Terminal Evaluation Terms 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***Enhancing adaptive capacity of communities to climate change-related floods in the North Coast and Islands Region of Papua New Guinea*** (PIMS 4452)

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

Project Summary Table

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Project Title:  |  |
| GEF Project ID: | PIMS 4452 |   | *at endorsement (Million US$)* | *at completion (Million US$)* |
| UNDP Project ID: | 00074956 | GEF financing:  | 6,018,777 |  |
| Country: | Papua New Guinea | IA/EA own: | 100,000      |       |
| Region: | Asia Pacific | Government: | 220,000      |       |
| Focal Area: |  | Other (DFAT)r: | 500,000 |       |
| FA Objectives, (OP/SP): |       | Total co-financing: | 820,000 |       |
| Executing Agency: | Climate Change Development Authority | Total Project Cost: | 6,838,777 |       |
| Other Partners involved: | National Weather Service,Conservation and Environmental Protection Authority, National Disaster Centre, Provincial Governments of Morobe, New Ireland, East Sepik, Madang and Northern Province, World Vision International, WCS, WWF, ADRA, Asian Disaster Preparedness Centre  | ProDoc Signature (date project began):  |      17 May 2012 |
| (Operational) Closing Date: | Proposed:October 2016 | Actual:December 2017 |

Objective and Scope

The impact of climate change-related hazards in the Papua New Guinea (PNG) country has been increasing in intensity and frequency. Further impacts from climate change include the loss of food gardens due to extensive flooding (both in coastal and riverine areas) combined with extended periods of drought. The rising sea level is causing some of PNG’s islands to be gradually submerged. Salt water intrusion is affecting groundwater particularly in the islands and in coastal areas, threatening domestic water supplies and agriculture. With the onset and multitude of climate change impacts, the country’s economy, environment and people are becoming more vulnerable and are at risk of not meeting basic human development needs. Climate change puts at risk the achievement of the goals set out in PNG’s major development plans.

Flooding in the coastal areas is one of the most important climate change related hazards in the North Coast and the Islands Region as settlements are usually located in the coasts, particularly the provincial capitals of East Sepik (Wewak), Madang (Madang), Morobe (Lae), and West New Britain (Kimbe). Similarly, in the hinterland areas, climate change-related inland flooding is the most pressing hazard with the largest potential for wide-spread damage.

The project was designed to enable the government of PNG to systematically assess vulnerability of these coastal and riverine communities to develop the necessary institutional and individual capacity at national, provincial, district, and local level to enable decentralized and well-informed decision-making. The project has supported development of guidance on climate resilient coastal and inland protection, land-use planning; and early warning relevant to the PNG context to assist planners, decision-makers and practitioners understand climate risks when making development and investment decisions. Project interventions at the community level seek to address specific vulnerability characteristics of two distinct geographic areas which are: i) selected coastal and island communities of the Northern and Island Coastal Provinces of East Sepik, Madang, Morobe, New Ireland and Northern, which face coastal flooding risks; ii) selected river communities in Northern Coastal Provinces exposed to inland flooding risks.

The objective of the project is to strengthen the ability of coastal and riverine communities in Papua New Guinea to make informed decisions; and to undertake concrete actions to adapt to climate change-driven hazards affecting their specific locations. This objective was to be achieved through four outcomes (and 11 outputs):

1. Reduced exposure and increased adaptive capacity of coastal communities to flood-related risks and hazards in 8 communities and 3 cities of the 11 provinces of the North Coast and Islands Region;
2. Reduced exposure and increased adaptive capacity of 8 riverine communities of the 4 provinces (East Sepik, Oro, Morobe and Madang Provinces);
3. Strengthened institutional capacity at national and sub-national levels to integrate climate change-related risks into sectoral policies and management practices;
4. Strengthened awareness, education and advocacy to promote ownership of adaptation and climate change-related risk reduction processes at national and sub-national levels.

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 objective of the evaluation 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.

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 at least 3 of the 5 pilot locations including the following project sites New Ireland, Madang and Morobe. Interviews will be held with the following organizations and individuals at a minimum: Provincial governments of Morobe, New Ireland and Madang. World Vision, Wildlife Conservation Society, World Wildlife Fund, beneficiary communities, schools in the above three provinces.

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](#_TOR_Annex_B:) of this Terms of Reference.

Evaluation Criteria & Ratings

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

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

Project finance / cofinance

The Evaluation will assess the key financial aspects of the project, including the extent of co-financing planned and realized. Project cost and funding data will be required, including annual expenditures. Variances between planned and actual expenditures will need to be assessed and explained. Results from recent financial audits, as available, should be taken into consideration. The evaluator(s) will receive assistance from the Country Office (CO) and Project Team to obtain financial data 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  | 100,000 | 100,000 | 220,000 | 222,000 | 500,000 | 500,00 | 820,000 | 820,000 |
| Loans/Concessions  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| * In-kind support
 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| * Other
 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Totals | 100,000 | 100,000 | 220,000 | 222,000 | 500,000 | 500,00 | 820,000 | 820,000 |

Mainstreaming

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

Impact

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

Conclusions, recommendations & lessons

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

Implementation arrangements

The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation resides with the UNDP CO in Papua New Guinea. 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 *31* days according to the following plan:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Activity** | Timing | Completion Date |
| **Preparation** | *4* days *(recommended: 2-4)* | *13/11/2017- 17/11/2017* |
| **Evaluation Mission** | *15* days (*r: 7-15)* | *20/11/2017-08/12/2017* |
| **Drafting Evaluation Report and stakeholder validation** | *10* days (*r: 5-10*) | *4/12/2017-15/12/2017* |
| **Final Report** | *2* days *(r;: 1-2*) | *18/12/2017-19/12/2017* |

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 weeks before the evaluation mission.  | Evaluator submits to UNDP CO  |
| **Presentation** | Initial Findings  | End of evaluation mission | To project management, UNDP CO |
| **Draft Final Report**  | Full report, (per annexed template) with annexes | Within 3 weeks of the evaluation mission | Sent to CO, reviewed by RTA, PCU, GEF OFPs |
| **Final Report\*** | Revised report  | Within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft  | Sent to CO for uploading to UNDP ERC.  |

\*When submitting the final evaluation report, the evaluator is required also to provide an 'audit trail', detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final evaluation report.

Qualifications and expewrience

The international consultant will be the Team Leader responsible for preparing the final evaluation report and its submission to UNDP.The consultant shall have prior experience in evaluating similar projects. Experience with GEF/Adaptation Fund financed projects is an advantage. The evaluator selected should not have participated in the project preparation and/or implementation and should not have conflict of interest with project related activities.

The Team Leader must present the following qualifications:

1. Advanced degree and minimum *10* years of relevant professional experience
2. Previous experience with results‐based monitoring and evaluation methodologies;
3. Technical knowledge in the targeted focal area(s) such as climate change adaptation, disaster risk management, environmental policy/planning/science, international development, public policy, engineering, other social sciences
4. Experience in managing or evaluating multi-donor funded projects particularly in Small Island States or Developing Countries;
5. Experience working with the AF, GEF or GEF evaluations, AF evaluations or other UN agencies and/or international organizations is recommended;
6. Experience in leading small multi-disciplinary, multi-national teams to deliver quality products in high stress, short deadline situations.

Evaluation

**Cumulative analysis**

The proposals will be evaluated using the cumulative analysis method with a split 70% technical and 30% financial scoring. The proposal with the highest cumulative scoring will be awarded the contract. Applications will be evaluated technically and points are attributed based on how well the proposal meets the requirements of the Terms of Reference using the guidelines detailed in the table below:

When using this weighted scoring method, the award of the contract to 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 weighting; 70%

\* Financial Criteria weighting; 30%

Only candidates obtaining a minimum of 49 points in the Technical Evaluation would be considered for the Financial Evaluation. Interviews may be conducted as part of technical assessment for shortlisted proposals.

Evaluation Matrix

| **Criteria** | **Points** | **Percentage** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Qualification** |  | 10% |
| * Advanced degree in relevant field
 | 10 |  |
| **Experience** |  | 60% |
| * Minimum 10 years of relevant professional experience
* Previous experience with results‐based monitoring and evaluation methodologies;
* Technical knowledge in the targeted focal area(s) such as climate change adaptation, disaster risk management, environmental policy/planning/science, international development, public policy, engineering, other social sciences
* Experience in managing or evaluating multi-donor funded projects particularly in Small Island States or Developing Countries;
* Experience working with the AF, GEF or GEF evaluations, AF evaluations or other UN agencies and/or international organizations is recommended;
* Experience in leading small multi-disciplinary, multi-national teams to deliver quality products in high stress, short deadline situations.
 | 101010101010 |  |
| Technical Criteria ( Minimum score (49 out of 70) to be technically competent |  | 70% |
| \*\*If necessary interviews shall also be conducted as part of the technical evaluation to ascertain best value for money.  |  |  |
| Financial Criteria – Lowest Price |  | 30% |
| Total |  | 100% |

Evaluator Ethics

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

Payment modalities and specifications

(*this payment schedule is indicative, to be filled in by the CO and UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based on their standard procurement procedures)*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| % | Milestone |
| *10%* | At contract signing |
| *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  |

Application process

1. The application should contain a current and complete C.V. in English with indication of the e‐mail and phone contact
2. Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability using the [template](https://intranet.undp.org/unit/bom/pso/Support%20documents%20on%20IC%20Guidelines/Template%20for%20Confirmation%20of%20Interest%20and%20Submission%20of%20Financial%20Proposal.docx)[[3]](#footnote-3) provided by UNDP;
3. CV and a Personal History Form ([P11 form](http://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/corporate/Careers/P11_Personal_history_form.doc)[[4]](#footnote-4));
4. Brief description of approach to work/technical proposal of why the individual considers him/herself as the most suitable for the assignment, and a proposed methodology on how they will approach and complete the assignment; (max 1 page)
5. Financial Proposal that indicates the all-inclusive fixed total contract price and all other travel related costs (such as flight ticket, per diem, etc), supported by a breakdown of costs, as per template attached to the Letter of Confirmation of Interest template. If an applicant is employed by an organization/company/institution, and he/she expects his/her employer to charge a management fee in the process of releasing him/her to UNDP under Reimbursable Loan Agreement (RLA), the applicant must indicate at this point, and ensure that all such costs are duly incorporated in the financial proposal submitted to UNDP.

Applicants are requested to submit their quotes and availability for the assignment addressed to ( UNDP Resident Representative, UNDP PNG, P.o.Box 1041, Port Moresby, Papua New Guinea) in a sealed envelope indicating the following reference “Consultant for (Climate Change Adaptation Project) Terminal Evaluation” or by email at the following address ONLY: (registry.pg@undp.org) This email address is being protected from spam bots, you need Javascript enabled to view it by (5pm, 3 November, 2017). Incomplete applications will be excluded from further consideration.

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

Annex A: Project Logical Framework

| **Project Strategy** | **Indicator** | **Baseline** | **Target at end of Project** | **Sources of Verification** | **Assumptions** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Objective**Strengthened ability of coastal and riverine communities in Papua New Guinea to make informed decisions about and to undertake concrete actions to adapt to climate change-driven hazards affecting their specific locations | Number of risk-exposed coastal communities protected through adaptation measures | In the current scenario, risk-exposed communities are to a large extent unable to adapt to climate change due to a lack of resources, capacity, knowledge and the necessary support through provincial and national institutions as well as policy frameworks. With the scale of adaptation measures planned for implementation the total population in the 16 targeted communities would be an estimated 32,000  | By the end of the project at least 8 coastal communities are protected through adaptation measures against coastal flooding scenarios, with attention to the special concerns of women as participants and beneficiaries. | Project reportsMinutes form the ATWG & PSC Provincial policy documents, development plansDisaster preparedness and response plans, project monitoring and evaluation reportsGender-disaggregated data reflecting participation of women and in terms of project impacts | Policital stability and commitment to climate compatible development is maintainedPolitical will and commitment by senior government officials to integrate climate change and adaptationStrong coordination amongst climate change stakeholders in the country, especially at provincial levelStrong community leadership, cooperation and support for project activities.Financial resources are allocated from government budgets and cofinanciers to address climate-related risks |
| Number of risk-exposed riverine communities protected through adaptation measures | Eight (8) riverine communities are protected through adaptation measures against inland flooding, with attention to the special concerns of women as participants and beneficiaries |
| Number of provinces with improved climate-related planning and policy frameworks to increase resilience  | At the end of the programme, adaptation to climate change is managed, monitored and planned at the provincial level in the targeted provinces and supported by a framework of policies and plans including disaster preparedeness and response plans, coastal zone management plans. |
| **Project Strategy** | **Indicator** | **Baseline** | **Target at end of Project** | **Sources of Verification** | **Assumptions** |
| **Outcome 1:** Reduced exposure and increased adaptive capacity of coastal communities to flood-related risks and hazards in 8 communities and three cities of the 11 provinces of the North Coast and Islands Region. | Number of communities benefitting from improved protection from coastal floods | The vast majority of communities exposed to coastal flooding is inadequately equipped with resources, capacity and support to adapt to the heightened risks from climate change The total number of inhabitants in the 8 target coastal communities that are vulnerable to coastal flooding is estimated at 16,000. An additional population of 120,000 in the cities of Lae, Wewak and Madang will benefit from the programme’s implementation  | By the end of the project, 8 communities are protected from coastal flooding through adaptation measures that were put in place in a community-led way with the agreements/compacts agreed on by communities to preserve the mangrove forests | *Project reports, monitoring & evaluation reports,* *Minutes from the ATWG, project reports, verification through reports from local CBOs and NGOs**Procurement records of relevant agencies**Site plans for establishment of AWS.**Progress reports from PNGNWS**Distributed weather information reports**Provincial policies, disaster managment plan, project reports**Feasibility studies, provincial coastal infrastructure development plans* | *There is a strong commitment from the communities and their leadership throughout the time of the project**PNGNWS remains committed to expand and manage their weather monitoring and forecasting activities and is adequately funded through government resources to allow for maintenance and further expansion after the project.**There is strong support from district and provincial level officials that ensure the continued cooperation among communities, districts and provinces**Provincial governments are supportive in expanding the role and resources for the climate change officers/focal points**Landowners allowing their land to be used to establish the AWS and voluntary weather recorders are committed and consistently recording data.**The provincial administrations support the identified coastal engineering measures and adopt them in their development plans* *Financial resources are allocated from government budgets and cofinanciers to address climate-related risks*The mangrove-focussed training concept will translate into new community-driven mangrove rehabilitation and conservation initiatives as indicated by feedback from the consultation |
| Number of AWS and voluntary weather stations in operationNumber of communities covered by the improved coastal warning system and weather information  | There is lack of equipment and capacity of the PNGNWS, hence, the forecasting of disasters and extreme weather events is severely limited. | At least 6 tidal gauges and at least 6 AWS and 10 voluntary weather stations established at strategic locations, meet WMO standards and contribute to the monitoring and early warning system. One AWS will have been installed in each target 8 communities. |
| Number of provinces wth comprehensive disaster prepared ness and response plans for coastal flooding in place | The provincial and national-level disaster management frameworks are evidently inadequate to address the risks  | At least four provinces will have a comprehensive disaster preparedness and response plans for coastal flooding in place and will have conducted dry run tests. |
| Number of provincial capitals with assessed engineering measures for adaptation | No effort has been done on this aspect in the target provincial capitals. | For three provincial capitals of Lae, Madang and Wewak suitable coastal engineering measures for adaptation are identified and addressed through respective planning and funding. For three provincial capitals of Lae, Madang and Wewak suitable coastal engineering measures for adaptation are identified and addressed through respective planning and funding.  |
|  | Number of community-led mangrove projects benefitting from support system for mangrove projects | Community-based mangrove projects are undertaken ad-hoc and largely without sufficient expertise and support | 33 community-led mangrove conservation and/or reforestation projects, covering about 100 hectares are supported through the support network and nurseries | Project reports, monitoring and evaluation reportsAnnual reports from the nurseriesGovernment budgets at local and national levels indicating allocation for operation of nurseries |
| Number of mangrove nurseries established and sustainably operatingResources allocated for continued operations of the nurseries | None | Eight (8) regional nurseries operate sustainably supplying the requirements of the target sites and replication areasBefore the end of the project, sufficient resources are allocated by government for the continued operations of the nurseries beyond the life of the project.  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Project Strategy** | **Indicator** | **Baseline** | **Target at end of Project** | **Sources of Verification** | **Assumptions** |
| **Outcome 2:** Reduced exposure and increased adaptive capacity of 8 riverine communities in 4 provinces | Number of communities benefitting from improved protection from inland flooding | The vast majority of communities exposed to inland flooding risk is inadequately equipped with resources, capacity and support to adapt to the changed scenarioThe total number of inhabitants in the 8 target riverine communities that are vulnerable to coastal flooding is estimated at a minimum 32000 people. | By the end of the project, eight communities are protected from inland flooding through adaptation measures that were put in place in a community-led way. | Project reports, monitoring & evaluation reports, Minutes from the ATWG, project reports, verification through reports from local CBOs and NGOsProcurement recordsSite plans for establishment of AWS.Progress reports from PNGNWSDistributed weather information reportsProvincial policies, disaster management plan | There is a strong commitment from the communities and their leadership throughout the time of the projectPNGNWS remains committed to expand and manage their weather monitoring and forecasting activities and is adequately funded through government resources to allow for maintenance and further expansion after the project.There is strong support from district and provincial level officials that ensure the continued cooperation among communities, districts and provincesProvincial governments are supportive in expanding the role and resources for the climate change officers/focal pointsLandowners allowing their land to be used to establish the AWSs.Voluntary weather recorders are committed and consistently recording data. |
| Number of communities covered by the improved warning system and weather information Number of AWS and voluntary weather stations in operation | Disaster preparedness is limited by the lack of and state of facilites and plansThere is lack of equipment and capacity of the PNGNWS is weak, hence theh forecasting of disasters and weather patterns is limited. | At least 6 AWS and at least 20 voluntary weather stations established at strategic locations, meet WMO standards and contribute to the monitoring and early warning system. One AWS will have been installed in each target 8 communities. |
| Number of provinces with comprehensive disaster preparedness and response plan for inland flooding | The provincial and national-level disaster managment frameworks are evidently inadquate  | At least four provinces will have a comprehensive disaster preparedness and response plan for inland flooding in place and will have conducted dry run tests. |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Project Strategy** | **Indicator** | **Baseline** | **Target at end of Project** | **Sources of Verification** | **Assumptions** |
| **Outcome 3:** Strengthened institutional capacity at national and sub-national levels to integrate climate change-related risks into sectoral policies and management practices | Number of national and provincial level policies, strategies, plans and coordinating mechanisms reviewed and incorporating resilience to climate change | Adaptation to the changed climate scenario of the present and future is inadequately considered in national and provincial level policies and planning frameworks  | At the end of the project, all major development plans in the targeted provinces reflect climate change and adaptation considerations and coastal zone management policies are developed for the most populated areas (especially Wewak, Kavieng, Madang, Lae) | Development plans, monitoring and evaluation reportsCoastal zone management policies and their gazettmentProject reports, monitoring and evaluation reports, verification through CBOs and NGOsMinutes of high-level policy meetings (NEC/NCCC/OCCD, etc)Gender-disaggregated data analysis | Senior officials of the provincial administrations are supportive of the project and the integration of climate change and adaptation in development plans and policies. Climate change officers / focal points at the provincial level are able to utilise trainings and resources to build their own and local capacity for adaptationThe Climate Change Act is gazetted and the CEPA is establishedThe government remains committed to the CCDS |
| Number of provincial and national-level officers trained in climate adaptation planning and implementationParticipation of women in project activities | At the provincial level the lack of resources, capacity and in some cases basic management mechanisms/plans is evidentTo be established at project inception | At the provincial level, there is a strong link between all climate change officers/focal points and the communities in their respective provinces and the officers are equipped with the resources and capacity to identify and manage adaptation needs in the provinceIncreased (at least 20%) number of women participating in capacity building activities at national and subnational level |
| **Project Strategy** | **Indicator** | **Baseline** | **Target at end of Project** | **Sources of Verification** | **Assumptions** |
| **Outcome 4:** Strengthened awareness and ownership of adaptation and climate change-related risk reduction processes at national and sub-national levels | % of the risk-affected population exposed to awareness raising activities and materials | Awareness raising efforts to date remain ad-hoc, uncoordinated and often undertaken with insufficient technical basis  | 75 % of the risk-affected population is exposed to awareness raising activities and materials. | Awareness raising materials, best practice toolkits, monitroing and evaluation reports, Field reports, project monitoring and evaluation reportsSchool curricula documentsTraining materials and records of trainings MOUs/agreements | Strong community leadership allows for capacity building and awareness raising to translate into community-led replication activitiesDepartment of Education remains committed to the integration of climate change in school curricula The role of corporate social responsibility in PNG gains further momentum and can be tapped for contributions in the area of climate change and adaptationInfrastructure tax credit schemes remain in place |
| Integration of climate change into the national school curricula and university academic programmes | Only few schools cover climate change in their classes and activites; there is very limited guidance for teachers | The topics of climate change and adaptation are introduced in PNG’s school curricula and university academic programmes and teachers are equipped with the required knowledge and material |
| Amount of funding mobilized via CSR and sponsorship agreements | CSR funding sources is currently nil. | By the end of the project agreements on continuation of awareness raising and adaptation activities (especially replication) through contributions from Corporate Social Responsibilty programmes and private sector participation are reached (including projects under infrastructure tax credit schemes) and make resources available for the community-led adaption in at least 10 further communities (estimated 500,000 USD) |

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

1. *Project Document*
2. *Mid-term Review Report*
3. *Project Progress Reports for 2013, 2014 and 2015*
4. *Final Project Progress Report 2017*
5. *Project Budget Revisions*
6. *GEF CCA Tracking Tool and mid-term review*
7. project files, national strategic and legal documents
8. National Inception Workshop Report, Community Based Mangrove conservation Handbook, Hazard Assessment report & maps for the 5 provinces, East Sepik), Early warning systems field assessment reports, Assessment of Flood Early Warning System in five province of Papua New Guinea, Roadmap for establishment of Flood Early Warning System in PNG, Communication Strategy, Climate Change Institutional and Capacity Assessment report, Early Warning Systems Inception report, Micro-Grant Agreements progressive reports (World Wide Fund for Nature, Foundation for People & Community Development, World Vision PNG and Adventist Development Relief Agency - PNG, Asian Disaster Preparedness Centre), Training course -Mainstreaming Climate Change Adaptation into Development Planning Process, Additional resources titled- Reader-Mainstreaming Climate Change Adaptation into Development Process, ADPC mission report, CCA mainstreaming training modules, draft CCA provincial plans, Teaching Guide for Climate Change Adaptation for Lower Primary Schools in PNG, Draft CCA curriculum for primary Schools, communication materials including posters: restoring mangrove in your community, benifits of mangrove for coastal communities, vegetable gardens, floating vegetable gardens, Guide for Yam planting, drought coping strategies, 21 photo stories on climate change impact on peopple, 18 digital stories on climate change impact on people. Press coverage - Inception Workshop on Flood Early Warning, Press coverage- Mangrove planting and conservation in East Sepik, Press Website Story on TV Infomercial - El Nino Preparedness (45 Second infomercial broadcasted on National TV for two months), Website story titled 'Local communities of Papua New Guinea are committed to fight climate change' Exposure Photo Story: Take Care of the Mangroves (https://undp-adaptation.exposure.co/take-care-of-the-mangroves).

Annex C: Evaluation Questions

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

| **Evaluative Criteria Questions** | **Indicators** | **Sources** | **Methodology** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Relevance: How does the project relate to the main objectives of the GEF focal area, and to the environment and development priorities at the local, regional and national levels?  |
|  | * Was/Is the project a good idea given the situation needing improvement?
 | * Strengthened ability of coastal and riverine communities in PNG to make informed decisions about and to undertake concrete actions to adapt to climate change-driven hazards affecting their specific locations
 | * Project reports (annual and quarterly)
* Mid-term review reports
* Media articles/reports
 | * Individual interviews
* Desk reviews
* Reports
 |
|  | * Does it deal with target group priorities? Why or why not?
 | * Reduced exposure and increased adaptive capacity of coastal communities to flood-related risks and hazards in 8 communities and three cities of the 11 provinces of the North Coast and Islands Region
 | * Project reports (annual and quarterly)
* Mid-term review reports
* Media articles/reports
 | * Individual interviews
* Desk reviews
* Reports
* FGDs
 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved? |
|  | * Have the planned purpose and component objectives, outputs and activities been achieved?
 | * Coastal and riverine communities are protected through adaptation measures against coastal and inland flooding
* Climate change adaptation is managed, monitored and planed at the provincial level in the targeted provinces and supported by a framework of policies and plans including disaster preparedness and response plans, coastal zone management plans
 | * Project reports (annual and quarterly)
* Mid-term review reports
* Media articles/reports
* Provincial policy documents, development plans
* Disaster preparedness and response plans
 | * Individual interviews
* Desk reviews
* Reports
* FGDs
 |
| Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards? |
|  | * Were inputs (resources and time) used in the best possible way to achieve the outcomes?
 | * Human and technical capacities of the central and provincial government institutions, NGOs and CBOs is developed
* Regional and international expertise bringing in state-of-the-art technologies, good practices are used
 | * Project reports (annual and quarterly)
* Mid-term review reports
* Media articles/reports
* Training reports
 | * Individual interviews
* Desk reviews
* Reports
* FGDs
 |
|  | * What could be done differently to improve implementation, thereby maximizing impact, at an acceptable and sustainable cost?
 |  |  |  |
|  Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, social-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results? |
|  | * To what extent has the project contributed towards its longer-term goals? What unanticipated positive or negative consequences did the project have? Why did they arise?
 | * Improved longer-term resilience and adaptive capacity of coastal and riverine communities to withstand climate change impacts
 | * Project reports (annual and quarterly)
* Mid-term review reports
* Media articles/reports
 | * Individual interviews
* Desk reviews
* Reports
* FGDs
 |
|  | * What are the remaining risks to project sustainability?
 |  |  |  |
| **Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward, reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status?**  |
|  | * To what extent has better managed, monitored and planned adaptation to climate change impacted environmental stress and/or ecological stress?
 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

Annex D: Rating Scales

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

Annex E: Evaluation Consultant Code of Conduct and Agreement Form

**Evaluators:**

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

**Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form[[5]](#footnote-5)**

**Agreement to abide by the Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN System**

**Name of Consultant:** \_\_     \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**Name of Consultancy Organization** (where relevant)**:** \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**I confirm that I have received and understood and will abide by the United Nations Code of Conduct for Evaluation.**

Signed at *place* on *date*

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

Annex F: Evaluation Report Outline[[6]](#footnote-6)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **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[[7]](#footnote-7)) |
| **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[[8]](#footnote-8))  |
| **3.1** | Project Design / Formulation* Analysis of LFA/Results Framework (Project logic /strategy; Indicators)
* Assumptions and Risks
* Lessons from other relevant projects (e.g., same focal area) incorporated into project design
* Planned stakeholder participation
* Replication approach
* UNDP comparative advantage
* Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector
* Management arrangements
 |
| **3.2** | Project Implementation* Adaptive management (changes to the project design and project outputs during implementation)
* Partnership arrangements (with relevant stakeholders involved in the country/region)
* Feedback from M&E activities used for adaptive management
* Project Finance:
* Monitoring and evaluation: design at entry and implementation (\*)
* UNDP and Implementing Partner implementation / execution (\*) coordination, and operational issues
 |
| **3.3** | Project Results* Overall results (attainment of objectives) (\*)
* Relevance(\*)
* Effectiveness & Efficiency (\*)
* Country ownership
* Mainstreaming
* Sustainability (\*)
* Impact
 |
| **4.**  | Conclusions, Recommendations & Lessons* Corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project
* Actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the project
* Proposals for future directions underlining main objectives
* Best and worst practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance and success
 |
| **5.**  | Annexes* ToR
* Itinerary
* List of persons interviewed
* Summary of field visits
* List of documents reviewed
* Evaluation Question Matrix
* Questionnaire used and summary of results
* Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form
 |

Annex G: Evaluation Report Clearance Form

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

1. For additional information on methods, see the [Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results](http://www.undp.org/evaluation/handbook), Chapter 7, pg. 163 [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. A useful tool for gauging progress to impact is the Review of Outcomes to Impacts (ROtI) method developed by the GEF Evaluation Office:  [ROTI Handbook 2009](http://www.thegef.org/gef/sites/thegef.org/files/documents/M2_ROtI%20Handbook.pdf) [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. <https://intranet.undp.org/unit/bom/pso/Support%20documents%20on%20IC%20Guidelines/Template%20for%20Confirmation%20of%20Interest%20and%20Submission%20of%20Financial%20Proposal.docx> [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. <http://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/corporate/Careers/P11_Personal_history_form.doc> [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. The Report length should not exceed *40* pages in total (not including annexes). [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. UNDP Style Manual, Office of Communications, Partnerships Bureau, updated November 2008 [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. Using a six-point rating scale: 6: Highly Satisfactory, 5: Satisfactory, 4: Marginally Satisfactory, 3: Marginally Unsatisfactory, 2: Unsatisfactory and 1: Highly Unsatisfactory, see section 3.5, page 37 for ratings explanations. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)