

# Terms of reference



Empowered lives.  
Resilient nations.

## GENERAL INFORMATION

**Title: Terminal Evaluation Lead Consultant (International)**

**Project Name:** Strategic Planning and Action to Strengthen Climate Resilience of Rural Communities in Nusa Tenggara Timur Province (SPARC)

**Reports to:** National Project Manager (NPM) SPARC

**Duty Station:** Home Based

**Expected Places of Travel (if applicable):** Nusa Tenggara Timur Province

**Duration of Assignment:** November – December 2018 (35 working days)

## REQUIRED DOCUMENT FROM HIRING UNIT

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	TERMS OF REFERENCE
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	(8) <b>CONFIRMATION OF CATEGORY OF LOCAL CONSULTANT, please select:</b> (1) Junior Consultant (2) Support Consultant (3) Support Specialist (4) Senior Specialist (5) Expert/ Advisor <b>CATEGORY OF INTERNATIONAL CONSULTANT, please select:</b> (6) Junior Specialist (7) Specialist (8) <b>Senior Specialist</b>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	APPROVED e-requisition

## REQUIRED DOCUMENTATION FROM CONSULTANT

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	CV/P11
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Copy of education certificate
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Completed financial proposal
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Completed technical proposal

### **Need for presence of IC consultant in office:**

partial (explain)

intermittent (deliverables-based)

full time/office based (needs justification from the Requesting Unit)

### **Provision of Support Services:**

Office space:  Yes  No

Equipment (laptop etc):  Yes  No

Secretarial Services  Yes  No

If yes has been checked, indicate here who will be responsible for providing the support services:

Signature of the Budget Owner: Fransiska Sugi

## I. BACKGROUND

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. This term of reference (TOR) sets out the expectations for a Terminal Evaluation (TE) of the **“Strategic Planning and Action to strengthen climate resilience of Rural Communities in Nusa Tenggara Timur”** otherwise known as the **“SPARC Project” (PIMS # 4549)**.

Rural communities in Nusa Tenggara Timur (NTT) are highly dependent on the climate for their subsistence agricultural production and water resources. Ensuring food and water security is already a major challenge. The climate induced problem that this project is focused on is thus that the impacts of the ongoing and projected changes in climate will very likely exceed the coping capacity of many rural communities. This will result in decreasing security in terms of livelihoods, food and water, affecting rural development in NTT.

There are strong indications that changes in rainfall patterns are already occurring: over the last decade, there has been a growing number of years with a ‘false’ start of the rainy season, floods and droughts both during dry and rainy season, and high winds. Historical data analysis indicates that extreme rainfall has increased during the last half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century when comparing 1901-1950 with 1951-2000. Climate change projections prepared up to 2050 for NTT province suggest a likely decrease in September-November rainfall by 2050, with greater decreases likely in the western parts of the Province. During the peak of the rainfall season (December-February) simulated changes are more uncertain, though there is a consistent indication that rainfall will increase during March-May, suggesting a shift of the rainy season (a later start and later end).

Whilst much of the variability in rainfall is currently dependent on ENSO, it is not clear how ENSO will change in the future as currently available models do not include ENSO. There are indications that the El-Niño phenomenon may be becoming more intense and their frequency relative to La Nina has increased since the 1970’s<sup>1</sup>. It is however not clear how this will translate into impacts on NTT’s climate in the long-term<sup>2</sup>. It seems likely that delayed starts to the season will continue to be a problem, especially in the near future, with the potential for increasing damages from increased incidence and intensity of cyclones (high rainfall and strong winds)<sup>3,4</sup>. Increases in rainfall during the peak and later part of the rainfall season also pose a potential threat to cropping activities (e.g. harvesting and drying rice/corn), though the impact of any such climatic changes will be dependent on the farming system, altitude and location.

The average temperature of NTT is expected to rise by 1-2°C by 2050<sup>5</sup>. Whilst temperature increases will depend on altitude and the proximity of the ocean, any increases in minimum night-time temperatures will likely reduce rice yields<sup>6</sup> whereas increases in maximum temperatures may lead to higher evaporation rates during the dry season

---

<sup>1</sup> Latif M, Keenlyside NS (2009) El Nino/Southern Oscillation response to global warming PNAS December 8, 2009 vol. 106 no. 49 20578-20583

<sup>2</sup> Naylor RL, Battisti DS, Vimont DJ, Falcon WP, Burke MB (2007). Assessing risks of climate variability and climate change for Indonesian rice agriculture. PNAS, May 8, 2007, vol.104, no.19, p7752

<sup>3</sup> Hennessy K, Page C, Bathols J, McInnes K, Pittcock B, Suppiah R, Walsh K (2004) Climate Change in the Northern Territory. CSIRO: consultancy report.

<sup>4</sup> The Centre for Australian Weather and Climate Research (2010) Climate Change in the Pacific: Scientific Assessment and New Research | Volume 2: Country Reports: Chapter 3: East Timor (Timor-Leste)

<sup>5</sup> Kirono D. (2010) Climate change in Timor-Leste – a brief overview on future climate projections. Prepared for the Department of Climate Change and Energy Efficiency (DCCEE). CSIRO, Australia. Pp 27

<sup>6</sup> Welch et al. (2010). Rice yields in tropical/subtropical Asia exhibit large but opposing sensitivities to minimum and maximum temperatures. Proceedings National Academy of Sciences ([www.pnas.org/cgi/doi/10.1073/pnas.1001222107](http://www.pnas.org/cgi/doi/10.1073/pnas.1001222107))

before planting. The former implies reduced production of food, whereas the latter may exacerbate drought and the amount of water required for irrigation, hence making agricultural production more difficult.

In summary, projections are: 1) increased rainfall variability, 2) increased incidence and magnitude of extreme events (floods, droughts, high winds), 3) shift in rainy season (later start, later end), and 4) increased temperature. It is however unknown if the projected mid- to long-term changes are within the adaptive boundaries of the current agro-ecosystems of NTT, or that major shifts in agro-ecosystems can be expected over time. For example, it is unclear if maize production in certain areas can be sustained in the longer term by e.g. improved agricultural practices, or that the agro-ecosystems in these areas become unsuitable for maize. The latter would require farmers in the longer term to shift to alternative crops suitable for such conditions.

According to Indonesia Climate Change Sectoral Roadmap for Marine and Fisheries (2010), a moderate risk level of sea water flooding in coastal areas is to be found on the south coast of the island of Sumba, Sumbawa, Flores to Alor Island. Meanwhile there is a level of high risk on the Saleh Gulf coast of the Sumbawa Island and the Ende beach up to around Larantuka beach on the Island of Flores. Changes in surface wind and ocean circulation and level of precipitation were also predicted to happen in NTT area. These conditions will affect traditional fishermen due to changing in fishing ground and fish availability, which could contribute to the food insecurity particularly in small islands.

Access to water for domestic use is challenged by climate change. During periods of prolonged dry spells in NTT, water sources in and nearby the communities are commonly reported to fall dry. Government support to ensure water security is limited in rural areas. Interviews with communities reported drastic measures taken by households to cope with water shortages. For example, in Sabu Raijua there have been cases where people were not able to bathe for two weeks, affecting personal hygiene. The incidence of dry spells is likely to increase due to climate change. This would increase the burden on women who are responsible for domestic water supply, spending more time fetching water, an activity that also befalls to children in many households. Water quality often deteriorates during periods of drought increasing risks of outbreaks of waterborne diseases such as diarrhoea.

Recognizing the increase of risks from climate change, Indonesian government has issued assessment reports, policies and sectoral guidelines for adaptation to the climate change. The policies included National Action Plan for Mitigation and Adaptation to Climate Change (MoE, 2007), Indonesia Climate Change Sectoral Roadmap (Bappenas, 2010), Second National Communication (2011) and recently in 2012 is the appointment of Climate Change Adaptation task force, led by Bappenas, which is responsible to develop National Action Plan for Climate Change Adaptation. The abovementioned policies and guidelines are the rational for the implementation of climate change adaptation programme in the subnational levels. The results and lesson learned from the project is aimed for contributing to the national discourse and refinement of the national policies on climate change adaptation.

The project was designed to focus on strengthening and developing climate resilient institutions and rural communities centred around livelihoods, food and water security, to pave the way for climate resilient development in NTT. In particular, it will support the following long-term solution with regard to:

- 1. Local government and climate resilient development** - Local government (including both provincial and district governments) has integrated climate resilience principles in policy, planning and budgeting, and have the institutional capacity to develop, implement and monitor this.
- 2. Climate resilient rural communities** - Communities will strengthen and diversify their livelihoods in anticipation of further changes in the climate and its impacts. Men and women will have the awareness and information about climate change impacts and adaptation options, and access to technologies, finance and tools.

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

## PROJECT SUMMARY TABLE

Project Title:	<b>“Strategic Planning and Action to strengthen climate resilience of Rural Communities in Nusa Tenggara Timur ”</b>			
GEF Project ID:	4340		<u>at endorsement</u> <u>(Million US\$)</u>	<u>As of June 30, 2018</u> <u>(Million US\$)</u>
UNDP Project/ Output ID:	00083625/ PIMS #4549	GEF financing:	<b>5,000,000 (SCCF)</b>	<b>4,885,540</b>
Country:	Indonesia	IA/EA own (UNDP):	100,000	93,551
Region:	Asia Pacific	Government:	67,873,320	
Focal Area:	Environment Unit	Other (Bank NTT, NGI):	191,165	176,543
FA Objectives, (OP/SP):	Climate Change Adaptation	Total co-financing:	67,873,320	
Executing Agency:	Ministry of Environment and Forestry	Total Project Cost:	5,291,165.00	5,155,634
Other Partners involved:	ProDoc Signature (date project began):		28 January 2013	
	(Operational) Closing Date:		Proposed: 31 December 2016	Actual: 31 December 2018

In line with the UNDP-GEF Guidance on Terminal Evaluation (TE), a Lead International Consultant will be recruited to conduct Terminal Evaluation for SPARC project. The TE will be conducted according to the guidance, rules and procedures established by UNDP and GEF as reflected in the UNDP Evaluation Guidance for GEF Financed Projects. The 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.

## II. SCOPE OF WORK, ACTIVITIES, AND DELIVERABLES

### Scope of Work

The evaluation shall be conducted to assess Project performance vis-à-vis its targets and expected outputs, and its contribution relative to its objective. It will draw lessons that can both improve the sustainability of benefits from this project, and aid in the overall enhancement of UNDP programming. The evaluation will cover the implementation period January 2013 – December 2018.

The specific objectives of the evaluation include:

- To assess project performance relative to its objective and targets, as stated in the Project Document and AMAT (1.1.1.1, 2.2.1, & 2.2.1.1). AMAT can be downloaded from following link [https://www.thegef.org/gef/tracking\\_tool\\_LDCF\\_SCCF](https://www.thegef.org/gef/tracking_tool_LDCF_SCCF)

- To assess the relevance, effectiveness and efficiency of the Project’s implementation and strategies in achieving the set outputs and results;
- To determine local capacities developed and level of participation of stakeholders in the achievement of the outputs and results; and
- To identify lessons learned and innovative practices and recommendations to inform the potential scale up of the project.

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

### Expected Deliverables

Deliverables/ Outputs	Target Due Dates	Review and Approval Required
<b>Draft Inception Report</b> Evaluator provides clarifications on timing and methods.	Nov 2018 (5 days)	UNDP CO Indonesia, Programme Manager and NPM SPARC
<b>Inception Report</b> Finalized methodologies and data collection instrument, analysis (etc.).	Nov 2018 (10 days)	
<b>Presentation and Submission of the Draft Evaluation Report</b> Full report, (per annexed template) with annexes.	Dec 2018 (10 days)	
<b>Final Report*</b> Revised report with annexes and presentation to the project.	Dec 2018 (10 days)	

\*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.

## III. WORKING ARRANGEMENTS

### Institutional Arrangement

The overall approach and methodology of the terminal evaluation shall be guided by the provisions set forth in the UNDP Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results and the UNEG Norms and Standards for Evaluation (refer to attached documents). It should be conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation.

The evaluation should employ a mixed methods approach, using both qualitative and quantitative evaluation methods and instruments (e.g. documents review, key informant interviews (KIIs), focus group discussions (FGDs), surveys, and observations from project site visits). 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.

The technical proposal of the Evaluator would have to indicate specific activities, data sources, data collection and analysis methods needed to meet the evaluation purpose and objectives. A set of evaluation questions

covering each of these criteria shall also be drafted by the evaluator as part of the inception report (see 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 selected members of the Project Board, GEF Operational Focal Point, UNDP Country Office, Project Team, UNDP-GEF Technical Adviser and relevant PCIC and LGU personnel based in the region. The evaluator is expected to conduct a field mission in NTT Province, including the following project sites: i) Sabu Raijua District; ii) Manggarai District; iii) Manggarai Timur District; and iv) Sumba Timur District. Interviews will be held with the following organizations and individuals at a minimum: i) Province and District Bappedas; ii) District agriculturists; iii) BMKG (Stasiun Klimatologi Lasiana-Kupang); iv) agricultural extension workers; v) local NGOs partner; vi) farmer groups; vii) Province and District Environmental Agency; viii) Nusa Cendana University (Postgraduate Programme); and ix) BPTP NTT.

The evaluator will review all relevant sources of information, such as the project document, inception report, project reports – including Project Implementation Reports (PIRs), project budget revisions, Quarter Progress Reports (QPRs), Midterm Review, 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](#) of this Terms of Reference.

#### **Duration of the Work**

- a) The duration of work is 35 days from November to December 2018.
- b) The expected starting date is Nov 2018 with expectation of completion on 31<sup>st</sup> Dec 2018.
- c) The unforeseen delay will be further discussed by UNDP as basis for possible extension.
- d) The feedback from UNDP and government partners to the submitted report can be expected within 10 working days from the date of submission.

#### **Duty Station**

- a) The contractor's duty station will be home-based with possibility of travel to Jakarta and NTT province during field visit to project sites.
- b) The consultant is working on the output-based, thus no necessity to report or present regularly.

#### **Travel Plan**

- a) The return travel cost from country of origin to Jakarta is to be included in the financial proposal.
- b) Travel cost (ticket and daily allowance) to project sites in NTT is to be included in the financial proposal. The duration of field mission to project sites will be 10 days.

### **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](#)), 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**. A rating scale for each criterion and overall Project performance will have to be defined by the Evaluator and must include a description for each rating as basis for interpretation. The completed table must be included in the evaluation executive summary. The obligatory rating scales are included in [Annex D](#).

<b>Evaluation Ratings:</b>			
<b>1. Monitoring and Evaluation</b>	<i>rating</i>	<b>2. IA&amp; EA Execution</b>	<i>rating</i>
M&E design at entry		Quality of UNDP Implementation – Implementing Agency	
M&E Plan Implementation		Quality of Execution - Executing Agency	
Overall quality of M&E		Overall quality of Implementation / Execution	
<b>3. Assessment of Outcomes</b>	<i>rating</i>	<b>4. Sustainability</b>	<i>rating</i>
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 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.

<b>Co-financing (type/source)</b>	<b>UNDP own financing (mill. US\$)</b>		<b>Government (mill. US\$)</b>		<b>Partner Agency (mill. US\$)</b>		<b>Total (mill. US\$)</b>	
	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.<sup>7</sup>

<sup>7</sup> 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](#)

## CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS & LESSONS

The evaluation report must include a chapter providing a set of **conclusions, recommendations** and **lessons**. Conclusions should build on findings and based on the evidences gathered and processed by the evaluator. Recommendations should be prioritized, specific, relevant and targeted with suggested entity or person in charge to implement the recommendation(s). Lessons generated from the experiences of the project should have broader applicability to other initiatives across regions or area of intervention.

## IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS

The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation resides with the UNDP CO in the Indonesia. The UNDP CO will contract the evaluator(s) 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 Evaluation team to set up stakeholder interviews, arrange field visits, coordinate with the Government and other participants who will be involved in the evaluation process.

## EVALUATION TIMEFRAME

The total duration of the evaluation will be 35 days over a time period of three (2) months according to the following schedule:

Activity	Timing	Completion Date
Preparation of the Draft Inception Report <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Inclusive of the initial meetings</li></ul>	5 days	2 <sup>nd</sup> week of November 2018
Submission of the Final Inception Report <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Circulation of the draft inception report, consolidation of comments from the Evaluation Review Group (ERG), revision and approval</li></ul>	3 days	3 <sup>rd</sup> week of November 2018
Data Collection Period <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Field visits and meetings with partners</li></ul>	10 days	4 <sup>th</sup> week of November 2018
Draft Evaluation Report	10 days	1st week of December 2018
Submission of the Final Evaluation Report <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Circulation of the draft evaluation reports, consolidation of comments from the ERG</li></ul>	7 days	3 <sup>rd</sup> week of December 2018

## IV. REQUIREMENTS FOR EXPERIENCE AND QUALIFICATIONS

### Academic Qualifications:

- Master's degree in development economics, development studies, management and other climate change adaptation-related fields.

### Years of experience:

- At least fifteen (15) years' experience with result-based management and evaluation methodologies particularly in the area of sustainable development and/or climate change adaptation with gender sensitive analysis;
- Experience in climate finance is an advantage;
- Experience working with the UN and/or GEF or GEF-evaluations;
- Experience working in Asia-Pacific region.



### III. Competencies and special skills requirement:

- Competence in climate change projects management/application.
- Demonstrate understanding of issues related to gender and climate change mitigation; experience in gender sensitive evaluation and analysis.
- Excellent communication skills;
- Demonstrate analytical skills;
- Familiarity with the key issues and stakeholders in the agriculture sector of the Indonesia;
- Demonstrated interviewing and writing skills with a strong capacity to produce evaluation and terminal reports based on a sound analysis of facts gathered;
- Demonstrated ability to assess complex situations particularly in agricultural financing, distil critical issues and to outline forward-looking conclusions and recommendations

## V. EVALUATION METHOD AND CRITERIA

### Cumulative analysis

When using this weighted scoring method, the award of the contract should 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	Maximum Point
<u>Technical</u>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Criteria A: qualification requirements as per ToR:<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Master's degree in development economics, development studies, management and other climate change adaptation-related fields. Experience in climate finance is an advantage.</li><li>2. At least fifteen (15) years' experience with result-based management and evaluation methodologies particularly in the area of sustainable development and/or climate change adaptation with gender sensitive analysis;</li><li>3. Experience working with the UN and/or GEF or GEF-evaluations;</li><li>4. Experience working in Asia-Pacific region.</li></ol></li></ul>	40%	10  10  10 10
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Criteria B: Brief Description of Approach to Assignment<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Understands the task and applies a methodology appropriate for the task?</li><li>2. Important aspects of the task addressed clearly and in sufficient detail?</li><li>3. Is planning logical, realistic for efficient project implementation?</li></ol></li></ul>	60%	25  20 15
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Criteria C: Further Assessment by Interview (if any)</li></ul>	N/A	

## VI. 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 [UNEP 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluations'](#)



## ANNEX A. PROJECT RESULTS FRAMEWORK

<p><b>This project will contribute to achieving the following:</b></p> <p><b>Country Programme Outcomes 2011-2015:</b></p> <p>2.2. Potential impact of Climate Change (CC) reflected in policy frameworks at all levels.</p> <p>4.1. Gol is able to minimize the risk of and respond adequately to community conflicts and natural disasters through the application of conflict-sensitive national policies and community initiatives, as well as recovery and disaster risk reduction strategies drawn from international and national best practices.</p> <p><b>CPAP Output(s) 2011-2015:</b></p> <p>2.3.3 Policy and guidelines to integrate climate change adaptation associated with DRR at decentralized level developed with appropriate capacity and resources</p> <p>4.3.1 National and local governments policy and regulatory enabling framework for DRR in target areas designed and implemented</p>
<p><b>Expected CPAP Indicators</b></p> <p>2.3.3.1 Number of provinces which have adopted or mainstreamed climate change adaptation principles into their development plans</p> <p>2.3.3.2 Extent to which climate change adaptation methodologies (including Climate Risk Management) and interventions associated with DRR are being piloted</p> <p>4.3.1.3 % of target areas effectively developing and implementing DRR sensitive spatial planning incorporating climate risk reduction</p>
<p><b>Expected CPD Outcome (s) 2016-2020:</b></p> <p>Strategic Plan Outcome 1. Growth and development are inclusive and sustainable, incorporating productive capacities that create employment and livelihood for the poor and excluded</p>
<p><b>Expected CPD Output indicator (s) 2016-2020:</b></p> <p>3.8 Policy and technical guidance are in place for integrating Climate Change Adaptation (CCA) and DRR into spatial and local development planning</p>
<p><b>Primary applicable Key Environment and Sustainable Development Key Result Area: 3.</b> Promote climate change adaptation</p>
<p><b>Applicable GEF Strategic Objective and Program:</b></p> <p>OBJECTIVE 1: Reduce vulnerability to the adverse impacts of climate change, including variability, at local, national, regional and global level</p> <p>OBJECTIVE 2: Increase adaptive capacity to respond to the impacts of climate change, including variability, at local, national, regional and global level</p>
<p><b>Applicable GEF Expected Outcomes:</b></p> <p>1.1 Mainstreamed adaptation in broader development frameworks at country level and in targeted vulnerable areas</p> <p>2.2 Strengthened adaptive capacity to reduce risks to climate-induced economic losses</p>
<p><b>Applicable GEF Outcome Indicators:</b></p> <p>1.1.1: Adaptation actions implemented in national/sub-regional development frameworks</p>

2.2.1: No. and type of targeted institutions with increased adaptive capacity to minimize exposure to climate variability					
	Objectively Verifiable Indicators			Means of verification	Risks and Assumptions
	Indicator	Baseline	Targets End of Project		
<p><b>Project Objective<sup>8</sup></b> To enable the NTT province to strengthen climate resilience of its rural Communities to improve livelihood, food, and water security.</p> <p><b>(equivalent to output in ATLAS)</b></p>	<p>- Annual Provincial and District government Work Plans and budgets approved by provincial and district parliaments that include specific reference to adaptation actions [refer to AMAT 1.1.1.1]</p>	<p>- Climate change is not integrated in provincial budgets and district budgets. The provincial Medium term development plan does not include any reference to climate change</p>	<p>- budget allocation for adaptation actions in the Provincial Annual Work Plan and in the Annual Work Plans of at least three districts from 2014 onward.</p>	<p>- Annual Work Plans approved by provincial parliament and district parliaments</p>	<p>Assumptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- High level national commitment will enable Senior government officials and politicians to give priority to addressing climate change</li> </ul> <p>Risks:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- provincial and/or district governments fail to allocate funding to climate resilience due to competing priorities and/or poor understanding of the climate change issues</li> </ul>
<p><b>Outcome 1<sup>9</sup> / Activity Result 1:</b></p> <p>Institutional capacity developed to integrate climate resilience in sustainable development at provincial and district level</p>	<p>- disaggregated by gender, number of trained people mandated to support climate resilient planning</p> <p>- number and type of targeted institutions with increased adaptive capacity to minimize exposure to climate variability (describe</p>	<p>- no trained people mandated</p> <p>- no systematic institutional capacity development for</p>	<p>- at least 100 trained people are mandated to support climate resilient planning</p> <p>- At least 5 institutes have strengthened their systems, programmes and human resources to</p>	<p>- Annual questionnaire</p> <p>- mid-term evaluation</p> <p>- annual progress reports</p> <p>- survey</p>	<p>Assumptions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- key-stakeholders are able and willing to absorb and apply the new knowledge and systems</li> <li>- a well designed approach to human resource development enables trainees to use their knowledge to change attitudes and practices towards an effective approach to climate change adaptation</li> </ul> <p>Risks</p>

<sup>8</sup> Objective (Atlas output) monitored quarterly ERBM and annually in APR/PIR

<sup>9</sup> All outcomes monitored annually in the APR/PIR. It is highly recommended not to have more than 4 outcomes.

<p>(equivalent to activity in ATLAS)</p>	<p>number and time) [refer to AMAT 2.2.1]</p> <p>- number and type of provincial and district level policies and programmes which have been adjusted / issued to address climate change resilience</p>	<p>adaptation is ongoing</p> <p>- No integration of climate resilience in provincial and district policies and programmes</p>	<p>better address climate variability</p> <p>- climate change resilience has been integrated in at least NTT's Medium Term Development Plan 2014-2018, and policies and programmes on agriculture and water</p>	<p>- Provincial and district policy documents and decisions</p>	<p>-trained people will be transferred to other positions which are not related to climate resilience</p> <p>-bureaucratic processes may hamper the implementation of institutional capacity development plans</p> <p>- insufficient political will at national, provincial and district level to allocate budget for climate resilient development</p>
<p>Outputs supporting outcome 1:</p> <p>1.1 A multi-stakeholder dialogue on climate change has been established and institutionalized at provincial and district level</p> <p>1.2 Staff of government agencies, members of parliament, media, universities and CSOs capacitated to address climate change adaptation</p> <p>1.3 The provincial government and three district governments have integrated key policies, programmes, and made necessary budget allocations to priority adaptation actions</p>					
<p><b>Outcome 2 / Activity Result 2:</b></p> <p>Livelihoods of vulnerable rural communities strengthened in a changing climate</p> <p>(equivalent to activity in ATLAS)</p>	<p>- climate risk reduction activities introduced at local level (list type and scope) [refer to AMAT 2.2.1.1]</p>	<p>- no climate risk reduction and awareness activities are introduced at local level;</p>	<p>- At least 5 types of climate risk reduction measures have been introduced in the three target districts, of which at least three measures are specifically targeting women</p>	<p>- Technical reports;</p> <p>KAP assessment</p>	<p>Assumptions:</p> <p>- sufficient technical capacity and human resources can be mobilized at the local level to implement project activities</p> <p>- communities are committed and able to invest time and effort</p> <p>Project adaptation measures are effective enough to reduce the effects of extreme climate events on lives and livelihoods.</p> <p>Risks:</p>

	<p>- % of households with a lower perception of vulnerability to climate risks due to new adaptation measures being introduced and applied, disaggregated by gender</p>	<p>- currently, the majority of households regard themselves as highly vulnerability to climate risks</p>	<p>- at least 75% of the households that have implemented adaptation measures regard themselves less vulnerable to climate change related risks as a result</p>		<p>- project may face significant delays with community action plans because of disagreements within communities about priorities and beneficiaries, - communities may be unwilling to participate and prefer to continue business as usual</p>
<p>Outputs supporting outcome 2:</p> <p>2.1: 300 communities in 40 villages and 15 sub-districts have developed a community based climate risk information system</p> <p>2.2: 150 communities have adjusted subsistence farming practices to more variable and extreme climatic conditions to strengthened food security.</p> <p>2.3: 100 communities have become more resilient by diversifying sources of income which are less sensitive to climate change</p> <p>2.4: In 50 communities, water resources infrastructure and management have been improved taking into account projected changes in rainfall patterns.</p> <p>5.1: 1 CCA-DRR convergence framework analytical study developed to promote effective utilization of resources for resilience building</p> <p>5.2: Relevant map and data resources to enable application of CCA-DRR convergence initiatives are developed for 6 villages in 3 districts</p> <p>5.3 3 Local NGOs capacitated to facilitate communities in developing CCA-DRR measures.</p>					



## ANNEX B: LIST OF DOCUMENTS TO BE REVIEWED BY THE EVALUATOR

---

- A. Project Document: **Strategic Planning and Action to strengthen climate resilience of Rural Communities in Nusa Tenggara Timur**
  - B. Project Inception Report (March 2013)
  - C. Annual Progress Reports (2013-2017)
  - D. Project Implementation Review (2014 – 2018)
  - E. Quarter Progress Reports (2014-2018)
  - F. Annual Work and Financial Plan (2013 – 2018)
  - G. Project Quality Assurance (2016-2017)
  - H. Minutes of the Project Board Meeting (1<sup>st</sup> to 7<sup>th</sup>) including Board Resolutions
  - I. Consultants' Reports, Terms of Reference (TORs) and Contracts
    - 1. Mid Term Review report
    - 2. Science to practice: lesson learnt from community based adaptation in semi arid region of Indonesia
    - 3. Local Knowledge on Climate in 4 Districts in NTT
    - 4. Success Story Books (Manggarai, Manggarai Timur, Sabu Raijua, and Sumba Timur)
    - 5. Book of Info SPARC
  - J. Responsible Parties' Reports
    - 1. Local NGOs' Report
    - 2. Report of District Coord (2014-2016)
  - K. Relevant Bills and Policies on Climate Change Adaptation
  - L. Strategy for Upscaling: Concept note for GCF – Developing Climate Resilience in small scale farming system in NTT
  - M. Compilation of Information, Education and Communication (IEC) Materials (e.g. newsletters, policy briefs, brochures, translated briefs, posters)
  - N. Project Tracking Tool (AMAT)
-

## ANNEX C: EVALUATION QUESTIONS

*This is a generic list with sample questions, to be further detailed by the evaluator during the inception phase.*

Evaluative Criteria Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
<b>RELEVANCE:</b> 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 were the project objectives and outputs aligned with member States' and other project stakeholders' development strategies?			
Were the project's expected accomplishments and indicators of achievements properly designed, time-bound and achievable?			
<b>EFFECTIVENESS:</b> To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved?			
How effective was the project in building the capacity of policymaker on (...)?			
To what extent does the project contribute to the objective of enhanced capacity of (...) to use the tools and mechanisms developed under this project to (...)?			
Do the project-related activities give the participants adequate access to the benefits and implications of the project?			
<b>EFFICIENCY:</b> Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards?			
What was the level of involvement of (insert division name) staff in meeting the requests for technical advice?			
How efficiently were human and financial resources used to deliver activities and outputs, in coordination with stakeholders?			
What were the major factors influencing the achievement or non-achievement of the project objectives?			
<b>SUSTAINABILITY:</b> To what extent are there financial, institutional, social-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?			
To what extent has support from other stakeholders, donors, or other multi-lateral or national partners been obtained to take forward positive outcomes resulting from the project?			
Was there adequate ownership of the project by the end-users, beneficiaries, and was there commitment displayed by them?			
<b>IMPACT:</b> Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward, reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status?			



To what extent was environmental sustainability integrated into the design and implementation of the project?			
To what extent is the sustainability of environmental concerns assured?			

## ANNEX D: RATING SCALES

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

## 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<sup>10</sup>

#### 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*

<sup>10</sup>[www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct](http://www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct)

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

## ANNEX F: EVALUATION REPORT OUTLINE<sup>11</sup>

---

- 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<sup>12</sup>)
  
- 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<sup>13</sup>)
  
- 3.1** Project Design / Formulation
  - Analysis of LFA/Results Framework (Project logic /strategy; Indicators)
  - Assumptions and Risks

---

<sup>11</sup>The Report length should not exceed 40 pages in total (not including annexes).

<sup>12</sup> UNDP Style Manual, Office of Communications, Partnerships Bureau, updated November 2008

<sup>13</sup> 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.

- 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 (\*), implementation (\*), and overall assessment (\*)
- Implementing Agency (UNDP) execution (\*) and Executing Agency execution (\*), overall project implementation/execution (\*), coordination, and operational issues

### 3.3 Project Results

- Overall results (attainment of objectives) (\*)
- Relevance (\*)
- Effectiveness (\*)
- Efficiency (\*)
- Country ownership
- Mainstreaming
- Sustainability: financial resources (\*), socio-economic (\*), institutional framework and governance (\*), environmental (\*), and overall likelihood (\*)
- 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

- Terms of Reference
- 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
- Report Clearance Form
- UNDP-GEF TE Report Audit Trail (*Annexed in a separate file*)
- GEF Project Tracking Tool (*Annexed in a separate file*)

**ANNEX G: EVALUATION REPORT CLEARANCE FORM**

---

*(to be completed by CO and UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based in the region and included in the final document)*

Evaluation Report Reviewed and Cleared by

UNDP Country Office

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

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

UNDP GEF RTA

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

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



