

TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR TERMINAL EVALUATION

ADDRESSING CLIMATE CHANGE RISKS ON WATER RESOURCES AND FOOD SECURITY IN THE DRY ZONE OF MYANMAR

BASIC INFORMATION

Location:	<i>Yangon, Nay Pyi Taw and Patheingyi, Mandalay</i>
Application Deadline:	21 Jan 2019
Type of Contract:	Individual Contract
Post Level:	International Evaluation Consultant (Team Leader)
Languages Required:	English
Starting Date: (date when the selected candidate is expected to start)	01 Mar 2019
Duration of Initial Contract:	01 Mar 2019 – 30 April 2019
Expected Duration of Assignment:	40 Days

BACKGROUND

In accordance with UNDP and Adaptation Fund (AF) M&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 *Addressing Climate Change Risks on Water Resources and Food Security in the Dry Zone of Myanmar* (PIMS# 4703)

UNDP Myanmar, with funding from Adaptation Fund is currently implementing a Climate Change Adaptation project - "Addressing Climate Change Risks on Water Resources and Food Security in the Dry Zone of Myanmar." The project aims to reduce the increasing impacts of climate change on agricultural and livestock production cycles in the dry zone of Myanmar - the impacts of increasing temperature and evaporation, declining water availability, and intensifying weather events especially flash floods and cyclones.

The Dry Zone is one of the most climate sensitive and natural resource poor regions in Myanmar. The dry zone covers approximately 54,390 square kilometers and represents about 10% of the country's total land area. The present population in the Dry Zone is estimated at 18 million people. It constitutes 34% of the country's total population of about 53 million. The population density is 123 people per square kilometer, making it the third most densely populated region in Myanmar.

Across the Dry Zone, water is scarce, vegetation cover is thin, and soil is degraded due to severe erosion. The region is characterized by low annual rainfall that ranges between 508 and 1,016 mm per annum with high variability and uneven distribution. The monsoon rain is bimodal with a dry period during July when dry desiccating winds blow from the south. The undulating land, composed mainly of sandy loam with low fertility, is subjected to severe erosion under rain and strong winds. The average mean temperature in the Dry Zone is about 27° C and the temperature often rises to about 43° C in the summer period. This dry environment with its other natural limiting factors has led to conditions of growing food insecurity and severe environmental degradation.

The major economic activities in the Dry Zone are subsistence farming such as paddy, sesame and groundnut and small-scale livestock rearing. Agricultural productivity is low and the farmers are heavily dependent on products from the natural forest especially fuel wood, pole, post and fodder to support their living and livestock. Many landless people are working as seasonal farm labourers, migrating to urban regions during non-planting time to find temporary employment.

The project operates in five townships in the Sagaing, Mandalay and Magway Regions – Shwebo and Moneywa townships in the Sagaing region, Myingyan and Nyaung Oo townships in the Mandalay Region, and Chauk township in the Magway Region. The townships were selected on the basis of observed temperature extremes, frequency of drought per year, and the impacts of climatic parameters on food security. An additional criterion for township selection was the potential to access ground and surface water resources – vital prerequisites for small irrigation and water management schemes. The direct beneficiaries of the project are marginal farmers in rain-fed areas and landless workers whose access to arable land is severely threatened by erosion and land degradation. Special emphasis is placed on women and female-headed households within this vulnerable group.

The project targets approximately 50,000 households from 280 villages. The target populations are largely categorized into the following three types of beneficiaries: First group is landless farmers, who make up about 60% of target population; second group is marginal/small farmers whose landholding is less than 2.5 hectares and they make up about 25% of target population; and the third group is farmers who have landholding larger than 2.5 hectares.

Absence of community water infrastructure for both domestic and agricultural purposes is a critical constraint in building the resilience of these communities to future climate change impact. This project aims to deliver the following key outputs to build community resilience to climate change:

1. Enhancing water capture and storage capacities in 280 villages to augment irrigation and domestic water supply during the dry periods
2. Protecting and rehabilitating 6,141 hectares of micro-watersheds through Farmer-Managed Natural Regeneration (FMNR) to increase natural water retention and reduce erosion
3. Establishing 3,983 hectares of community-based agro-forestry plots in private and communal lands to conserve soil and water
4. Introducing drought-resilient farming methods
5. Introducing resilient post-harvest processing and storage systems
6. Introducing diversified livestock production systems targeting landless households
7. Develop climate hazard maps and risk scenarios in each township to support community-based climate risk management and preparedness planning
8. Strengthen local level climate and disaster risk management framework for timely and effective communication of climate risk and early warning information.

At the national level, the Project is supported by a Project Steering Committee (PSC). The PSC oversees and keep abreast of project progress and facilitate the implementation of the project in partnership with co-financing institutions. Implementation of the project and allocation of resources is the responsibility of UNDP - as the executing agency under the overall direction of the PSC. The PSC is chaired by the Country Director of UNDP and the Director General of Dry Zone Greening Department (DZGD). The DZGD is also the principle counterpart agency for the project. Other members of the PSC include representatives from Environmental Conservation Department, Irrigation and Water Utilization Management Department, Department of Meteorology and Hydrology, Department of Agriculture, Relief and Resettlement Department, Livestock Breeding and Veterinary Department, Watershed Management Section, Forest Department, Department of Rural Development and Foreign Economic Relations Department

To assist the Project Team on technical questions, a Technical Advisory Group (TAG) has been constituted. The TAG provides guidance and advice on technical questions related to water management, agriculture, forestry, food security and risk information/communication. The main objective of the TAG is to identify technical strengths and weaknesses of the project, take stock of available and required technical know-how under different project components, and provide technical backstopping and quality control throughout the project period. The TAG includes representatives from Dry Zone Greening Department, Environmental Conservation Department, Irrigation and Water Utilization Management Department, Department of Meteorology and Hydrology, Department of Agriculture, Relief and Resettlement Department, Livestock Breeding and Veterinary Department, Watershed Management Section of Forest Department and Department of Rural Development.

A project team, which is housed in the Dry Zone Greening Department offices in Patheingyi and Nyaung U, comprises of the following personnel – National Project Manager, Technical Specialist (International), Soil Conservation and Water Harvesting Specialist (Nyaung U-based), Agricultural Specialist, Environmental Conservation and Forestry Specialist (Nyaung U-based), Livestock Specialist, Monitoring and Evaluation Officer, Project Assistant and a Project Driver.

Under the overall guidance of PSC and TAG, the Project Team is responsible for the day-to-day management and implementation, oversight, reporting and monitoring of project activities.

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

Project Title: *Addressing Climate Change Risks on Water Resources and Food Security in the Dry Zone of Myanmar*

AF Project ID: 4703

UNDP Project ID: 00089618

Executing Agency: *UNDP*

Other Partners involved: *Government of Myanmar, INGO, NGO/CSO, FAO, UNOPS, UNHABITAT*

AF financing at endorsement (Million US\$): *7,289,425*

Total co-financing financing at endorsement (Million US\$): *UNDP (624,998), Government of Myanmar- In Kind (554,181)*

ProDoc Signature (date project began): *17 February 2015*

(Operational) Closing Date (proposed): *30 June 2019*

OBJECTIVE AND SCOPE:

The project was designed to reduce the vulnerability of households in Myanmar's Dry Zone to increasing drought and rainfall variability and enhance the capacity of households to plan for and respond to future impacts of Climate Change on food security. This objective is aligned with the Objective spelled out by the Adaptation Fund to "Reduce vulnerability and increase adaptive capacity to respond to the impacts of climate change, including variability at local and national levels".

The strategy of the project to achieve this objective is to reduce the risks and effects from the increasingly recurring incidents of drought through an improved water management, crop and livestock adaptation programme in five of the most vulnerable townships of Myanmar's Dry Zone. The programme is based on principles of local empowerment and implemented by community-based organizations (CBOs) such as Village Development Committees, Water User Committees, farmer groups, communal forest user groups, and local Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs). Programme components relate to three main Outcomes and composed of lower-level Outputs to achieve them. The three main Outcomes are as follows:

- Continuous fresh water availability is ensured during the dry seasons in 280 villages in the Dry Zone
- Climate Resilient agricultural and livestock practices enhanced in Myanmar's Dry Zone
- Timeliness and quality of climate risk information disseminated to Dry Zone households enhanced through use of short-term weather forecasts, medium-term seasonal forecasts, and longer-term climate scenario planning

The Terminal evaluation will be conducted in the Dry Zone of Myanmar – covering the 5 project townships of Shwebo and Monywa under Sagaing Region; Myingyan and Nyaung U under Mandalay Region and Chauk under Magwe Region.

The Terminal evaluation (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’.¹ This is a mandatory evaluation as per initial agreement in the project document.

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. The primary audience of the evaluation will be the Government of Myanmar, Adaptation Fund and UNDP. The secondary audience of the evaluation will be project beneficiaries, implementing partners and other development partners active in the Dry Zone of Myanmar. This independent Terminal Evaluation will take place three months prior to the final PSC meeting and will focus on the delivery of the project’s results as initially planned (and as corrected after the mid-term evaluation, if any such correction took place); will look at impact and sustainability of results, including the contribution to capacity development and the achievement of global environmental benefits/goals; and will also include an independent review of project implementation arrangements and their efficacy.

EVALUATION APPROACH AND METHOD:

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 (**see Annex E**). 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, as well as provide a complete, fair and unbiased assessment through analysis of available data and information and facts on the ground. This should be done through application of various methods, including collection of additional qualitative and quantitative data and information. The evaluation will also consider the recommendations of the Mid-Term evaluation and assess progress made in addressing the management responses and the final outcome of the recommendations. In addition, the evaluation will also review the results of the project impact assessment survey, which is currently underway. The Impact Assessment Survey will provide evidence-based qualitative and quantitative data and information and inform the terminal evaluation in a significant manner – especially in terms of achievements of overall targets of the project.

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 Patheingyi Mandalay, including the following project sites – Shwebo, Monywa under Sagaing Region, Myingyan and Nyaung U under Mandalay Region and Chauk under Magwe Region. The evaluator will observe project activities in the field and interview project beneficiaries and implementing partners on the ground - to assess the extent of project impacts/results and identify remaining gaps and challenges and recommend actions for future programming, as appropriate. Interviews will be held with the following stakeholders and individuals at a minimum: Dry Zone Greening Department, Environmental Conservation Department, Forest Department, Department of Rural Development, Irrigation and Water Utilization Management Department, Department of Agriculture, Livestock Breeding and Veterinary Department, Department of Meteorology and Hydrology, Department of Disaster Management, and Foreign Economic Relations Department; Implementing partners, key experts and consultants in the subject area, Project Steering Committee members, project stakeholders, academia, local government and CSOs, etc. The evaluator will review all relevant sources of information, such as the project document, project reports – including Annual PPRs, project budget revisions, midterm evaluation, progress reports, AF tracking tools, project files, national strategic and legal documents, and any other materials that the

¹ 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](#).

Loans/Concessions								
• In-kind support								
• Other								
Totals								

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 Required Co-Financing Table below, which will be included in the terminal evaluation report.

MAINSTREAMING:

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

IMPACT:

The evaluators will assess the extent to which the project is achieving impacts or progressing towards the achievement of impacts. Key findings that should be brought out in the evaluations include whether the project has demonstrated: a) verifiable improvements in ecological status, b) verifiable reductions in stress on ecological systems, and/or c) demonstrated progress towards these impact achievements [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. Additionally, lessons learned should be provided as per the template. **(see Annex B).**

IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS:

The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation resides with the UNDP CO in Myanmar. 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 evaluation team to set up stakeholder interviews, arrange field visits, coordinate with the Government etc.

The Programme Team under Sustainable and Inclusive Growth Unit, with the support of the project team - will be responsible for - supervising and guiding the evaluation team during the evaluation process; identifying and ensuring participation of relevant stakeholders; reviewing and providing substantive comments and approving the inception report, including the work plan, analytical framework and methodology; providing substantive feedback on the draft and final evaluation reports; making payments against results; ensuring that evaluation findings and conclusions are relevant and recommendations are implementable; and contribute to the dissemination of the evaluation findings and follow-up on management response, etc.

The overall Task Manager for the Terminal Evaluation will be Ms. Pem C. Wangdi, Programme Specialist, Sustainable and Inclusive Growth Unit, UNDP Myanmar.

EVALUATION TIMEFRAME:

The total duration of the evaluation will be **40 days** starting from **01 March 2019 – 30 Apr 2019**, according to the tentative plan below. Please note that the evaluation mission team will have a briefing session with UNDP CO in **Yangon on 04 Mar 2019**; a de-briefing session in **Yangon on 22 Mar 2019**; a briefing meeting with the AF

Designated National Authority on **18 Mar 2019 in Nay Pyi Taw**. The rest of the mission will be in Patheingyi, Mandalay and Project areas.

Activity	Timing	Completion Date
Preparation	02 days (1-2 Mar 2019)	02 Mar 2019
Evaluation Inception Report	02 days (1-2 Mar 2019)	02 Mar 2019
Evaluation Mission	20 days (03 Mar – 23 Mar 2019) (03 Feb 2019 and 21 Mar 2019 in Yangon; 17 Mar in Nay Pyi Taw; rest of the time in Patheingyi, Mandalay and Project areas)	23 Mar 2019
A draft set of initial findings established	Towards the end of Evaluation Mission	20 Mar 2019
A stakeholder workshop on initial findings	Towards end of Evaluation Mission coinciding with the Technical Advisory Group Meeting	21 Mar 2019
A wrap up discussion with the country office and project team on initial findings	Towards end of Evaluation Mission	22 Mar 2019
Draft Evaluation Report	10 days (25 Mar - 03 Apr 2019)	03 Apr 2019
Final Report	08 days (23 – 30 Apr 2019) (Note: 3-week time delay for circulation and review of the draft report)	24 Apr 2019

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 2 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, Annex C) with annexes	Within 3 weeks of the evaluation mission	Sent to CO, reviewed by RTA, PCU, AF 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.

PAYMENT MODALITIES AND SPECIFICATIONS:

%	Milestone
10%	At submission and approval of inception report
40%	Following submission and approval of the 1 st 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 consultants will be held to the highest ethical standards and are required to sign a Code of Conduct upon acceptance of the assignment (**see Annex D**). UNDP evaluations are conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG 'Ethical Guideline for Evaluations.'

REQUIRED SKILLS AND EXPERIENCE

The evaluation team will be composed of one international and one national Evaluation Consultant. The consultants shall have prior experience in evaluating similar projects. Experience with AF financed projects is an advantage. The international consultant will act as the team leader and will be responsible for all the deliverables of the assignment. The national consultant will support the international consultant and perform duties assigned by the international consultant as per the scope of this TOR. 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.

This TOR is for the recruitment of the **International Evaluation Consultant (Team Leader)**. The International Evaluation Consultant (Team Leader) is expected to possess the following skills, knowledge and expertise:

EDUCATION: (a total of 20 points will be considered for the technical evaluation of this criteria)

- Master's Degree in Environment, Natural Resources Management, Social Sciences or other closely related field;

EXPERIENCE: (a total of 75 points will be considered for the technical evaluation of this criteria)

- Work experience in relevant technical areas for at least 5 years;
- Recent experience with result-based management evaluation methodologies;
- Experience applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios;
- Competence in adaptive management, as applied to Climate Change Adaptation focal area;
- Experience working with the AF or GEF evaluations;
- Experience working in South East Asia region;
- Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender and climate change adaptation; experience in gender sensitive evaluation and analysis;
- Excellent communication skills;
- Demonstrable analytical skills;
- Project evaluation/review experiences within United Nations system will be considered an asset;

The International Evaluation Consultant (Team Leader) will be responsible for:

- Providing overall leadership on the independent evaluation of the Adaptation Fund Project – “Addressing Climate Change Risks on Water Resources and Food Security in the Dry Zone of Myanmar” - based on inputs and insights from the national consultant
- Conducting desk reviews of relevant documents and interview with government partners, UN/UNDP staff, donors and other partners
- Reviewing the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, value-added and impact of the AF Project;
- Identifying whether or not UNDP has achieved its intended results (based on the strategic outcomes and work plans)
- Ensuring completion of all the deliverables outlined above: evaluation inception report, draft evaluation report, and final evaluation report

LANGUAGE: *(A total of 5 points will be considered for the technical evaluation of this criteria)*

- Fluency in written and spoken English is required;
- Some knowledge of Myanmar language is desirable, but not compulsory

ANNEXES TO THE TOR

ANNEX A: LIST OF DOCUMENTS TO BE REVIEWED BY THE MTE TEAM

1. Project Document
2. Monitoring and Evaluation Framework
3. List and contact details of project staff, key project stakeholders, including Project Board, and other partners to be consulted
4. Project sites, highlighting suggested visits
5. Midterm evaluation (MTE) and other relevant evaluations and assessments
6. Project Inception Report
7. Annual Project Performance Reports (PPR's)
8. Finalized AF Tracking Tools
9. Quarterly Progress Reports
10. All monitoring reports prepared by the projects
11. Project budget broken out by outcomes and outputs
12. Financial Data
13. Sample of project communications materials, i.e. press releases, brochures, documentaries, etc.
14. Minutes of the Project Steering Committee Meetings and other meetings (i.e. Project Appraisal Committee meetings)
15. Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF)
16. Country Programme Document (CPD)
17. Country Programme Action Plan (CPAP)

ANNEX B: LESSONS FOR ADAPTATION

Lessons for Adaptation	Response
Climate Resilience Measures	
What have been the lessons learned, both positive and negative, in implementing climate adaptation measures that would be relevant to the design and implementation of future projects/programmes for enhanced resilience to climate change?	
What is the potential for the climate resilience measures undertaken by the project/programme to be replicated and scaled up both within and outside the project area?	
Concrete Adaptation Interventions	
What have been the lessons learned, both positive and negative, in implementing concrete adaptation interventions that would be relevant to the design and implementation of future projects/programmes implementing concrete adaptation interventions?	
What is the potential for the concrete adaptation interventions undertaken by the project/programme to be replicated and scaled up both within and outside the project area?	
Community/National Impact	
What would you consider to be the most successful aspects for the target communities?	
What measures are/have been put in place to ensure sustainability of the project/program results?	
What measures are being/could have been put in place to improve project/program results?	
Knowledge Management	
How has existing information/data/knowledge been used to inform project development and implementation? What kinds of information/data/knowledge were used?	
If learning objectives have been established, have they been met? Please describe.	
Describe any difficulties there have been in accessing or retrieving existing information (data or knowledge) that is relevant to the project. Please provide suggestions for improving access to the relevant data.	
Has the identification of learning objectives contributed to the outcomes of the project? In what ways have they contributed?	

ANNEX C: EVALUATION REPORT OUTLINE⁴

- i. Opening page:
 - Title of UNDP supported AF financed project
 - UNDP and AF project ID#s.
 - Evaluation time frame and date of evaluation report
 - Region and countries included in the project
 - AF Operational Program/Strategic Program
 - Name of the organization commissioning the evaluation
 - Implementing Partner and other project partners
 - Evaluation team members
 - Acknowledgements
- ii. Executive Summary
 - Project Summary Table
 - Project Description (brief)
 - Evaluation Rating Table
 - Evaluation objectives and intended audience
 - Brief Evaluation methodology
 - Most important findings
 - Summary of conclusions, recommendations and lessons
- iii. Acronyms and Abbreviations
(See: UNDP Editorial Manual⁵)
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 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

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

⁵ UNDP Style Manual, Office of Communications, Partnerships Bureau, updated November 2008

⁶ 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.

- 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, and sites visited
 - Summary of field visits
 - List of documents reviewed
 - Evaluation Question Matrix
 - More details on the methodology, such as data collection instruments, including details of their reliability and validity
 - Questionnaire used and summary of results
 - Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form, Evaluators biodata and/or justification of team composition
 - Results framework
-

ANNEX D: 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 Form⁷

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: _____

⁷www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct

ANNEX E: 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
Relevance: How does the project activities and outputs relate to the main objectives of the GEF focal area, and to the environment and develop regional and national levels? To what extent are the objective of the project still valid?		
•	•	•
•	•	•
•	•	•
Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved? What were the major factors influencing the achievement or non-achievement of the		
•	•	•
•	•	•
•	•	•
Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards? Were objectives achieved on time? Was the Project implemented in the most efficient way compared to		
•	•	•
•	•	•
•	•	•
Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, social-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project res To what extent will the benefits of the project continue after donor funding ceases? What are the major factors which influenced the achievement or non-achievement of sustainability of the project?		
•	•	•
•	•	•
•	•	•
Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward, reduced environmental stress and/or improve What has happened as a result of the project? What real difference has the project made to the beneficiaries?		
•	•	•
•	•	•

ANNEX F: RATING SCALES

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