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| ***TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR THE TERMINAL EVALUATION OF THE ENHANCING RESILIENCE OF COASTAL COMMUNITIES OF SAMOA TO CLIMATE CHANGE (PIMS 4667)*** |
| **Introduction:**  This is the Terms of Reference (ToR) for the UNDP-AF Terminal evaluation (TE) of the full-sized project titled ***Enhancing resilience of coastal communities of Samoa to Climate Change*** (PIMS 4667) implemented through the Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment- Planning and Urban Management Division, which is to be undertaken in early 2018.  Project Summary Table   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | Project Title: | **Enhancing resilience of coastal communities of Samoa to Climate Change** | | | | | | | AF Project ID: | | WSM/MIE/Multi/2011/1/PD |  |  | *at MTE (Million US$)* | | UNDP Project ID: | | 00079525  4667 | AF financing: | 8,048,250.00 | 8,048,250.00 | | Country: | | Samoa | IA/EA own: |  |  | | Region: | | Pacific | Government: |  | 3,126,244.20 | | Focal Area: | | Climate Change Adaptation | Other: |  |  | | FA Objectives, (OP/SP): | | Coastal Management | Total co-financing: |  | 3,126,244.20 | | Executing Agency: | | Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment (MNRE) | Total Project Cost: | 8,048,250.00 | 11,174,494.20 | | Other Partners involved: | | Government Ministries i.e. LTA, MWCSD, CSSP, MOF | ProDoc Signature (date project began): | | 9th November 2012 | | (Operational) Closing Date: | Proposed:  8 November 2016 | Actual:   1. June 2018 | |
| **Project Description or Context and Background:**  The project was designed to *enhance the resilience of coastal communities through a set of interventions at the community and sub-national policy levels.*  The objective of the project ‘ *Enhancing resilience of coastal communities of Samoa to Climate Change*  is to strengthen the ability of all Samoan communities, and the public service, to make informed decisions and manage anticipated climate change driven pressures (including extreme events) in a proactive, integrated and strategic manner. This programme is designed to complete a holistic and countrywide approach to climate change adaptation in the coastal zones in Samoa. The programme has a 3-pronged structure, focusing on the implementation of on-the ground adaptation measures at the community level, integrated with sustainable development processes and supported through enhanced national institutional and knowledge management capacities. The programme has a 3-pronged approach:   1. A main focus upon on-the-ground implementation of coastal adaptation measures, addressing climate change impacts on key infrastructure elements and coastal ecosystems in an integrated way. Integration is achieved within the framework of a comprehensive village land use plan – the CIM Plan. 2. Strengthened institutional policies and capacities to provide an enabling environment for climate resilient coastal development; and, 3. The systematic capture and dissemination of knowledge and lessons learned to aid and inform further implementation and pursuit of climate resilient development.   The programme components and relative outcome are:   1. Community-engagement in coastal vulnerability assessment, adaptation planning and awareness 2. *Strengthened awareness and ownership of coastal adaptation and climate risk reduction processes at community and national levels in 25 Districts and 139 villages.* 3. Integrated Community-based coastal adaptation and disaster risk management measures 4. *Increased adaptive capacity of coastal communities to adapt to coastal hazards and risks induced by climate change in 25 Districts and 139 villages.* 5. Institutional strengthening to support climate resilient coastal management policy frameworks 6. *Strengthened institutional capacity of government sectors to integrate climate and disaster risk and resilience into coastal management-related policy frameworks, processes and responses.*   The Project Management Unit is shared with the AF sister project PPCR funded under the World Bank and implemented by the Ministry of Finance. This PMU supported AF until the end of year 2016.  The project is implemented, as Executing Agency, Government of Samoa, Planning and Urban Management Agency under the Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment. The project recruited an Administrative Assistant and Promotion and Awareness Officer to support the project.  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. |
| **Scope of Work:**  The objective of this consultancy is to undertake the Terminal Evaluation of the Adaptation Fund project- Enhancing resilience of the Coastal Communities to Climate Change.  **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 ( [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 GEF Technical Adviser based in the region and key stakeholders. The evaluator is expected to conduct a field mission to Samoa, including the following project sites: Taelefaga and Musumusu, Vaiala Seawall, Manase wave breakers, Sili Water Scheme, 2 small grants project sites (1 in Upolu and 1 in Savaii), 2 Roads (TBC). Interviews will be held with the following organizations and individuals at a minimum: MNRE (PUMA, Forestry), LTA, MWCSD, MOF (PPCR, CSSP), MWTI.  The evaluator will review all relevant sources of information, such as the project document, project reports – including Annual PPRs, 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 (See: 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 / co-finance  The Evaluation will assess the key financial aspects of the project, including the extent of co-financing planned and realized. Project cost and funding data will be required, including annual expenditures. Variances between planned and actual expenditures will 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. |
| **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.  ***(24 June 2018)*** | Evaluator submits to UNDP CO | | **Presentation** | Initial Findings | End of evaluation mission ***(13 July 2018)*** | To project management, UNDP CO | | **Draft Final Report** | Full report, (per annexed template) with annexes | Within 3 weeks of the evaluation mission  ***(20 July 2018)*** | Sent to CO, reviewed by RTA, PCU, AF/GEF OFPs | | **Final Report\*** | Revised report | Within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft  ***(30 July 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**) |
| **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. |
| **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 | 12 June 2018 | | Evaluation Mission | 15 days | 01 July 2018 | | Draft Evaluation Report | 07 days | 20 July 2018 | | Final Report | 05 days | 30 July 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* |
| **Duty Station:**  Home-based with 1 travel to Samoa. It is expected that the consultant will spend 15 (working) days on mission in Samoa. |
| **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 Team members must present the following qualifications:   * 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%) * Masters Degree in Climate change related discipline, environment, disaster risk management, social sciences or closely related field. (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): |
| **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 | | At contract signing | Xxx Jun 2018 (10%) | $xxx | | Upon submission and approval of the 1st draft terminal evaluation report | Xxx July 2018 (40%) | $xxx | | Upon submission and approval (UNDP-CO and UNDP RTA) of the final terminal evaluation report | Xxx July 2018 (50%) | $xxx | | **TOTAL** | **100%** | **$xxx** | |
| **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 **22nd March 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** | | | | | | | |
| **Objective** | **Original Indicator / Proposed MTR amendment** | **Baseline** | **Targets /**  **Proposed MTR amendment** | **Achievements at MTR** | **Source of verification** | **Risks and Assumptions** | **MTR Comments** |
| Strengthened ability of coastal communities to make informed decisions about climate-change induced hazards and undertake concrete adaptation actions | Number of risk-exposed coastal communities protected through coastal adaptation measures based on climate-sensitive Coastal Infrastructure Management Plans (CIMP) | In the lack of systematic implementation of CIM Plans, the target villages and districts are highly exposed to climate-induced hazards | By the end of the programme 139 villages in 25 districts are protected from climate-induced risks as a result of coastal adaptation measures implemented guided by revised CIM Plans | Despite delays in the CIM Plan Review, the project has progressed to implement some of the no-regret interventions in the current version of the plans. Furthermore, the project has progressed to review the CIM strategy to reflect on the reef to ridge approach in addition to disaster management and risk reduction. | Project progress reports  Technical reports  Mid-term and Final Evaluations | Linkages between national institutional coordination and local development processes facilitate the timely review of CIM Plans and the implementation of community-level coastal adaptation measures | *There is only one bid responded to the joint CIM Plan Review for PPCR and AF. Negotiations was discontinued due to non-response to other bid requirements.* |
| **Outcome 1**  Strengthened awareness and ownership of coastal adaptation and climate risk reduction processes at community and national levels in 25 Districts and 139 villages through gender-sensitive processes | No. of Districts covered by reviewed and updated CIM Plans with climate change risks fully integrated | The 6 CIM Plans prepared under IAMP1 have no DRM component.  The 19 CIM Plans prepared under SIAM2 require review. | By the end of year one at least 8, year two 18 and by the completion of the programme at least 25 districts will have their CIM Plans reviewed and updated with climate change risks fully integrated, through balanced involvement of man, women and youth population. | The CIM Plan Review has yet to commence. | Project progress reports.  Annual workplans | Political stability is maintained  Strong coordination amongst climate change stakeholders in the country  Strong community leadership, cooperation and support for project activities. | The review of CIM Plans will be the main activity for year 3 of the project given the efforts to align it with the similar review for the PPCR Districts. |
| No. of Districts with village hazard zone relocation plans competed | There are currently no village relocation plans available to guide relocation activities for households to move out from coastal hazard zones. | By the end of year one 5, year two 10 and by the completion of the programme at least 15 districts will have at least one village hazard zone relocation plan completed through balanced involvement of man, women and youth population  Observation: these targets might need some minor revisions (20 % reduction for each year) to guarantee quality control | This activity awaits the review of the CIM Plans and the availability of the Relocation Handbook that will be compiled under component 3. | Project progress reports.  Annual workplans |  | This activity should be prioritized during Q2, Q3 2016. |
| No. of community representatives trained on coastal risk assessment and adaptation and numbers of individuals engaged in those sessions.  Revision: Please include the GENDER dimension in this indicator. | Currently there has been no training for village leaders in coastal adaptation and climate risk reduction processes including village relocation planning. | By the end of the project at least 300 village representatives (including matais, women and youth groups) trained (year 1- 50, year 2- 100, year 3-200), involving traditional leaders, women and youth group representatives | The Community Engagement Plan prepared under PPCR will also be utilized for AF Districts. The CEP considers these trainings as part of the review. Therefore, the said trainings will be undertaken around year 3 when the CIM Plan Review is scheduled to start. | *Sui o le Nuu* training session minutes and attendance registers |  | This activity should include/ review the gender dimension during the planned implementation (i.e. women participitation in decision-making).  Or just add disagregated by gender |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Outcome 2**  Increased adaptive capacity of coastal communities to adapt to coastal hazards and risks induced by climate change in 25 Districts and 139 villages | Km of coastal roads and related infrastructure improved to  withstand climate change and variability-induced stress | There has been road reconstructions and upgrading undertaken in response to past hazards, such as the 2009 tsunami, but without integrating systematically climate change related risks in the process | By the end of the programme at least 80km of coastal roads and related infrastructure is improved to  withstand climate change and variability-induced stress  Observation: this target needs to be significantly revised based on financial considerations of road construction/ rehabilitation, and an achievable target proposed under this programme. In addition, the programme target should be also integrated into responsible line ministries. Suggested reduction of 40% of this programme target, and in current government projects. | A total length of 7.73 Km of coastal access roads were upgraded facilitating relocation of communities away from the coast. | Project progress reports.  Annual workplans | Low staff turnover resulting in sustained capacity of government and partner institutions. | The unit cost ST 700 per meter for road construction is or about USD 280.00. To meet target of 80km of road will be impossible under the current project allocated resources. |
| Km of coastline with climate resilient shoreline and flood protection measures introduced, including vegetation planting along the coast and riparian streams and beach replenishment | There are only a few villages, where shoreline adaptation measures have been introduced through the PACC and CBDAMPIC projects, but only in a pilot fashion | By the completion of the programme climate resilient shoreline and flood protection measures are introduced in at least 140km coastline and riparian streams, including vegetation planting in at least 60 km coast and 50 km of riparian streams, and beach replenishment techniques applied in at least 2 sites and 10 Km coastline.  Observation: this target remains ambitious considering the current implementation status. These coastal protecion targets are suggested to urgently being aligned/ integrated in line minsitries/ departments targets OR to be reduced by 30%. | The project has resourced a 700 meter long seawall; a river rock wall, and identified two sites for beach replenishment | Project progress reports.  Annual workplans | Communities are willing and committed to actively participate in the project  No political interference in selection of districts and village works sites | Ensure that the M&E acitivity are regularly (monthly visit) implemented during and futher the completion of physical construction to assess efficiency and effectiveness of adaptation measures (and ideally a quantitative measure of community resilience). |
| N. of population and communities accessing improved water sector services and infrastructure to manage  impacts on water supply induced by climate change and variability  Revision: Please include the GENDER dimension in this indicator. | The target villages lack robust water supply system to withstand climate-induced impacts in water supply | By the end of the programme at least 9,000 inhabitants in 15 villages have their water supply and associated infrastructure improved to manage climate-induced impacts on water supply | Three villages (Lona, Masina and Lelea) at total population of close to 700 were supported through systems to capture and distribute water. Two other sites are earmarked for 2016 in the island of Savaii | Project progress reports.  Annual workplans |  | As previously, ensure that the M&E acitivity are regularly implmented during the all implementstion phases to measure (quantitevely when possible) community involvement, improvement in water availaibility/ quality, and long-term water availaibility tredns vs. climate induced water cycle variability. |
| Perception of coastal communities on changes in climate-induced risks as a result of interventions | Baseline to be set at the beginning of the project | By the end of the project at least 80% of the coastal communities involved perceive risk reduction to climate-induced hazards | This is expected at the end when CIM Plan for the selected districts are reviewed with some adaptation projects implemented. | Community consultations and surveys |  | Revise the questionnaire/ survey that will be eventually implemented to determine/ measure improved risk perception. |

|  |
| --- |
| **ANNEX B: List of Documents to be reviewed by the TE evaluator**   1. Adaptation Fund Project Document-Samoa 2. Project Inception Report 3. Project Performance Reports (PPRs) to the Adaptation Fund 4. All Annual Work Plans (AWP) & Quarterly Workplans 5. Audit Reports 6. Technical Advisory Group Meeting Minutes 7. Technical Reports 8. MOUs 9. Community Meeting Consultations 10. Communication Strategy and products 11. Mid-Term Review Report including the Management Response 12. Small Grants Templates and Process 13. Small Grants Reports- CSSP |
| **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? | | | | | To what extent is the principle of the project in line with national priorities? | Level of participation of the concerned agencies in project activities.  Consistency with relevant strategies and policies. | Minutes of meetings, Project progress reports, national and regional strategy and policy documents | Desk review, interviews | | To what extent is the Project aligned to the main objectives of the GEF/AF focal area? | Consistency with GEF/AF strategic objectives | AF Strategy documents, PPRs, Tracking Tools | Desk review, interview with UNDP-AF RTA | | Do the outcomes developed during the project formulation still represent the best project strategy for achieving the project objectives? | Consistency with relevant strategies and policies | Lessons learned, evaluations, progress reports | Desk review, interviews | | Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved? | | | | | To what extent have the project objectives and outcomes, as set out in the Project Document, project’s Logical Framework and other related documents, have been achieved? | Effectiveness | PPRs, evaluation reports, lessons learned | Desk review, interviews | | Were the project budget and duration planned in a cost-effective way? | Cost-effectiveness | Financial expenditure reports, cofinancing records, PPRs | Desk review, interviews | | How and to what extent have implementing agencies contributed and national counterparts (public, private) assisted the project? | Execution of implementing partner and other responsible partners | Progress reports, evaluation reports | Desk review, interviews | | Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards? | | | | | Were the risks identified in the project document and PPRs the most important and the risk ratings applied appropriately? | Risks mitigated | Risk logs, progress reports, lessons learned | Desk review, interviews | | Are project outcomes contributing to national and regional development plans and priorities? | Plans and policies incorporating initiatives | Government approved plans and policies | Desk review, interviews | | How useful was the logical framework as a management tool during implementation and any changes made to it? | Appropriateness of results framework | Progress reports, evaluation reports, PPRs | Desk review, interviews | | Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, social-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results? | | | | | Was project sustainability strategy developed during the project design? | Sustainability | Sustainability strategy | Desk review, interviews | | Has institutional capacity for supporting PCB management been strengthened, and are governance structures capacitated and in place? | Institutional and individual capacities | Progress reports, PPRs, testimonial evidence, training records | Desk review, interviews | | Are there ongoing activities that pose an environmental threat to the sustainability of project outcomes? | Environmental threats | State of environment reports, CIMPS | Desk review, interviews, field visits | | Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward, reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status? | | | | | Are the project outcomes contributing to national development priorities and plans? | Impact | National development strategies and plans, approved legislation | Desk review, interviews | | Has the project demonstrated progress towards these impact achievements? | Impact | Progress reports, PPRs | Desk review, interviews | |
| **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 From**  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 result 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**  **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)