**Annex 1 TERMES OF REFERENCE**

**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 *“Climate Change Adaptation Programme in Water and Agriculture in Anseba Region”* (PIMS # 4540.)

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

**Project Summary Table**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Project Title:  |  |
| GEF Project ID: | 00078054 |   | *at endorsement (Million US$)* | *at completion (Million US$)* |
| UNDP Project ID: | 00061576 | GEF financing:  | 6,010,000 | 6,010,000 |
| Country: | Eritrea | IA/EA own: | - | - |
| Region: | Africa | Government: | - | - |
| Focal Area: | Climate Change | Other: | - |  |
| FA Objectives, (OP/SP): |       | Total co-financing: | - |  |
| Executing Agency: | UNDP | Total Project Cost: | 6,010,000 | 6,010,000 |
| Other Partners involved: | MoLWE, MoA, Zoba Anseba Local Government | Prodoc Signature (date project began):  | 05.09.2012 |
| (Operational) Closing Date: | Proposed:November,2018 | Actual:      |

**1.Objective and Scope of TE**

The project is supported by GEF/AF and implemented by MoLWE, MoA, Zoba-Anseba Local Government and UNDP under the project title “Climate Change Adaptation in Water and Agriculture in sub-zobas Habero and Hamelmalo, Anseba Region, Eritrea”. The purpose of this terminal evaluation (TE) is to assess the achievement of project results, and to draw lessons that can both improve the sustainability of benefits from this project, and aid in the overall enhancement of UNDP programming and provide advice and recommendations on future replication to further expands the benefits of the project.

The UN guidance on UNDAF processes recommends annual and terminal evaluation reviews of joint projects for relevance and progress towards its set of outcomes. In 2013, the GOE and UNDP signed and agreed to jointly *implement “climate change adaptation programme in water and agriculture in Anseba region, Eritrea”*, a project that is being implemented from the Adaptation Fund and is one of the projects prioritized in the NAPA through the agency of UNDP. Aannual reviews and monitoring and evaluation were undertaken in the last five years of implementing the project. This TE aims to assess the projects’ outcomes, relevance, efficiency and sustainability and to come up with recommendations. The project is a five-year climate adaptation programme that integrates water and agriculture implemented at the Anseba regional level. The project is organized across four outcomes and 12 outputs with a budget of $6.45 million, benefitting 6141 households, 1350 of whom are female-headed directly and has a potential to benefit a total of 75,400 inhabitants of the two sub-zobas of Hamelmalo and Habero directly or indirectly.

**2. BACKGROUND**

Eritrea is extremely vulnerable to adverse effects of climate change mainly because of its geographical location in the arid and semi-arid region of the Sahelian Africa. Environmental issues, in the country, are among the top priorities since the war and recurrent droughts have caused immense damage to the environment. The rainfall intensity is very high with a lot of rainfall falling within a limited period resulting in soil erosion and run-off. The rainfall also shows great variation in space and time. Under normal conditions, the rainfall in the sub humid agro-ecological zone in the eastern escarpment may reach as high as 1000 mm while in the Southern Red Sea and the North Western parts of the country; it is less than 200 mm.

The causes of climate change in Eritrea could be due to anthropogenic factors, both occurring at the global and local levels. At the local level, the gas emissions from agricultural activities, manure management; emissions from forest activities, burning of savannah and methane emissions from domestic livestock enteric fermentation could contribute to climate change.

The impacts of climate change are manifested on desertification/land degradation. Climate change also causes temperature increase above the mean global value, increasing variability in rainfall, more frequent dry spells and more severe droughts. The effects of these impacts on water resources and agriculture exacerbated food insecurity, diminishing biological diversity. They also increased the incidence of weeds, insect pests and diseases and reduced grain yield and livestock production and worsened health conditions.

The mitigation mechanisms should mainly focus on food security and the effects of climate change on crop production, livestock, and forestry and water resources.

Climate models suggest that Eritrea’s climate will generally become more variable, with high levels of uncertainty regarding climate projections in the Sahel zone. The main climate risks or hazards identified in the assessments carried out to develop the Eritrean National Adaptation Programme of Action (NAPA) are as follows:

* *Increased climatic variability****:*** Relative to baseline conditions, there have been observed changes in average, range, and variability of temperature and precipitation throughout the country;
* *Recurring drought****:*** The occurrences of dry spells, seasonal droughts and multi-year droughts are more frequent than in the past;
* *Flash flooding:* there has been a perceived increase in episodes of torrential rainfall with heavy runoff and flooding; and
* *Sea level rise:* Coastal areas and the hundreds of Eritrean islands in the Red Sea are susceptible to rising sea levels associated with climate change.

Current projections do not provide much information on increased frequency of extreme events, such as flooding, although this was identified by the NAPA as a key threat. However, in a country like Eritrea in which drought has long been a significant and severe natural phenomenon, the high likelihood that climate change will increase incidence and severity of drought is a cause for considerable concern.

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 and covers the entire programme.

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.

**3. 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 (*fill in* [*Annex C*](#_TOR_Annex_C:)) The evaluator is expected to amend, complete and submit this matrix as part of an evaluation inception report, and shall include it as an annex to the final report.

The evaluation must provide evidence‐based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The evaluator is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with government counterparts, in particular the 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 Zoba Anseba (Sub Zoba Habero and Hamelmalo), including the following project sites *(Fiza, Mezeret, Habero Tseada, Ajerbeb,Musa Shebah, Basheri, Hamelmalo Agricultural College, and Wazentet, Gebsi).* Interviews will be held with the following organizations and individuals at a minimum: MoLWE, MND, Zoba Anseba Local Administration, MoA, Zoba Anseba NUEW, ago-pastoral farming communities, local administrators, etc.

The evaluator will review all relevant sources of information, such as the project document, project reports – including Annual PPR, 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.

**4. Project objectives**

The Programme Objective is to increase community resilience and adaptive capacity to climate change through an integrated water management and agricultural development approach in the sub-zobas of Hamelmalo and Habero, Zoba Anseba—Eritrea. The programme will adopt a participatory approach working with vulnerable groups in particularly drought-prone areas of Zoba Anseba, including small-scale farmers, agro-pastoralists and rural women.

Flood water will be harvested, water storage will be developed, and soil erosion control measures and irrigation will be introduced. Climate-smart technology will be implemented, including drought-resistant and early maturing crops, by means of enhanced extension services. Rangeland management systems will be enhanced. Improved information on climate change risks will be generated and integrated into farmer and pastoralist practices. The programme will improve knowledge and understanding of climate change impacts among stakeholders, develop a community-based early warning system to reduce climate risks, and an action research approach linking traditional and scientific knowledge through the use of seasonal forecasts.

The programme will additionally have a strong learning and knowledge management component to capture and disseminate lessons learned. Every effort will be made to institutionalise this within the processes of the Ministry of Agriculture at the Zoba Anseba level, the executing agency.

**5. objectives of the TERMINAL evaluation**

This Terminal Evaluation will be coordinated by the MoLWE, Zoba Anseba Local Government and UNDP Eritrea Country Office. The TE will assess progress towards the achievement of the project objectives and outcomes as specified in the Project Document and assess early signs of project success or failure with the goal of identifying the necessary changes to be made in order to set the project on-track to achieve its intended results. The TE will also review the project’s strategy, its risks to sustainability.

The Terminal Evaluation will also assess the achievement of project results/outcomes, and to draw lessons that can both improve the sustainability of benefits from this project, and aid in the overall enhancement of UNDP programming. It will focus on the effectiveness, efficiency and timeliness of project implementation; will highlight issues requiring decisions and actions; and will present initial lessons learned about project design, implementation and management. Findings of this review will be incorporated as recommendations for future replication.

The Terminal Evaluation serves to document lessons learnt and plays a critical role in supporting accountability. Its main objectives are:

1. To monitor and, particularly, evaluate results, impacts and review all indicators
2. To promote accountability for resources use
3. To document, provide feedback on and disseminate lessons learned
4. To provide a basis for decision making on necessary amendments and improvements

**6.Scope of the TERMINAL evaluation**

The TE team will assess the following four categories of project progress. The Terminal Evaluation will cover the entire project funded by GEF/AF.

The following aspects will need to be addressed by the Consultant

**i. Project Strategy**

Project design:

* Review the problem addressed by the project and the underlying assumptions. Review the effect of any incorrect assumptions or changes to the context to achieving the project results as outlined in the Project Document.
* Review the relevance of the project strategy and assess whether it provides the most effective route towards expected/intended results. Were lessons from other relevant projects properly incorporated into the project design?
* Review how the project addresses country priorities. Review country ownership. Was the project concept in line with the national sector development priorities and plans of the country (or of participating countries in the case of multi-country projects)?
* Review decision-making processes: were perspectives of those who would be affected by project decisions, those who could affect the outcomes, and those who could contribute information or other resources to the process, taken into account during project design processes?
* Review the extent to which relevant gender issues were raised in the project design. See Annex ---- of *Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluation of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects* for further guidelines.
* If there are major areas of concern, recommend areas for improvement.

Results Framework/Log frame:

* Undertake a critical analysis of the project’s log frame indicators and targets, assess how “SMART” the end-of-project targets are (Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Relevant, Time-bound), and suggest specific amendments/revisions to the targets and indicators as necessary.
* Are the project’s objectives and outcomes or components clear, practical, and feasible within its time frame?
* Examine if progress so far has led to or could in the future catalyse beneficial development effects (i.e. income generation, gender equality and women’s empowerment, improved governance etc...) that should be included in the project results framework and monitored on an annual basis.
* Ensure broader development and gender aspects of the project are being monitored effectively. Develop and recommend SMART ‘development’ indicators, including sex-disaggregated indicators and indicators that capture development benefits.

**ii. Progress Towards Results**

Progress Towards Outcomes Analysis:

* Review the logframe indicators against progress made towards the end-of-project targets using the Progress Towards Results Matrix and following the *Guidance For Conducting Terminal Evaluation of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects*; colour code progress in a “traffic light system” based on the level of progress achieved; assign a rating on progress for each outcome; make recommendations from the areas marked as “Not on target to be achieved” (red).

**Table. Progress Towards Results Matrix (Achievement of outcomes against End-of-project Targets)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Project Strategy** | **Indicator[[2]](#footnote-2)** | **Baseline Level[[3]](#footnote-3)** | **Level in 1st PPR (self- reported)** | **Midterm Target[[4]](#footnote-4)** | **End-of-project Target** | **Midterm Level & Assessment[[5]](#footnote-5)** | **Achievement Rating[[6]](#footnote-6)** | **Justification for Rating**  |
| **Objective:**  | Indicator (if applicable): |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Outcome 1:** | Indicator 1: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Indicator 2: |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Outcome 2:** | Indicator 3: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Indicator 4: |  |  |  |  |  |
| Etc. |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Etc.** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**Indicator Assessment Key**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Green= Achieved | Yellow= On target to be achieved | Red= Not on target to be achieved |

In addition to the progress towards outcomes analysis:

* Compare and analyse the GEF Tracking Tool at the Baseline with the one completed right before the Terminal Evaluation.
* Identify remaining barriers to achieving the project objective in the remainder of the project.
* By reviewing the aspects of the project that have already been successful, identify ways in which the project can further expand these benefits.

**iii. Project Implementation and Adaptive Management**

Management Arrangements:

* Review overall effectiveness of project management as outlined in the Project Document. Have changes been made and are they effective? Are responsibilities and reporting lines clear? Is decision-making transparent and undertaken in a timely manner? Recommend areas for improvement.
* Review the quality of execution of the Executing Agency/Implementing Partner(s) and recommend areas for improvement.
* Review the quality of support provided by the GEF/AF Partner Agency (UNDP) and recommend areas for improvement.

Work Planning:

* Review any delays in project start-up and implementation, identify the causes and examine if they have been resolved.
* Are work-planning processes results-based? If not, suggest ways to re-orientate work planning to focus on results?
* Examine the use of the project’s results framework/ log frame as a management tool and review any changes made to it since project start.

Finance and co-finance:

* Consider the financial management of the project, with specific reference to the cost-effectiveness of interventions.
* Review the changes to fund allocations as a result of budget revisions and assess the appropriateness and relevance of such revisions.
* Does the project have the appropriate financial controls, including reporting and planning, that allow management to make informed decisions regarding the budget and allow for timely flow of funds?
* Informed by the co-financing monitoring table to be filled out, provide commentary on co-financing: is co-financing being used strategically to help the objectives of the project? Is the Project Team meeting with all co-financing partners regularly in order to align financing priorities and annual work plans?

Project-level Monitoring and Evaluation Systems:

* Review the monitoring tools currently being used: Do they provide the necessary information? Do they involve key partners? Are they aligned or mainstreamed with national systems? Do they use existing information? Are they efficient? Are they cost-effective? Are additional tools required? How could they be made more participatory and inclusive?
* Examine the financial management of the project monitoring and evaluation budget. Are sufficient resources being allocated to monitoring and evaluation? Are these resources being allocated effectively?

Stakeholder Engagement:

* Project management: Has the project developed and leveraged the necessary and appropriate partnerships with direct and tangential stakeholders?
* Participation and country-driven processes: Do local and national government stakeholders support the objectives of the project? Do they continue to have an active role in project decision-making that supports efficient and effective project implementation?
* Participation and public awareness: To what extent has stakeholder involvement and public awareness contributed to the progress towards achievement of project objectives?

Reporting:

* Assess how adaptive management changes have been reported by the project management and shared with the Project Board.
* Assess how well the Project Team and partners undertake and fulfil GEF reporting requirements (i.e. how have they addressed poorly-rated PPRs, if applicable?)
* Assess how lessons derived from the adaptive management process have been documented, shared with key partners and internalized by partners.

Communications:

* Review internal project communication with stakeholders: Is communication regular and effective? Are there key stakeholders left out of communication? Are there feedback mechanisms when communication is received? Does this communication with stakeholders contribute to their awareness of project outcomes and activities and investment in the sustainability of project results?
* Review external project communication: Are proper means of communication established or being established to express the project progress and intended impact to the public (is there a web presence, for example? Or did the project implement appropriate outreach and public awareness campaigns?)
* For reporting purposes, write one half-page paragraph that summarizes the project’s progress towards results in terms of contribution to sustainable development benefits, as well as global environmental benefits.

**iv. Sustainability**

* Validate whether the risks identified in the Project Document, Annual Project Review/PPRs and the ATLAS Risk Management Module are the most important and whether the risk ratings applied are appropriate and up to date. If not, explain why.
* In addition, assess the following risks to sustainability:

Financial risks to sustainability:

* What is the likelihood of financial and economic resources not being available once the GEF/AF assistance ends (consider potential resources can be from multiple sources, such as the public and private sectors, income generating activities, and other funding that will be adequate financial resources for sustaining project’s outcomes)?

Socio-economic risks to sustainability:

* Are there any social or political risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project outcomes? What is the risk that the level of stakeholder ownership (including ownership by governments and other key stakeholders) will be insufficient to allow for the project outcomes/benefits to be sustained? Do the various key stakeholders see that it is in their interest that the project benefits continue to flow? Is there sufficient public / stakeholder awareness in support of the long-term objectives of the project? Are lessons learned being documented by the Project Team on a continual basis and shared/ transferred to appropriate parties who could learn from the project and potentially replicate and/or scale it in the future?

Institutional Framework and Governance risks to sustainability:

* Do the legal frameworks, policies, governance structures and processes pose risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project benefits? While assessing this parameter, also consider if the required systems/ mechanisms for accountability, transparency, and technical knowledge transfer are in place.

Environmental risks to sustainability:

* Are there any environmental risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project outcomes?

**Conclusions & Recommendations**

The TE team will include a section of the report setting out the TE’s evidence-based conclusions, in light of the findings.[[7]](#footnote-7)

Recommendations should be succinct suggestions for critical intervention that are specific, measurable, achievable, and relevant. A recommendation table should be put in the report’s executive summary. See the *Guidance For Conducting Terminal Evaluation of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects* for guidance on a recommendation table.

The TE team should make no more than 15 recommendations total.

*Gender perspective*: Extent to which the project accounts for gender differences when developing and applying project interventions. How are gender considerations mainstreamed into project interventions? Suggest measures to strengthen the project’s gender approach.

**7. 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: |       |

**8. 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 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**9. 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.

**10. 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.[[8]](#footnote-8)

**11. Conclusions****, recommendations & lessons**

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

**12. Implementation arrangements**

The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation resides with the UNDP CO and MoLWE in Eritrea*.* 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.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Activity** | Timing | Completion Date |
| **Preparation** | *3* days  |  *03-05/10/2018* |
| **Evaluation Mission** | *12* days  | *06-17/10/2018* |
| **Draft Evaluation Report** | *8* days | *18-25/10/2018* |
| **Final Report** | *7*days | *01/11/2018* |

**13. Evaluation deliverables**

The evaluation team is expected to deliver the following:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Deliverable | Content  | Timing | Responsibilities |
| **Inception Report** | Evaluator provides clarifications on timing and method  | No later than 1 week before the evaluation mission.  | Evaluator submits to UNDP CO  |
| **Presentation** | Initial Findings  | End of evaluation mission | Project management Unit, UNDP CO, MoLWE and Zoba Administration |
| **Draft Final Report**  | Full report, (per annexed template) with annexes | Within 3 weeks of the evaluation mission | Sent to CO, reviewed by RTA, PCU, GEF OFPs, project management unit, MoLWE |
| **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.

**14. TE ARRANGEMENTS**

The principal responsibility for managing this TE resides with the Commissioning Unit. The Commissioning Unit for this project’s TE is ISDU/*UNDP Country Office*

The commissioning unit will contract the consultants and ensure the timely provision of per diems and travel arrangements within the country for the TE team. The Project Team will be responsible for liaising with the TE team to provide all relevant documents, set up stakeholder interviews, and arrange field visits.

**15. Team Composition**

The evaluation team will be composed of *(1 international and 1 national evaluators).* The consultants shall have prior experience in evaluating similar projects. Experience with GEF financed projects is an advantage. (*If the team has more than 1 evaluator, one will be designated as the team leader and will be responsible for finalizing the report).* The evaluators selected should not have participated in the project preparation and/or implementation and should not have conflict of interest with project related activities.

The selection of consultants will be aimed at maximizing the overall “team” qualities in the following areas:

* Recent experience with result-based management evaluation methodologies; (10%)
* Experience applying SMART targets and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios; (10%)
* Competence in adaptive management, as applied to the project “Climate Change Adaptation Programme in Water and Agriculture in Anseba Region” (5%)
* Experience working with the GEF or GEF-evaluations; experience in gender sensitive evaluation and analysis is an added value; (5%)
* Experience working in Africa; (5%)
* Work experience in relevant technical areas for at least 10 years; (40%)
* Excellent communication skills; fluency in English (both oral and written) and the local language/*Tigregna* (for national consultant), is required (5 points)
* Demonstrable analytical skills;
* Project evaluation/review experiences within United Nations system will be considered an asset;

 A Master's degree or above in Climate Change, Environmental Sciences, Natural Resources Management, Agriculture, Land Management, or other closely related field (20%)

**16. 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)

**17. Remuneration and Payment modalities and specifications**

The financial proposal of costs must be expressed in **Lump Sum Amount** and ***“*all-inclusive”**[[9]](#footnote-9)*.* Payments are based upon output, i.e. upon delivery of the services specified in the TOR. To assist the requesting unit in the comparison of financial proposals, the financial proposal will include a breakdown of this lump sum amount (including professional fees, travel—air tickets, and per diems/DSA). Transport facilities for fieldwork and workshops shall be supported and organized by UNDP/MoLWE.

The work will take approximately 30 working days spread between 01 October — 31 November 2018.

The payment schedule will be as follows:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| % | Milestone |
| *10%* | Upon submission and approval of an inception report |
| *40%* | Following submission and approval of the 1st draft terminal evaluation report |
| *50%* | Following submission and approval by UNDP-CO and UNDP RTA of the final terminal evaluation report  |

**18. Application process**

Applicants are requested to apply online by 17/09/2018. 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.

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. Populate with data from the Logframe and scorecards [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Populate with data from the Project Document [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. If available [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. Colour code this column only [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. Use the 6 point Progress Towards Results Rating Scale: HS, S, MS, MU, U, HU [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. Alternatively, TE conclusions may be integrated into the body of the report. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. 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-8)
9. The term “all inclusive” implies that all costs (professional fees, travel costs/air tickets, DSA/living allowances, communications, consumables, etc.) that could possibly be incurred by the Contractor are already factored into the final amounts submitted in the proposal. [↑](#footnote-ref-9)