. Frequency and timeliness of climate-related data availability. | 1. DCCMS[[5]](#footnote-5)– 15**%** national coverage of operational manual (15%) and automatic (0%) weather stations (Annex 6[[6]](#footnote-6)).1. DWR[[7]](#footnote-7)– **52%** national coverage of operational surface manual (85%) and automatic (19%)[[8]](#footnote-8) hydrological stations (Annex 6)[[9]](#footnote-9). 1. Number and Type (operational stations)Automatic weather stations: **6**Manual synoptic stations: **4**Manual river discharge and water level stations: **158**Rainfall logging stations actively transmitted through GPRS network: **0**2. DCCMS: i) **4** times daily between 5am-5pm for manual synoptic stations; ii) **once** a day for AWSs; iii) **once a month** for rainfall logging gauges.2. DWR: **daily** to **monthly** basis | 1. DCCMS[[10]](#footnote-10)– **77%** national coverage of operational manual (71%) and automatic (84%)[[11]](#footnote-11) weather stations (Annex 6)[[12]](#footnote-12).1. DWR[[13]](#footnote-13)– **69%** national coverage of operation surface manual (100%) and automatic (39%) hydrological stations (Annex 6)[[14]](#footnote-14). 1. Number and Type (operational stations)Automatic weather stations: **45**Manual synoptic stations: **22**Surface manual hydrological stations: Manual river discharge and water level stations: **208**Rainfall logging stations actively transmitted through GPRS network: **53**2. DCCMS: **hourly** for synoptic stations and **daily** for rainfall logging gauges. 2. DWR: **6** hourly and **2-4** hourly for flood prone areas.  | 1. Field inspection of AWS sites; review of climate monitoring database.2. 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 vandalised or not maintained.Assumption: Communities living nearby installed hydro-meteorological equipment commit to taking active measures to prevent the equipment from being vandalised; 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 exists, by 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 that equipment is procured and installed in a timely manner.Risk: Alerts and warnings required by communities are not feasible to produce due to scientific or technological barriers.Assumption: The most up to date technology and scientific approaches and advances are feasible and appropriate for meeting the LDCF project needs. The level of error for forecasting is within the minimum thresholds appropriate for the LDCF project activities. |
| **Outcome 2**Hydro-meteorological and environmental information for early warnings and long-term development plans efficiently and effectively used. | 1. Percentage of population with access to improved climate information and flood, drought and Mwera wind warnings (disaggregated by gender).

2. Policies, annual budgets and development plans that integrate climate information (type and level). | 1. 10% of men and 10% women with access to improved climate information and flood, drought and Mwera wind warnings (*to be confirmed during project inception)*.Male: 628,620Female: 663,136[[15]](#footnote-15)2. Currently **0** policies and development plans | 1. 17% of men and 17% women with access to improved climate information and flood, drought and Mwera wind warnings (*to be confirmed during project inception)*.Male: 1,093,242Female: 1,154,912[[16]](#footnote-16)2. **7** District Development Plans and 1 National DRM Policy | 1. Gender-sensitive field surveys undertaken within the 7 priority districts, representative the f the local population; consultant reports 2. Review of District Development Plans and the NDRM Policy. | Risk: Lack of commitment from communities where EWSs are established undermines the effectiveness of the LDCF project demonstrations.Assumption: Awareness raising activities, and the demonstration of the advantages of responding to the information provided through the established EWS, will ensure the commitment of the communities to participating in the LDCF project.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 exists, by the LDCF project are best suited to the local context and do not restrict the transfer and communication of information.Risk: Alerts and warnings required by communities are not feasible to produce due to scientific or technological barriers.Assumption: The most up to date technology and scientific approaches and advances are feasible and appropriate for meeting the LDCF project needs. The level of error for forecasting is within the minimum thresholds appropriate for the LDCF project activities. |

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

* Project document
* CEO endorsement request
* Project Implementation Plan
* Mid term review report
* Project Monitoring reports
* GEF adaptation tracking tools
* Project Implementation Reports (PIR)
* Quarterly progress reports
* Technical committee minutes
* Steering committee minutes
* Project Identification Form (PIF)
* Project Initiation Plan
* United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF)

Annex C: Evaluation Questions

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

| **Evaluative Criteria Questions** | **Indicators** | **Sources** | **Methodology** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Relevance: How does the project relate to the main objectives of the GEF focal area, and to the environment and development priorities at the local, regional and national levels?  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved? |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards? |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, social-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results? |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| **Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward, reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status?**  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

Annex D: Rating Scales

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

Annex E: Evaluation Consultant Code of Conduct and Agreement Form

**Evaluators:**

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

**Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form[[17]](#footnote-17)**

**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[[18]](#footnote-18)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **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[[19]](#footnote-19)) |
| **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[[20]](#footnote-20))  |
| **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

Evaluation Report Reviewed and Cleared by

UNDP Country Office

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

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

UNDP GEF RTA

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

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

1. For additional information on methods, see the [Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results](http://www.undp.org/evaluation/handbook), Chapter 7, pg. 163 [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. A useful tool for gauging progress to impact is the Review of Outcomes to Impacts (ROtI) method developed by the GEF Evaluation Office:  [ROTI Handbook 2009](http://www.thegef.org/gef/sites/thegef.org/files/documents/M2_ROtI%20Handbook.pdf) [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. To be confirmed and finalized during the inception phase. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. To be confirmed and finalized during the inception phase. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. There are currently 22 Synoptic Weather Stations in Malawi for which accurate locality data has been obtained, however, only four are fully functional. Based on these data, 4 out of 26 districts in Malawi are covered by the current monitoring network. There are also an additional 53 manual rainfall logging stations that require rehabilitation, however, no accurate locality data was obtained for these. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. **Manual:** 4 operational in 4 out of 26 districts, which equates to **15%**.**Automatic:** Currently **none** of the 26 automatic weather stations [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. There are currently 158 operational manual hydrological monitoring stations in Malawi (*Directory of Hydrometric Stations in Malawi, 2012. Ministry of Irrigation and Water Development*).Accurate locality data was obtained from the DWR for 79 of these of these operational hydrological monitoring stations (see Annex 6). Based on these data, 22 of 26 districts (85%) are covered by the current monitoring network. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. There are six hydrological monitoring stations with automatic Data Collection Platforms (DCPs), which were installed in the late 1990s under the SADC Hydrological Cycle Observing System (HYCOS) Phase 1 Project. These stations are located in five of the 26 districts in Malawi, namely: Karonga, Nkhata Bay, Mangochi, Machinga and Mulanje. This equates to ~19% coverage. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. **Manual:** 158 operational in 22 out of 26 districts, which equates to **85%**.**Automatic:**6 operational in 5 out of 26 districts, which equates to **19%.** [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. 25 automatic, 18 manual and 53 rainfall logging stations rehabilitated and 20 Automatic Weather Stations (AWS) installed in priority districts [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
11. There are currently 26 AWSs requiring rehabilitation in 20 of the 26 districts of Malawi. Through the rehabilitation of this network, as well as the installation of 20 additional AWSs in priority districts, the coverage in Malawi will increase to a minimum of 22 of 26 districts. [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
12. **Manual:** Synoptic weather stations operational in 17 of 26 districts, which equates to **71% .Automatic:** Operational in 22 out of 26 districts, which equates to **84%**. [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
13. 50 manual hydrological monitoring stations rehabilitated, and 10 automatic hydrological monitoring stations installed in priority districts. [↑](#footnote-ref-13)
14. **Manual:** Operational in all 26 districts (**100%**).**Automatic:** Operational in 10 out of 26 districts, which equates to **39%**. [↑](#footnote-ref-14)
15. Based on baseline estimates of 43% of male and female populations in districts covered by the Enhanced Community Resilience Programme (Kasungu, Machinga, Mwanza, Thyolo, Mulanje) that receive weather and climate information. [↑](#footnote-ref-15)
16. Based on 43% of the male and female population that receive weather and climate information in 7 priority districts (Karonga, Salima, Nkhota-kota, Rumphi, Nkhata-bay, Dedza and Phalombe) which will benefit from improved climate information and warnings for flood, drought, and Mwera wind warnings and mainstreaming of climate information and EWS into local development plans. [↑](#footnote-ref-16)
17. www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct [↑](#footnote-ref-17)
18. The Report length should not exceed *40* pages in total (not including annexes). [↑](#footnote-ref-18)
19. UNDP Style Manual, Office of Communications, Partnerships Bureau, updated November 2008 [↑](#footnote-ref-19)
20. 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-20)