Terminal Evaluation Terms of Reference

BASIC INFORMATON

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Location:** | *Djibouti*  |
| **Application Deadline:** |  |
| **Type of Contract:** | *Individual Contract* |
| **Post Level:** | *International/national Consultant*  |
| **Languages Required:** | *English/French*  |
| **Starting** (date when the selected candidate is expected to start) | *15/09/2018* |
| **Expected Duration of Assignment:**  | 30 days |

background

In accordance with UNDP and AFM&E policies and procedures, all regular UNDP supported AF 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 project  *Development of agropastoral perimeters as a climate change adaptation strategy for poor rural communities in Djibouti* (*PIMS 4683.).*

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

Project Title: Developing agro-pastoral shade gardens as an adaptation strategy for poor rural communities

AF Project ID: 00066414

UNDP Project ID: *00082602*

Executing Agency: Ministry of Housing, Urban Planning and Environment (MHUPE)[[1]](#footnote-1)

Other Partners involved: MAEPH, CERD, SEAS, ADDS

AF financing at endorsement (Million US$): 4,658,556

Total co-financing financing at endorsement (Million US$): 4 658 556

ProDoc Signature (date project began): 13 August 2012

(Operational) Closing Date (proposed):13 August 2017

Djibouti lies in Northeast Africa on the Gulf of Aden at the southern entrance to the Red Sea. Djibouti has a land area of about 23,000 km2, and a population of 818,200 people (Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper (PRSP), Djibouti National Office on Statistics (DISED), 2009) growing at 2.8% per annum, 6.1% considering refugees arrivals. More than 80% of the population lives in urban areas, with 58.1% in the capital city. Djibouti‘s agriculture sector remains very modest and is characterized by its low level of productivity and small contribution to the domestic food supply. The National Strategy for Food and Nutrition Security (2008) estimates that less than 10% of the calories consumed nationally come from domestic production, the remaining 90% being imported from neighbouring countries or from the international market. In both rural and urban areas, households, especially the poorest ones, are overly dependent on the import market to access food and cover their basic nutritional needs. This heavy reliance on regional or international food import makes the country highly vulnerable to external market risks that are often beyond its control (e.g. products availability, abrupt surge in food prices, etc.). Djibouti is characterized also by a very arid and semi-desert type of climate, which makes it extremely sensitive to climate change-induced drought and water scarcity risks.

The country has a fluctuating, low and abrupt precipitation regime with annual mean rainfall of 150 mm, mean temperatures comprised between 17°C and 42°C and extremely high rate of evapotranspiration amounting to 2000 mm per year. The aridity of the climate is further reinforced by a particularly hot and dry West wind regime (Khamsin‘) resulting from the warming and drying of the Eastern African Monsoon (Foehn effect) when blowing over Somalia and Ethiopia‘s mountain ranges. Under historical conditions, Djibouti climatic context is clearly one of high hydrological uncertainty, frequent dry spell and chronic water stress, features that are likely to be worsened by climate change with wide-ranging implications on the national economy, food security and human development in general.The adverse effects of drought and the increased vulnerability to climate change are high in all rural areas of Djibouti. However, the two large, flat and semi-desertic plains of Petit Bara and Grand Bara, which are important cross-roads for transhumance movements (from the eastern part of the country to the south-west), are particularly exposed to drought and have been prioritized by the NAPA as priority areas that require urgent adaptation interventions to secure water resources and conserve soil related ecosystems on which local communities depend. The targeted area is located in the district of Ali Sabieh (South of the country) and ranges over nearly 30 km long and 12 km wide.

**OBJECTIVE AND SCOPE:**

The project "***Development of agropastoral perimeters as a climate change adaptation strategy for poor rural communities in Djibouti***" is funded by the Adaptation Fund (US $ 4,658,556. ), implemented by UNDP and implemented by the MHUE. The invention area of the project is located in the regions of Arta and Ali Sabieh. This project is intended to help strengthen the resilience of these populations to shocks related to these climate changes. The actual project activities started in 2013.

The project was designed to mobilize and secure sustainable water resources for agro-pastoral communities. It also aims to develop sustainable agro-pastoral systems to provide better fodder production capacities (diversification of agricultural production). The project also plans to develop microfinance products to facilitate and promote agro-pastoral production systems that are climate resilient.

The key expected outcomes of the project are:

* Capacities to mobilize and secure sustainable water resources to agro-pastoral communities developed in the face of climate change;
* Sustainable agro-pastoral systems developed, providing greater forage production capacities, diversifying agricultural productions and creating capacities for replication;
* Microfinance products developed to facilitate and promote diversified and climate resilient agro-pastoral production systems.

The TE will be conducted according to the guidance, rules and procedures reflected in the ‘UNDP Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-supported, GEF-financed Projects’ (2012), henceforth referred to as ‘TE Guidance’.[[2]](#footnote-2)

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.

**EVALUATION APPROACH AND METHOD:**

An overall approach and method 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 TE Guidance. A set of questions covering each of these criteria will be provided to the selected evaluator (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 operational focal point, UNDP Country Office, project team, UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based in the region and key stakeholders.

DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

The evaluator is expected to conduct a field mission to the region of Arta, including the following project sites *(Didjander 1, Omar Djagga , Wadjaleh, Kourtimalei , Yabeh, Hamboucto, Qor Qaloc*). 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 tracking tools, project files, national strategic and legal documents, and any other materials that the evaluator considers useful for this evidence-based assessment. The project team will provide these documents to the selected evaluator.

Interviews will be held with the following organizations and individuals at a minimum:

* Ministry of Housing, Urbanism and Environment
* Focal Points of the Ministry of Agriculture
* Institute of Sciences of Life / CERD
* Djibouti Social Development Agency (DSDA)
* State Secretariat National Solidarity
* UNDP Program Officer
* National Director of Projects
* Deputy Director of DATE
* Project coordinator
* Socio-economic consultant
* Agronomist consultant
* Hydrologist Consultant
* Project agro-pastoralists
* The beneficiaries of the project
* Technical advice / focal points of the project

The evaluator will review all relevant sources of information, such as the project document, project reports – including Annual APR/PIR, project budget revisions, midterm review, progress reports, 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.

**EVALUATION CRITERIA & RATINGS:**

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

* Monitoring and Evaluation design at entry
* Monitoring and Evaluation Plan Implementation
* Overall quality of M&E
* Relevance
* Effectiveness
* Efficiency
* Overall Project Outcome Rating
* Quality of UNDP Implementation – Implementing Agency (IA)
* Quality of Execution - Executing Agency (EA)
* Overall quality of Implementation / Execution
* Sustainability of Financial resources
* Socio-political Sustainability
* Institutional framework and governance sustainability
* Environmental sustainability
* Overall likelihood of sustainability

The completed Required Ratings table (as found in the TE Guidance) must be included in the evaluation executive summary. The obligatory rating scales can be found in the TE Guidance.

A full recommended report outline can be found in the TE Guidance.

**PROJECT FINANCE AND 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 | UNDP own |  | Government | Partner Agency | Total |  |
| (type/source) | financing (mill. US$) | (mill. US$) |  | (mill. US$) | (mill. US$) |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Planned |  | Actual | Planned |  | Actual | Planned | Actual | Planned | Actual |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Grants |  | 0.15 |  | 0.15 | 2.0 |  | 2.0 |  |  | 2.15 | 2.15 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Loans/Concessions |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| • | In‐kind |  |  |  | 0.2 |  | 0.2 |  |  | 0.2 | 0.2 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | support |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| • | Other |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 12.1 |  | 12.1 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Totals |  | 0.15 |  | 0.15 | 2.2 |  | 2.2 |  | 12.1 | 2.35 | 14.45 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**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 [a useful tool for gauging progress to impact is the 2009 Review of Outcomes to Impacts (ROtI) method developed by the GEF Evaluation Office].

**CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS & LESSONS:**

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

**IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS:**

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

**EVALUATION TIMEFRAME:**

The total duration of the evaluation will be 30 days over a period of 4 weeks, according to the following plan:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Activity** | Timing | Completion Date |
|  |  |  |
| **Preparation** | 3 days | 18 September 2018 |
|  |  |  |
| **Evaluation Mission** | 12 days | 30 September 2018 |
| **Draft Evaluation Report** | 7 days | 9 October 2018 |
|  |  |  |
| **Final Report with comments** | 5 days | 5 November 2018 |
|  |  |  |

**DELIVERABLES:**

The evaluation team is expected to deliver the following:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Deliverable | Content | Timing | Responsibilities |
|  |  |  |  |
| **Inception** | Evaluator provides | No later than 2 weeks | Evaluator submits to UNDP CO |
| **Report** | clarifications on timing | before the evaluation |  |
|  | and method | mission |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| **Presentation** | Initial Findings | End of evaluation mission | To project management, UNDP |
|  |  |  | CO |
|  |  |  |  |
| **Draft Final** | Full report, (per annexed | Within 3 weeks of the | Sent to CO, reviewed by RTA, |
| **Report** | template) with annexes | evaluation mission | PCU, GEF OFPs |
|  |  |  |  |
| **Final Report\*** | Revised report | Within 1 week of receiving | Sent to CO for uploading to UNDP |
|  |  | UNDP comments on draft | 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 for an audit trail template.

**PAYMENT MODALITIES AND SPECIFICATIONS:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| % | Milestone |
| 10% | *at* submission and approval of inception report |
| 40% | Following submission and approval of the 1st draft terminal evaluation report |
| 50% | Following submission and approval (UNDP‐CO and UNDP RTA) of the final terminal evaluation |
|  | report |
|  |  |

COMPETENCIES

**CORPORATE COMPETENCIES:**

* Demonstrates integrity by modelling the UN’s values and ethical standards;
* Promotes the vision, mission and strategic goals of UN/UNDP;
* Displays cultural, gender, religion, race, nationality and age sensitivity and adaptability;

**FUNCTIONAL COMPETENCIES:**

* Ability to lead strategic planning, results-based management and reporting;
* Builds strong relationships with clients, focuses on impact and result for the client and responds positively to feedback;
* Consistently approaches work with energy and a positive, constructive attitude;
* Demonstrates good oral and written communication skills;
* Demonstrates ability to manage complexities and work under pressure, as well as conflict resolution skills.
* Capability to work effectively under deadline pressure and to take on a range of responsibilities;
* Ability to work in a team, good decision-making skills, communication and writing skills.

Evaluation consultant 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'.

REQUIRED SKILLS AND EXPERIENCE

The evaluation team will be composed of 1-international and 1 national evaluators*.* The international consultant will be designated as 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.

**EDUCATION:**

* An advanced degree in environment, agriculture, climate change, economics or other closely related field.

**EXPERIENCE:**

* Minimum 10 years of relevant professional experience;
* Knowledge of UNDP and AF;
* Previous experience with results‐based monitoring and evaluation methodologies;
* Excellent communication skills;
* Demonstrable analytical skills;
* Project review experiences within United Nations system will be considered an asset;
* Experience with evaluating similar AF financed projects is an advantage.
* Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender;

**LANGUAGE:**

* Fluency in written and spoken English is required;

**APPLICATION REQUIREMENTS:**

Qualified candidates are requested to apply online via this website. The application should contain:

* CV In English (or in French, as appropriate);
* Financial Proposal\*- (using the standard template) Costs related to missions will be paid separately as per UNDP rules and regulations;
* Incomplete applications will not be considered. Please make sure you have provided all requested materials.
* **Please note that UNDP jobsite system allows only one uploading of application document, so please make sure that you merge all your documents into one single file**.

\*Please note that the financial proposal is all-inclusive and shall take into account various expenses incurred by the consultant/contractor during the contract period (e.g. fee, health insurance, vaccination and any other relevant expenses related to the performance of services...).

Payments will be made only upon confirmation of UNDP on delivering on the contract obligations in a satisfactory manner.

Individual Consultants are responsible for ensuring they have vaccinations/inoculations when travelling to certain countries, as designated by the UN Medical Director. Consultants are also required to comply with the UN security directives set forth under dss.un.org

General Terms and conditions as well as other related documents can be found under:  <http://on.undp.org/t7fJs>

**Qualified women and members of minorities are encouraged to apply.**

Due to large number of applications we receive, we are able to inform only the successful candidates about the outcome or status of the selection process.

**EVALUATION OF APPLICANTS:**

Individual consultants will be evaluated based on a cumulative analysis taking into consideration the combination of the applicants’ qualifications and financial proposal.

The award of the contract should be made to the individual consultant whose offer has been evaluated and determined as:

* Responsive/compliant/acceptable; and
* Having received the highest score out of a pre-determined set of weighted technical (desk reviews based on cv) and financial criteria specific to the solicitation.

Only the highest ranked candidates who would be found qualified for the job will be considered for the Financial Evaluation.

* Technical Criteria - 70% of total evaluation
* Financial Criteria - 30% of total evaluation

Only candidates obtaining a minimum of 60 points would be considered for the Financial Evaluation

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Criteria | Weight  | Max. Point |
| Technical | 70% | 70 |
| University degree in a relevant field, such as ecology, biological science, environmental management, or similar; | 10 | 10 |
| Minimum of 5 years of demonstrated experience in project evaluation (MTR and TE) | 30 | 20 |
| Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender and biodiversity; experience in gender sensitive evaluation and analysis | 10 | 5 |
| Experience in facilitation of multi-stakeholder workshops and broad-based consultative processes; | 10 | 10 |
| Sound understanding on linkages between climate change, ecosystems and small-scale Infrastructures evidenced through past work experience; | 5 | 5 |
| Language requirement:Excellent written communication skills in French and ability to communicate in English | 5 | 5 |
| Financial proposal | 30 % | 30 |

ANNEXES TO THE TOR

* Project Logical Framework
* List of Documents to be Reviewed by the Evaluators
* Evaluation Questions
* Rating Scales
* Evaluation Consultant Code of Conduct and Agreement Form
* Evaluation Report Outline
* Evaluation Report Clearance Form
* Audit Trail

**ANNEX A: PROJECT LOGICAL FRAMEWORK**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Outcomes and** |  | **Targets and** |  | **Sources of** |  | **Outputs and Indicators** |
|  | **Indicators** |  | **Milestones** |  |  | **Verification** |  |  |
|  | **Outcome** |  | **1:** | Completion of | EIA | Comprehensive | **Output 1.1.** Rainfall-runoff and groundwater models developed and institutionalized |
|  | Capacities |  | to | and |  |  | pedological, | review by PMU | within the | Study and Research Center of Djibouti (Centre d‘Etudes et de la Recherche |
|  | mobilize and secure | hydrological, |  | and | after 1 month of | de Djibouti, CERD ) and the Water Department of the Ministry of Agriculture to project |
|  | sustainable |  | water | hydro-geological |  |  | implementation; | likely climate change impacts on the water availability in the areas of Petit Bara and |
|  | resources | to | agro- | studies after | first | 6 |  |  |  | Grand Bara; |
|  | pastoral |  |  |  | months of project; |  | O&M | manuals |  |  |
|  | communities |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | prepared | by | **Indicator 1.1.1:** |
|  | developed | in | the | All |  |  | community | Month 6; |  | Approved detailed EIA and submission of hydrological, hydro-geological reports |
|  | face | of | climate | members |  | have | been |  |  |  | indicating expected current and future water demand scenarios for appropriate locations; |
|  | change |  |  |  |  | trained in | good | water | Quarterly |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | practice |  | guidelines | maintenance |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | within | the | first | 3 | checks |  | for |  |  |
|  | **Indicator 1.1:** |  | months |  | of |  | water | boreholes | and | **Output 1.2:** Based on model outputs, controlled groundwater extraction, artificial |
|  | Number | of | planned | infrastructure |  |  |  | pumping |  | recharge and climate ―smart‖ management plans that take into account seasonal changes |
|  | boreholes, dams and | development; |  |  |  | systems; |  | in precipitation as well as long term mean amounts, projections, developed, and |
|  | water storage basins |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | benefiting | 30,000 people; |
|  | with associated solar | At | least | one | water | Annual reservoir |  |  |
|  | pumping | equipment | management |  |  |  | seepage tests by | **Indicator 1.2.1:** |
|  | in | place |  | and | committee | is | created | PMU; |  |  | Percentage of total hectares of agro-pastoralist's land which is irrigated by boreholes; |
|  | operational; |  |  | in each | shade | garden |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | zone | (6 |  | total) | after | Quarterly water | **Indicator 1.2.2:** |
|  | **Indicator 1.2:** |  | first year; |  |  |  |  | quality tests; |  | Amount of time spent in search of water from boreholes; |
|  | Water |  | resources |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | secured | for | shade | 228 ha and at least | Training |  |  |  |
|  | garden | irrigation to | 30,000 | people |  | are | evaluation | by | **Output 1.3:** Community-based surface water harvesting infrastructures, such as earth |
|  | cover | 228 | ha | and | served | with | secure | PMU | every | 3 | dams, percolation basins and subsurface dams which increase surface supply and |
|  | serve 30,000 people; | water infrastructure; | months; |  | groundwater tables in support of shade-garden pilot schemes (see 2.1) introduced and |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | related local management rules and structures established; |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Annual survey; |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | **Indicator 1.3.1:** |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Project | terminal | Percentage of total hectares of agro-pastoralist's land which is irrigated by surface water |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | evaluation. | sources; |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | **Indicator 1.3.2:** |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Amount of time spent in search of water from surface water sources; |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | **Output 1.4:** Good practice guidelines based on knowledge sharing for integrated |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | groundwater and surface water maintenance and use developed through stakeholder-led |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | and participatory processes including community water management teams, government |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | water regulators, Ministry‘s technical staff, and agriculture extension services; |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | **Indicator 1.4.1:** |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Number of maintenance efforts on water systems and percentage of successful local |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | maintenance efforts; |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | **Indicator 14.2:** |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Management plans and good practice guidelines emphasized and enforced by the water |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | infrastructure management committee; |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Outcome 2:** |  | Technical staff | of | the | Daily surveys of | **Output 2.1:** Six sets of 38 pilot community-managed agro-pastoral shade garden plots (1 |
| Climate |  | resilient | Ministry |  |  | of | agro-pastoral | ha per family) established that includes date palms, multi-purpose fence trees, local and |
| agro-pastoral | Agriculture and | lead | plots |  | by | regional varieties of climate resilient forage, vegetables and fruits (henna, dates, jujube, |
| systems | developed, | farmers from agro- | technical | and mango, etc) benefiting 228 agro-pastoral families - approximately 2,800 people; |
| providing |  | greater | pastoral | zones | have | specialists; |  |
| forage | production | been | trained |  | in |  |  |  | **Indicator 2.1.1:** |
| capacities, |  | drought | tolerant | Monthly | reports | Number of pastoralists engaged in shade gardening, agro-pastoral production; |
| diversifying |  | agriculture by the end | to | PMUby |  |
| agricultural |  | of the 2nd year of the | agricultural | **Indicator 2.1.2:** |
| productions | and | project; |  |  |  | technical | Percentage of families who can produce fodder, fruit and vegetables to satisfy their needs |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 86 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| creating |  | capacities |  |  |  |  |  |  | specialists; | with extra to sell in the market; |
| for replication |  | 228 | shade |  | garden |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | owners | have | been | Quarterly |  |
| **Indicator** |  | **2.** | **1:** | trained in good agro- | surveys | by | **Output 2.2:** Improved extension service for shade gardening benefiting 228 agro- |
| Number |  | of | shade | pastoral |  | practices | PMU; |  | pastoral families - approximately 2,800 people (targeted training for extension service |
| gardens |  | developed | within | the | first | 3 |  |  | personnel and agro-pastoralists designed and delivered on the issues grazing, forage |
| including | irrigation | months | of |  | shade | Project | terminal | management, cultivation techniques, crop protection, water efficiency, composting |
| reservoirs, |  |  |  | garden development; | evaluation. | methods, etc, in the context of increasing climate change pressures); |
| distribution |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| networks, |  |  | and | 114 | hectares |  | of | salt |  |  | **Indicator 2.2.1:** |
| fencing; |  |  |  |  | and | drought-resistant |  |  | Number of project beneficiaries disaggregated according to gender that have been trained |
|  |  |  |  |  | forage | established |  |  | on cultivation techniques, crop rotation, livestock hygiene, etc by specialists; |
| **Indicator 2.2:** % of | after | 6 | months | of |  |  |  |
| population | who | has | shade |  |  | garden |  |  | **Indicator 2.2.2:** |
| developed |  | shade | development; |  |  |  |  |  | Percentage change in beneficiaries' capacities to cultivate their own land and raise |
| gardens | resilient | to |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | livestock autonomously; |
| climate |  |  | change | At least one women‘s |  |  |  |
| impacts |  |  |  | by | tree | seedling |  | nursery |  |  |  |
| demonstrating a) the | has | been created | in |  |  | **Output 2.3.** Well-sized feed/forage stocking facilities created in both project locations to |
| cultivation |  |  | of | each | shade |  | garden |  |  | allow better management of forage availability over repeated drought periods; |
| diversified, | drought | zone (6 total) by the |  |  |  |
| resistant |  |  |  |  | end | of | the |  | second |  |  | **Indicator 2.3.1:** |
| grasses/trees, b) crop | year; |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Number of constructed storage facilities per agro-pastoral zone; |
| rotation | techniques |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| and | c) |  | water | 114 | hectares | of |  |  | **Indicator 2.3.2:** |
| efficient |  | irrigation | productive |  |  |  |  |  | Percentage of project beneficiaries that utilize storage facilities; |
| practices. |  |  |  | fruit/vegetable | plants |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | and trees after 2 yrs. |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Outcome 3:** | 228 | agro-pastoralists | Quarterly | **Output 3.1:** A three-tiered adaptation-oriented micro-finance scheme that supports |
| Micro-credit | in | cooperatives have | reviews | by climate-resilient shade gardening practices in the Grand and Petit Bara plains developed |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | 87 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| products |  | developed | received |  | financial | ADDS; |  |  | through partnership with | the Djiboutian Agency for Social Development (Agence |
| to | facilitate | and | education and training |  |  |  | Djiboutienne de Developpement Sociale, ADDS ) which generates a total value of US$ |
| promote | diversified | on |  | micro-credit |  |  |  | 300,000 throughout the project ; |
| and climate resilient | principals by ADDS 6 | Quarterly |  |  |  |  |
| agro-pastoral |  | months | after | shade | surveys |  | by | **Indicator 3.1.1:** |  |
| production systems | garden development; | PMU; |  |  | Percentage of beneficiaries trained in micro-credit principles; |
| **Indicator 3.1** |  | At least 300 agro- | Yearly | reviews | **Indicator 3.1.2:** |  |
| Number |  | of | MF | pastoralists |  | and | (for the last | 3 | Number of technical guides prepared detailing how MF can be used for adaptation- |
| products |  | deployed | potentially |  | 300 | years | of | the | oriented activities; |  |
| to | agro-pastoralists | pastoralists | organized | project) | on | the |  |  |  |
| and |  | pastoralists | in | 6 | cooperatives | effectiveness | of |  |  |  |
| which provide loans | using MF products by | MF |  | for | **Output 3.2:** At least 300 agro-pastoralists have been organised to form agro-pastoral |
| ear-marked | for | the end of the project. | adaptation by an | cooperatives (including women cooperatives) to facilitate training on climate-resilient |
| adaptation |  | to |  |  |  |  |  | independent, |  | agro-pastoral practices and to support the development of financial literacy and the |
| climate-change; |  | At | least | 3 | women | international |  | diversification of agricultural activities; |
|  |  |  |  |  | cooperatives | formed | specialist |  |  |  |  |
| **Indicator 3.2:** |  | by the end of the |  |  |  | **Indicator 3.2.1:** |  |
| % | of |  | total | project; |  |  |  | Project | terminal | Number of loans and percentage of payback on loans; |
| population | using |  |  |  |  |  | evaluation. |  |  |  |  |
| micro-credit |  | At | least | 1 | mobile |  |  |  | **Indicator 3.2.2:** |  |
| products conditioned | banking |  |  | service |  |  |  | Percentage of population in each tier of 3-tiered microfinance programme (safety net, |
| on |  | establishing | provided at the end of |  |  |  | nano- and microfinance) |  |
| shade-gardens | and | the | 3rd | year of the |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| related agro-pastoral | project. |  |  |  |  |  |  | **Output 3.3:** | At least 4 established agro-pastoral cooperatives develop comprehensive |
| activities to enhance |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | climate adaptation plans incorporating lessons learned on best practices for shade |
| their resilience to | At | least | 4 | established |  |  |  | gardens to be integrated into the National Programme for Food Security and the National |
|  |  |  | Microfinance Policy in | order to facilitate the replication of shade-garden-based |
| climate change. |  | agro-pastoral |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | adaptation solutions. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | cooperatives | are |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Indicator 3.3:** |  | formed by the end of |  |  |  | **Indicator 3.3.1:** |  |
| Community-driven | the 3rd year to develop |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Percentage of population which has been organized into adaptation plan cooperatives |
| adaptation plans are | comprehensive |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| integrated | into | the | climate |  | adaptation |  |  |  | **Indicator 3.3.2:** |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Attendance | and participation at bi-annual workshops used to document community |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| National Programme | plans |  |  |  |  | recommended measures to improve the adaptation-oriented MF products |
| for Food Security |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| and the National MF | 6 bi-annual workshops |  |  |
| Policy | have | been | conducted |  |  |
|  | to | facilitate | the |  |  |
|  | collection |  | and |  |  |
|  | documentation | of |  |  |
|  | ideas | to | promote |  |  |
|  | sustainable |  | MF |  |  |
|  | products at each stage |  |  |
|  | of the shade | garden |  |  |
|  | development process |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

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

* GEF Project Information Form (PIF), Project Document, and Log Frame Analysis (LFA)
* Project Implementation Plan
* Implementing/Executing partner arrangements
* List and contact details for project staff, key project stakeholders, including Project Boards, and other partners to be consulted
* Project sites, highlighting suggested visits
* The country's national strategy document
* The paper on the country's long-term vision (Vision Djibouti 2035)
* Lessons Learned Report
* Mid Term Review (MTR) Report
* Annual Project Implementation (APR/PIR) Reports
* Project budget and financial data
* Project Tracking Tool, at baseline, at mid‐term, and at terminal points
* UNDP Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF)
* UNDP Country Programme Document (CPD)
* UNDP Country Programme Action Plan (CPAP)
* GEF focal area strategic program objectives

 **ANNEX C: EVALUATION QUESTIONS**

This Evaluation Criteria Matrix must be fully completed/amended by the consultant and included in the TE inception report and as an Annex to the TE report.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Evaluative Criteria Questions** |  | **Indicators** |  | **Sources** |  | **Methodology** |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Relevance: How does the project relate to the main objectives of the GEF focal area, and to the environment and development priorities at the local, regional and national levels?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | • | • | • | • |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | • | • | • | • |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | • | • | • | • |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved? |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | • | • | • | • |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | • | • | • | • |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | • |  | • | • |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in‐line with international and national norms and standards?

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | • | • | • | • |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  | • | • | • | • |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  | • | • | • | • |
|  |  |  |  |  |

Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, social‐economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long‐term project results?

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | • | • | • | • |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  | • | • | • | • |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  | • | • | • | • |
|  |  |  |  |  |

Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward, reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status?

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | • | • | • | • |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  | • | • | • | • |
|  |  |  |  |  |

**ANNEX D: RATING SCALES**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| ***Ratings for Effectiveness, Efficiency,*** | ***Sustainability ratings:*** | ***Relevance ratings*** |
| ***Overall Project Outcome Rating, M&E, IA*** |  |  |  |
| ***& EA Execution*** |  |  |  |
| 6. | Highly Satisfactory (HS): no | 4. | Likely (L): negligible risks to | 2. Relevant (R) |
| shortcomings | sustainability |  |
| 5. | Satisfactory (S): minor shortcomings | 3. | Moderately Likely (ML): moderate risks | 1. Not relevant |
| 4. | Moderately Satisfactory (MS): |  |  | (NR) |
| moderate shortcomings | 2. | Moderately Unlikely (MU): significant |  |
| 3. | Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): | risks |  |
| significant shortcomings | 1. | Unlikely (U): severe risks |  |
| 2. | Unsatisfactory (U): major |  |  |  |
| shortcomings |  |  |  |
| 1. | Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): severe |  |  |  |
| shortcomings |  |  |  |
| *Additional ratings where relevant:* |  |  |  |
| Not Applicable (N/A) |  |  |  |
| Unable to Assess (U/A) |  |  |  |

**ANNEX E: EVALUATION CONSULTANT CODE OF CONDUCT AND AGREEMENT FORM**

**Evaluator:**

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 Form3**

**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: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

3www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct

**ANNEX F: EVALUATION REPORT OUTLINE4**

1. 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
2. Executive Summary
	* Project Summary Table
	* Project Description (brief)
	* Evaluation Rating Table
	* Summary of conclusions, recommendations and lessons
3. Acronyms and Abbreviations
4. Introduction
	* Purpose of the evaluation
	* Scope & Methodology
	* Structure of the evaluation report
5. 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
6. Findings

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | (In addition to a descriptive assessment, all criteria marked with (\*) must be rated6) |
| **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
* 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 (\*)

4The Report length should not exceed *40* pages in total (not including annexes).

1. UNDP Style Manual, Office of Communications, Partnerships Bureau, updated November 2008
2. See Annex D for rating scales.
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* 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
1. 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
2. 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
	* Report Clearance Form
	* *Annexed in a separate file:* TE audit trail
	* *Annexed in a separate file:* Terminal GEF Tracking Tool, if applicable

**ANNEX G: EVALUATION REPORT CLEARANCE FORM**

Evaluation Report Reviewed and Cleared by

UNDP Country Office

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

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

UNDP GEF RTA

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

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

**ANNEX H: TE REPORT AUDIT TRAIL**

**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Para No./ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Comment/Feedback on the draft TE |  |  | TE team response and |  |
|  |  | Author |  |  | # |  |  | comment |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | report |  |  | actions taken |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | location |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**ANNEX D: RATING SCALES**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| ***Ratings for Effectiveness, Efficiency,*** | ***Sustainability ratings:*** | ***Relevance ratings*** |
| ***Overall Project Outcome Rating, M&E, IA*** |  |  |  |
| ***& EA Execution*** |  |  |  |
| 6. | Highly Satisfactory (HS): no | 4. | Likely (L): negligible risks to | 2. Relevant (R) |
| shortcomings | sustainability |  |
| 5. | Satisfactory (S): minor shortcomings | 3. | Moderately Likely (ML): moderate risks | 1. Not relevant |
| 4. | Moderately Satisfactory (MS): |  |  | (NR) |
| moderate shortcomings | 2. | Moderately Unlikely (MU): significant |  |
| 3. | Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): | risks |  |
| significant shortcomings | 1. | Unlikely (U): severe risks |  |
| 2. | Unsatisfactory (U): major |  |  |  |
| shortcomings |  |  |  |
| 1. | Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): severe |  |  |  |
| shortcomings |  |  |  |
| *Additional ratings where relevant:* |  |  |  |
| Not Applicable (N/A) |  |  |  |
| Unable to Assess (U/A) |  |  |  |

1. In French: Ministère de l’Habitat, de l’Urbanisme, de l’Aménagement du Territoire et de l’Environnement(MHUATE) [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. The guidance document for UNDP-supported GEF financed projects can be used for AF financed projects as well. The document is available via this [link](http://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=2&ved=0CCUQFjAB&url=http%3A%2F%2Fweb.undp.org%2Fevaluation%2Fdocuments%2Fguidance%2Fgef%2Fundp-gef-te-guide.pdf&ei=TR5JVZfCFYadgwTrvIH4Bw&usg=AFQjCNGsRhcXqiAAWwMGYKwml2H4hQ8d8Q&bvm=bv.92291466,d.eXY&cad=rja). [↑](#footnote-ref-2)