



INDIVIDUAL CONSULTANT PROCUREMENT NOTICE
(International Consultant – Team Leader for Terminal Evaluation)

UNDP/PN/41/2017

Date: 27 September 2017

Country: Nepal

Description of the assignment: The project was designed to help the Government of Nepal (GON) to overcome some of the key barriers to managing the growing risks of from Glacier Lake Outburst Flood (GLOFs) in the High Mountains and flooding in the Tarai and Churia Range of southern Nepal through with an emphasis on community engagement, empowerment and social inclusion. There was insufficient institutional knowledge and capacity to understand and manage GLOF risks, as they are highly complex, site-specific and too costly; and at the same time there lacked cohesion among different agencies to manage the risks associated with recurrent flooding in the Tarai in current on-going programmes. The support aimed to assess the gaps and help increase the institutional knowledge and capacity of the various stakeholders and also build the limited capacity and understanding among local communities regarding ways to reduce their vulnerability to GLOFs in the mountains and flooding in Tarai. It aimed to improve information sharing and coordination at the central and local levels and among the various Ministries, Departments and non-governmental actors.

The project's overall objective is to reduce human and material losses from GLOF events in Solukhumbu District and catastrophic flooding events in the Tarai and Churia Range of Nepal.

The **primary objective** of the assignment – evaluation of the project 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.

Number of consultant required: 1

Project name: Community Based Flood and Glacial Lake Risk Reduction Project

Period of assignment/services (if applicable): 12 October to 15 November 2017 (Not to exceed 20 days)

Duty Station: Homebased (10 days) with missions to Nepal (Kathmandu and other districts – 10 days)

Proposal should be submitted at the following address: **Procurement Unit, UNDP (Ref.: UNDP/PN/41/2017: International Consultant – Team Leader, CFGORRP**, by email to procurement.np@undp.org not later than **1730 hours (Nepal Standard Time) of 08 October 2017.**

Any request for clarification must be sent in writing, or by standard electronic communication to the e-mail: query.procurement.np@undp.org mentioning Procurement Notice Ref: **UNDP/PN/41/2017: International Consultant – Team Leader, CFGORRP**, on or before **04 October 2017**. The procurement unit will respond in writing, including an explanation of the query without identifying the source of inquiry, to all consultants or via bulletin published on the UNDP website: <http://www.np.undp.org/content/nepal/en/home/operations/procurement.html>. Inquiries received after the above date and time shall not be entertained.

1. SCOPE OF WORK, RESPONSIBILITIES AND DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSED WORK

Please refer to the attached ToR (Annex 1)

Please submit your application at the following email address: procurement.np@undp.org

2. REQUIREMENTS FOR EXPERIENCE AND QUALIFICATIONS

Education & Experience:

- At least Master's Degree environmental science/management, Natural resource economics/management, Social Science / Business Administration, or other closely related field.

Experience:

- Minimum 10 years of relevant professional experience (monitoring & evaluation) in Climate Change Adaptation, Disaster Risk Management is required
- Previous experience on results-based monitoring and evaluation methodologies with UNDP and/or GEF will be considered as asset;
- Technical knowledge in the targeted focal area(s): climate change adaptation, disaster risk management especially the GLOF and flood risk management is preferable.
- Experience of working in similar tasks in Nepal or South East Asian countries

Competencies

- Outstanding knowledge and experience of participatory monitoring, review and evaluation processes, and experience in review and evaluation of technical assistance projects with major donor agencies
- Recent involvement on result-based management evaluation methodologies;
- Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender and experience in gender sensitive evaluation and analysis;
- Excellent writing, communication and analytical skill;
- Excellent writing and communication skills in English
- Demonstrated ability to assess complex situations, succinctly distill critical issues, and draw forward-looking conclusions and recommendations;
- Ability and experience to lead and work with multi-disciplinary and national teams;
- The consultant must bring own computer/ laptop and related equipment.

3. DOCUMENTS TO BE INCLUDED WHEN SUBMITTING THE PROPOSAL

Interested individual consultants must submit the following documents/information to demonstrate their qualifications:

- Offeror's Letter to UNDP Confirming Interest and Availability for the Individual Contractor (IC) Assignment along with the completed financial proposal and PII template annexed to this letter.
- A cover letter with a brief presentation of your consultancy explaining your suitability for the work;
- A brief methodology on how you will approach and conduct the work (limit to under 1500 words);

Note:

- Applicants of 62 years or more require full medical examination and statement of fitness to work to engage in the consultancy
- The candidate has to be an independent consultant (If the candidate is engaged with any organization, the organization employing the candidate will be issued with a Reimbursable Loan Agreement (RLA) to release the employee for the consultancy with UNDP.)
- Due to sheer number of applicants, the procurement unit will contact only competitively selected consultant.

4. EVALUATION

Individual consultants will be evaluated based on the following methodologies:

Cumulative analysis

When using this weighted scoring method, the award of the contract should be made to the individual consultant whose offer has been evaluated and determined as:

- a) responsive/compliant/acceptable, and
- b) Having received the highest score out of a pre-determined set of weighted technical and financial criteria specific to the solicitation.

Technical Criteria weight; 70%

* Financial Criteria weight; 30%

Only candidates obtaining a minimum of 49 points in the technical evaluation would be considered for the Financial Evaluation.

Criteria	Weight	Max. Point
<u>Technical</u>		
Criterion A: At least Master's Degree environmental science/management, Social Science, Natural resource economics/management, watershed management, or other closely related field.	20%	20
Criterion B: Minimum 10 years of relevant professional experience (monitoring & evaluation) in Climate Change Adaptation, Disaster Risk Management is required	20%	20
Criterion C: Previous experience on results-based monitoring and evaluation methodologies with UNDP and/or GEF will be considered as asset;	5%	5
Criterion D: Experience of working in similar tasks in Nepal or South East Asian countries	5%	5
Criterion E: Organization & Methodology for carrying out this assignment	20%	20
<u>Financial</u>		
☐ Lowest financial proposal	30%	30

Contract will be awarded to the technically qualified consultant who obtains the highest combined score (financial and technical). The points for the Financial Proposal will be allocated as per the following formula:

$$\frac{\text{Lowest Bid Offered} *}{\text{Bid of the Consultant}} \times 30$$

* "Lowest Bid Offered" refers to the lowest price offered by Offerors scoring at least 70% points in technical evaluation.

ANNEX

ANNEX 1- TERMS OF REFERENCES (TOR)

ANNEX 2- GENERAL CONDITIONS OF CONTRACT FOR THE SERVICES OF INDIVIDUAL CONSULTANT

ANNEX 3- P11 Form

ANNEX 4 - OFFEROR'S LETTER TO UNDP CONFIRMING INTEREST AND AVAILABILITY FOR THE INDIVIDUAL CONTRACTOR (IC) ASSIGNMENT

TERMS OF REFERENCE

TERMINAL EVALUATION

COMMUNITY BASED FLOOD AND GLACIAL LAKE RISK REDUCTION PROJECT

GOVERNMENT OF NEPAL and UNITED NATIONS DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME

Position Title:	International Consultant - Terminal Evaluation
Organizational Unit:	Energy, Environment, Climate and DRM Unit, UNDP CO Nepal
Reporting to:	ACD/Head of Energy, Environment, Climate and DRM Unit and Regional Technical Advisor (Adaptation) based in BRH, UNDP through Senior Project Officer- Integrated Climate Risk Management, EECDRM Unit, UNDP Nepal
Type of Contract:	Individual Contract
Contract Period(s):	12 October- 20 November 2017
Duration:	20 working days (spread over between 12 October- 20 November 2017)
Duty Station:	Homebased with (10 days) missions to Nepal (Kathmandu and other districts)

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 *Community Based Flood and Glacial Lake Risk Reduction Project* (PIMS #4657).

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

PROJECT SUMMARY TABLE

Project Title:	Community Based Flood and Glacial Lake Risk Reduction Project			
GEF Project ID:	4551		<u>at endorsement</u> <u>(Million US\$)</u>	<u>at completion</u> <u>(Million US\$)</u>
UNDP Project ID:	00069781	GEF financing:	6.300	6.300
Country:	Nepal	IA/EAA own:	0.000	0.949
Region:	South Asia	Government:	7.000	7.000
Focal Area:	CCA	Other:	13.352	12.403
FA Objectives, (OP/SP):	People living in areas vulnerable to climate change and disasters benefit from improved risk management and are more resilient to hazard-related shocks (outcome 7).	Total co-financing:	19.403	19.403

Executing Agency:	Ministry of Population & Environment- Department of Hydrology & Meteorology	Total Project Cost:	7.249	7.249
Other Partners involved:	Department of National Parks and Wildlife Conservation (DNPWC), Department of Water Induced Disaster Management (DWIDM) & Department of Soil Conservation and Watershed Management (DSCWM)	ProDoc Signature (date project began):		15 July 2013
		(Operational) Closing Date:	Proposed: October 2017	Actual: 31 October 2017

OBJECTIVE AND SCOPE

The project was designed to help the Government of Nepal (GON) to overcome some of the key barriers to managing the growing risks of Glacier Lake Outburst Flood (GLOFs) in the High Mountains and flooding in the Tarai and Churia Range of southern Nepal, with an emphasis on community engagement, empowerment and social inclusion. There was insufficient institutional knowledge and capacity to understand and manage GLOF risks, as they are highly complex, site-specific and too costly; at the same time, there has been a lack of cohesion among different agencies to manage the risks associated with recurrent flooding in the Tarai. The support aimed to assess the gaps and help increase the institutional knowledge and capacity of the various stakeholders and also build the limited capacity and understanding among local communities regarding ways to reduce their vulnerability to GLOFs in the mountains and flooding in Tarai. It aimed to improve information sharing and coordination at the central and local levels and among the various Ministries, Departments and non-governmental actors.

The project's overall objective is to reduce human and material losses from GLOF events in Solukhumbu District and catastrophic flooding events in the Tarai and Churia Range of Nepal.

First Outcome aims to reduce GLOF risks arising from Imja Lake. The major outputs under GLOF component encompasses: construction of artificial controlled drainage system for Imja Lake, monitoring of lake and channel levels by local community and institutional representatives, designing of a practical, low-tech and gender-sensitive low-maintenance CBEWS and training in GLOF Risk Management, thereby institutionalizing GLOF knowledge at local and institutional level. Development of an artificial controlled drainage system; installation and operationalization of CBEWS and strengthening individual and institutional capacities for GLOF risk management are the strategies adopted for reduction of potential losses from GLOF hazard. Second Outcome aims to reduce human and material losses from recurrent flooding events and to increase the adaptive capacity of local communities in eight VDCs of 3 river basins (Ratu, Khando, Gagan) and two tributaries Hadiya and Kong through locally-appropriate structural and non-structural measures. The flood component consists of four outputs which emphasize sediment control and stabilization of hazard prone slopes and river banks through structural and non-structural measures; undertaking flood proofing and water and sanitation systems; training to relevant district line agency representatives on flood risk management and flood preparedness, and installation of an effective Community Based Early Warning System (CBEWS) in consultation and participation with concerned local communities and representatives. The sediment control programme in Ratu River, the first of its kind in Nepal, aimed to demonstrate the critical importance of managing upstream-downstream linkages in any riverine flood risk management programme.

Through structural support and strengthening capacity of key local and national institutions and stakeholders to manage GLOF and lowland flood risks in Nepal; approximately 71,752 vulnerable people will be directly benefitted by these interventions.

Implementation arrangements of the Project:

This project is being implemented over the course of four years, which started in September 2013 and will end in October 2017. The project is executed under UNDP National Implementation Guidelines. The project's lead

Implementing Agency is the Department of Hydrology and Meteorology (DHM) under the Ministry of Population and Environment - MOPE (formerly the Ministry of Science, Technology and Environment) of the Government of Nepal. DHM is responsible for implementing the project and also houses the Project Management Unit (PMU) within its building. For implementation of Component 2, a dedicated Field Coordination Office (FCO) has been set up and housed in District Soil Conservation Office (DSCO) Lahan, Siraha and made functional under the overall guidance of PMU. MOPE as a cooperating agency is responsible for supporting and monitoring of the project on behalf of the GON and ensure appropriateness of interventions in meeting national priorities. The MOPE may co-ordinate with other relevant ministries and departments in order to provide inputs to the project as and when needed. The Department of Water Induced Disaster and Management (DWIDM) under the Ministry of Irrigation and Department of Soil Conservation and Watershed Management (DSCWM) under Ministry of Forest and Soil Conservation are the collaborating partners responsible for providing technical oversight, planning and monitoring of activities under Component 2 of the project.

The Implementing Agency (DHM) will coordinate with Department of National Park and Wildlife Conservation (DNPWC) to establish linkages between the project and Sagarmatha National Park (SNP) in order to work smoothly in the Imja Glacial Lake and its surroundings, as the lake is situated in SNP.

UNDP serves as the GEF Agency for the Project and is responsible for the provision of project cycle management services (i.e. General Management support) via the Country Office and specialized technical and oversight support from the UNDP-GEF unit. DHM, along with collaborating partners and UNDP will jointly monitor and evaluate all project activities.

EVALUATION CONTEXT

The project kick started in September 2013 with a startup coordination meeting between the collaborating partners on September 2, 2013. The inception workshop at central level and local levels were held during October and November 2013 respectively. A field scoping visit was conducted soon after the inception meeting and the Field Coordination Office (FCO) was established in Lahan, Siraha district. The field level work gained momentum after the establishment of FCO and District project Office in the project targeted districts. Baseline studies and detailed technical studies for both the component were undertaken and completed in 2014. Based on the results of the technical studies, activities were designed and rolled out in the year 2015 and 2016. Year 2017 is dedicated towards the consolidation of ongoing works and the documentation of knowledge products. The Project is close to the end of its implementation cycle and will be operationally closed by end of October. Mid Term Review (MTR) of Project was completed on April 2016 which rated project as a 'Satisfactory'. The MTR prescribed to focus on the sustainability aspects of the interventions undertaken. Based on the recommendations of MTR and project priority, CFGORRP/DHM has devised strategies and activities and aligned the Exit Strategy to address the overarching thrust of sustainability. As the project is completing its implementation cycle, a Terminal Evaluation (TE) is planned to be undertaken.

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

The objectives of the evaluation are to assess the achievement of project results, and to draw lessons that can both improve the sustainability of benefits from this project, and aid in the overall enhancement of UNDP programming.

EVALUATION APPROACH AND METHOD

An overall approach and method¹ 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 ([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 TE team shall review all relevant sources of information including documents prepared during the preparation phase (i.e. PIF, UNDP Initiation Plan, UNDP Environmental & Social Safeguard Policy, the Project Document, project reports including Annual Project Review/PIRs, Mid Term Review (MTR) report, project budget revisions, national strategic and legal documents, Project databases, M&E framework, M&E Plans and any other materials that the team considers useful for this evidence-based review). 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.

The team will review the baseline GEF focal area CCA Tracking Tool submitted to the GEF at CEO endorsement, and the CCA Tracking Tool that must be completed before the TE field mission begins.

The TE team is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach² ensuring close engagement with Project team, government counterparts, in particular the GEF operational focal point, UNDP Country Office, project team, UNDP GEF Regional Technical Adviser and key stakeholders.

The evaluator is expected to conduct a field mission to Nepal, including the Khumbu region- mountain area and Terai districts. For component 1, the team shall visit Namche to see community based activities and interact with Sagarmatha National Parks (SNP) stakeholders. For component 2, the team shall visit Field Coordination Office, FCO Lahan and project areas of Siraha, Mahottari and Udayapur Districts, at minimum, to observe project interventions and interaction with stakeholders. Interviews will be held with the following organizations and individuals at a minimum:

- At the central level, the team shall meet the PEB members, Director Generals from collaborating partners, Focal Persons, Engineer Department-Nepal Army, Technical Advisory Group (TAG) and officials from President Chure-Terai Madhesh Conservation Development Board (PCTMCDB) and ICIMOD.
- For component I, the consultant team shall meet officials from Sagarmatha National Park. At beneficiary level, the consultant team shall visit and interact with the most vulnerable communities across the high risk settlements downstream of the Imja, Dudh Koshi River corridor. The Team shall interact with Local Resource Persons (LRPs), Taskforce members and local communities especially women, children, elderly, disabled and other marginalized people.
- For component II, the consultant team shall meet the officials from District Soil Conservation Offices (DSCOs), divisional office of DWIDM, DAO, Red Cross, municipality at district level. At the local level, the consultant team shall meet and interact with members of Local Disaster Risk Management Committees (LDRMCs), Community Disaster Management Committees (CDMCs) and Taskforces. The team shall also interact with vulnerable communities in the targeted eight VDCs especially the women and socially excluded groups.

¹ For additional information on methods, see the [Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results](#), Chapter 7, pg. 163

² For ideas on innovative and participatory Monitoring and Evaluation strategies and techniques, see UNDP Discussion Paper: Innovations in Monitoring & Evaluating Results, 05 Nov 2013.

- The decision on the number of vulnerable people and stakeholders to be met by the TE shall be based on the study approaches proposed. However, the TE team shall propose a detailed checklist for undertaking Focus Group Discussion and Key Informant Interviews in the study methodology.

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.

During the inception phase, the International Consultant is expected to coordinate with the National Consultant to decide on the field location in consultation with the UNDP CO Nepal. The consultants will have to split their travel to manage time, as locations are diverse.

The final TE report should fully describe the approach and rationale undertaken by TE including explicit underlying assumptions, challenges, strengths and weaknesses about the methods and approach followed.

EVALUATION CRITERIA & RATINGS

An assessment of project performance will be carried out, based against expectations set out in the Project Logical Framework/Results Framework (see [Annex A](#)), which provides performance and impact indicators for project implementation along with their corresponding means of verification. The evaluation will at a minimum cover the criteria of: **relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact**. 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](#).

Evaluation Ratings:			
1. Monitoring and Evaluation	rating	2. IA & EA Execution	rating
M&E design at entry		Quality of UNDP Implementation – Implementing Agency (IA)	
M&E Plan Implementation		Quality of Execution - Executing Agency (EA)	
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 in order to complete the co-financing table below, which will be included in the terminal evaluation report.

Co-financing (type/source)	UNDP own financing (mill. US\$)		Government (mill. US\$)		Partner Agency (mill. US\$)		Total (mill. US\$)	
	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual

Grants								
Loans/Concessions								
• In-kind support								
• Other								
Totals								

MAINSTREAMING

UNDP supported GEF financed projects are key components in UNDP country programming, as well as regional and global programmes. The evaluation will assess the extent to which the project was successfully mainstreamed with other UNDP priorities, including poverty alleviation, improved governance, the prevention and recovery from natural disasters, and gender. The evaluation shall also examine this project's contribution to the United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) & Country Programme Action Plan (CPAP).

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.³ The evaluators will also assess whether any unintended or negative impacts have been realized, documenting if found, and the project's progress towards achieving outcome/objective level indicators as outlined in project document.

CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS & LESSONS

The evaluation report must include a chapter providing a set of **conclusions, recommendations** and **lessons**. Conclusions should build on findings and be based in evidence. Recommendations should be prioritized, specific, relevant, and targeted, with suggested implementers of the recommendations. Lessons should have wider applicability to other initiatives across the region, the area of intervention, and for the future.

IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS

The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation resides with the UNDP CO in Nepal. 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 provide all relevant documents for review, set up stakeholder interviews, arrange field visits, coordinate with the Government etc. Hence, the team of evaluators shall work closely with the Project team during the process so as to ensure the effective management of overall evaluation process.

EVALUATION TIMEFRAME

The total duration of the evaluation will be three weeks (*recommended: 10-12*) according to the following plan:

Activity	Timing	Completion Date
Preparation	2 days	12-13 October 2017

Evaluation Mission including field visit	<i>10 days</i>	<i>13-31 October 2017</i>
Draft Evaluation Report	<i>4 days</i>	<i>7 November 2017</i>
Final Report	<i>6 days</i>	<i>15 November 2017</i>

EVALUATION DELIVERABLES

The evaluation team is expected to deliver the following:

Deliverable	Content	Timing	Responsibilities
Inception Report with presentation	Evaluator provides clarifications on timing and method	No later than 2 weeks before the evaluation mission: 13 October, 2017	Evaluator submits to UNDP CO
Presentation of draft report	Initial Findings	End of evaluation mission: 31 October 2017	To project management, UNDP CO
Draft Final Report	Full report, (per annexed template) with annexes	Within 3 weeks of the evaluation mission: 7 November 2017	Sent to CO, reviewed by RTA, PCU, GEF OFPs
Final Report*	Revised report	Within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft: 15 November, 2017	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. See [Annex H](#) for an audit trail template. The TE report must be in English.

The evaluation team will be accountable for producing following Deliverables/Expected outputs:

Evaluation inception report: It should detail the evaluators' understanding of what is being evaluated and why, showing how each evaluation question will be answered by way of: proposed methods; proposed sources of data; and data collection and analysis procedures. The inception report should include a proposed schedule of tasks, activities and deliverables, designating a team member with the lead responsibility for each task or product. The inception report provides the programme unit and the evaluators with an opportunity to verify that they share the same understanding about the evaluation and clarify any misunderstanding at the outset.

Presentation of inception report to key stakeholders including UNDP, Donor and key Government counterparts

Draft Terminal Evaluation report with all major findings and recommendations

Presentation of draft report to stakeholders, including UNDP, Donor and key Government counterparts-

Final Draft Terminal Evaluation report incorporating comments received, and including a clear succinct Executive Summary

Final presentation on the Terminal Evaluation for the Government of Nepal, Donor and UNDP.

Final Evaluation Report: To be prepared in standard format (**Annex F**) and submitted to the UNDP after incorporating feedback received on the Draft Report. The Final Report should be accompanied by four digital copies of the processed data files, transcripts and associated materials.

TEAM COMPOSITION

The evaluation team will be composed of two people: one international and one national consultant. The international consultant will be the Team Leader, responsible for finalizing the report. The consultants shall have prior experience in evaluating similar projects. National consultant shall work in the team as one team expert. Experience with GEF financed projects is an advantage. The evaluators selected should not have participated in the project preparation and/or implementation and should not have conflict of interest with project related activities.

The Team members must present the following qualifications:

Team leader: International Consultant

Position : 1

Academic Qualification

- At least Master's Degree environmental science/management, Natural resource economics/management, Social Science / Business Administration, or other closely related field.

Experiences

- Minimum 10 years of relevant professional experience (monitoring & evaluation) in Climate Change Adaptation, Disaster Risk Management is required
- Previous experience on results-based monitoring and evaluation methodologies with UNDP and/or GEF will be considered as asset;
- Technical knowledge in the targeted focal area(s): climate change adaptation, disaster risk management especially the GLOF and flood risk management is preferable.
- Experience of working in similar tasks in Nepal or South East Asian countries

Competencies

- Outstanding knowledge and experience of participatory monitoring, review and evaluation processes, and experience in review and evaluation of technical assistance projects with major donor agencies
- Recent involvement on result-based management evaluation methodologies;
- Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender and experience in gender sensitive evaluation and analysis;
- Excellent writing, communication and analytical skill;
- Excellent writing and communication skills in English
- Demonstrated ability to assess complex situations, succinctly distill critical issues, and draw forward-looking conclusions and recommendations;
- Ability and experience to lead and work with multi-disciplinary and national teams;
- The consultant must bring own computer/ laptop and related equipment.

Team expert: National Consultants

Position : 1

Academic Qualification

- At least Master's Degree environmental science/management, Social Science, Natural resource economics/management, watershed management, or other closely related field.

Experience:

- Minimum 7 years of relevant professional experience (monitoring & evaluation) in Climate Change Adaptation, Disaster Risk Management is required.

- Experience of evaluating projects on Climate Change Adaptation, Disaster Risk Management is desirable;
- Knowledge of UNDP and GEF;
- Previous experience with results-based monitoring and evaluation methodologies with UNDP and/or GEF will be considered as asset;
- Technical knowledge in the targeted focal area(s): climate change adaptation, disaster risk management especially the GLOF and flood risk management is preferable (fill in);
- Experience with evaluating similar GEF financed projects is an advantage.

Language:

- Fluency in written and spoken English is required;
- Good knowledge of Nepali and Maithili / Bhojpuri / Terai Regional Languages is an asset.

The evaluation team shall conduct debriefing meeting with UNDP Country Office, National Project Director, Project Management Unit after end of the evaluation mission to share draft findings, recommendations. Inputs from the meeting shall be incorporated to draft and finalize the terminal evaluation report.

EVALUATOR ETHICS

The evaluation will be conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG "Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation" - UNEG 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluations' and are required to sign a Code of Conduct (**Annex E**) upon acceptance of the assignment. Evaluators will take necessary measures to protect the rights and confidentiality of informants. All evaluators must be independent and objective, and therefore should not have had any prior involvement in design, implementation, decision-making or financing any of the UNDP/ CFGORRP interventions contributing to this outcome. In addition, to avoid any conflict of interest, evaluators should not be rendering any service to the implementation agency of the projects and programme to be evaluated for a year following the evaluation.

The evaluation is expected to adhere to a framework supporting human rights-based (HRBA), results-oriented and gender responsive monitoring and evaluation. Towards this purpose, the project evaluation will encompass the principles of gender equality and human rights, ensuring that the evaluation process respects these normative standards, and aims for the progressive realization of same by respecting, protecting and fulfilling obligations of non-discrimination, access to information, and ensuring participation through a combination of consultative and participatory evaluation approaches. For more details on human rights and gender equality in evaluations, please refer to the UNEG Handbook Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluation – Towards UNEG Guidance.

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

EVALUATION CRITERIA

Combined Scoring method – where the qualifications and methodology will be weighted a max. of 70%, and combined with the price offer which will be weighted a max of 30%. Only candidates scoring 70% (i.e. 49 points) in the technical evaluation will be considered for financial proposal evaluation.

Combined Scoring method – where the qualifications and methodology will be weighted a max. of 70%, and combined with the price offer which will be weighted a max of 30%. Only candidates scoring 70% (i.e. 49 points) in the technical evaluation will be considered for financial proposal evaluation.

Technical Evaluation Criteria	Maximum Points	Weight %
<i>(a) Academic Qualification</i>	<i>(20)</i>	
Master's Degree environmental science/management, Natural resource economics/management, Social Science / Business Administration, or other closely related field.	20	20%
<i>(b) Knowledge and Experience</i>	<i>(30)</i>	
Minimum 10 years of relevant professional experience (monitoring & evaluation) in Climate Change Adaptation, Disaster Risk Management is required	20	20 %
Previous experience on results-based monitoring and evaluation methodologies with UNDP and/or GEF will be considered as asset;	5	5 %
Experience of working in similar tasks in Nepal or South East Asian countries	5	5 %
<i>(c) Technical Proposal</i>	<i>(20)</i>	
<i>Organization & Methodology</i> for carrying out this assignment	20	20%
<u>Total Technical:</u>	70	70%
<u>Financial Proposal:</u> 30%	30	30%
FINAL SCORE:	100	100%

ANNEX A: PROJECT LOGICAL FRAMEWORK

	Indicator	Baseline	Targets End of Project	Source of verification	Risks and Assumptions
Project Objective⁴ To reduce human and material losses from Glacier Lake Outburst Flooding (GLOF) in Solukhumbu District and catastrophic flooding events in the Tarai and Churia Range	Number of high risk settlements of the GLOF Impact Zone of Solukhumbu district downstream of Imja lake area covered by an Early Warning System (EWS) [refer to AMAT 1.2.1.2]	More than 31,862 people live in the high risk settlements of Imja GLOF Impact Zone and are directly vulnerable to GLOF impacts. They have no EWS. Other forms of disaster preparedness are also limited. c. 7,400 ropani (377 ha) of agricultural land at risk from GLOF impacts C. 800 houses at risk from GLOF impacts Infrastructure: 5.5 km road, 94 km trail, 25 truss and suspension bridges, 0.5 river embankment, 0.5	By the end of the project, at least 100% of the population (men and women) who are directly vulnerable to GLOF impacts within the 27 high risk settlements GLOF Impact Zone are covered by a comprehensive community-based Early Warning System (CBEWS)	Project monitoring records on CBEWS including results of random tests and mock drills Independent end of project evaluation report Existing Imja GLOF risk models used to estimate change in GLOF risks with a reduced Imja lake volume following the lake lowering and additional assumptions regarding impact of EWS in providing additional lead time that allows people to safeguard their lives and a certain proportion of	The artificial drainage channel constructed by the project is stable and continues to be maintained regularly by DHM Local communities perceive value and support in developing and maintaining a community-based EWS for the Imja GLOF Impact Zone. Climate change induced glacier melt at Imja remains at or below the level indicated by current climate change projections. The rate of glacier melt at Imja does not accelerate due to other non-climate change-related factors

⁴ Objective (Atlas output) monitored quarterly ERBM and annually in APR/PIR

	Indicator	Baseline	Targets End of Project	Source of verification	Risks and Assumptions
		<p>irrigation canal, 3 schools, 4 office buildings, 137 hotels, 64 teashops, 3 temple, gomba and mosque, 2 hydropower dam, 5 water mills, 7 transmission lines and 1 industry.</p> <p>Total direct & indirect costs of potential GLOF damages including replacement of major infrastructure estimated as \$8.98 billion (see Section 2.3.5 & Annex 1 and 4)</p>		<p>livelihood assets. (Assumptions to be determined in Year 2.)</p> <p>Revised hazard maps combined with field verification</p> <p>Trekkers evaluation surveys (end of trek evaluation done by the SNP Office)</p>	
	Number of institutions with increased capacity to minimize human and material losses	Weak system for flood risk management (only construction work is done) in DWIDP and no GLOF risk management	By the end of the project, targeted training/on the job training in gender sensitive flood risk management including disaster	Capacity assessment report done at the end of the project.	Political stability and security situation is favorable to implement planned activities.

	Indicator	Baseline	Targets End of Project	Source of verification	Risks and Assumptions
	from potential GLOF events in the High Mountains and climate-related flooding in the Tarai and Churia Range [refer to AMAT 2.2.1]	<p>committee in Solukhumbu district.</p> <p>Number of trained staff in DHM is limited to work in GLOF risk reduction.</p> <p>DDRC is mostly involved in rescue and relief for post disaster work and their activity in the targeted districts is limited.</p>	<p>preparedness will have been provided to least 32 technical staff from 2 key government departments, DHM (2 – senior level) and DWIDP (30 – district and regional level), 30 representatives from 5 DDRCs, 64 representatives from 1 GLOF Risk Management Committee and atleast 2 university students.</p> <p>DHM will have the necessary technologies, skills & systems to assess and effectively communicate GLOF risk levels and warnings.</p> <p>DWIDP will have the necessary technologies, skills & systems to monitor sediment load in flood-prone river basins in the Tarai & Churia Range</p> <p>The Annual District Plans of at least 3 of the 5 target project districts , incorporate budgeted</p>	Functional institutions in place.	<p>There will be no/limited transfers of trained technical staff in other ministries/departments or in other non-government organizations</p> <p>Institutions established at the community and district level are functional and supportive to implement the project activities.</p>

	Indicator	Baseline	Targets End of Project	Source of verification	Risks and Assumptions
			flood risk preparedness activities		
OUTCOME 1⁵ Risks of human and material losses from Glacial Lake Outburst Flooding (GLOF) events from Imja Lake reduced	Average depth of Imja lake [refer to AMAT 1.2.1.2]	Average water depth 35.1 m in May 2009 New baseline to be established before channel constructed and water level markers placed in the outlet.	Average depth of lake kept below dangerous levels by ensuring average water depth during spring and summer months is at least 3 metres or more below the baseline level prior to the construction of the channel.	Project assessments with DHM at start and end of project Annual DHM monitoring of lake depth	The artificial drainage channel constructed by the project is stable and continues to be maintained regularly by DHM Local communities perceive value and support in developing and maintaining a community-based EWS for the Imja GLOF Impact Zone. Climate change induced glacier melt at Imja remains at or below the level indicated by current climate change projections. The rate of glacier melt at Imja does not accelerate due to other non-climate change-related factors.
	Percentage of high risk settlements of Imja GLOF Impact Zone residents (including women, children and	90% of the community have heard about GLOF risks but are not prepared for it. (Source Regional	100% of residents from Solukhumbu district of the high risk settlements of the GLOF Impact Zone (within 75 km of outlet) understand how the EWS works and know	Interview-based questionnaire surveys at the start and end of the project	Communities participate in project awareness generation and training activities on GLOF risk reduction, learn how to operate and maintain the

⁵ Outcomes are equivalent to activity in ATLAS. All outcomes monitored annually in the APR/PIR.

	Indicator	Baseline	Targets End of Project	Source of verification	Risks and Assumptions
	elderly people) with a clear understand of how the EWS works and what to do in the event of a GLOF [refer to AMAT 2.1.2.1 / 3.1.1.1]	GLOF Risk Reduction Project) Baseline to be established in Year 1 of Project to identify the gender-disaggregated population (male and female) who are aware of the potential benefits of an EWS.	what to do in the event of a GLOF, including men and women and elder residents.	Project monitoring records on the CBEWS. Simulation of GLOF event and random tests of effectiveness of EWS system in a sample of villages in the GLOF Impact Zone	CBEWS and see value in maintaining it beyond the life of the project
	Number of targeted institutions with increased capacity to minimize exposure to GLOF risks [refer to AMAT 2.2.1.1 / 2.2.2.1 / 2.3.1.1/2 / 3.2.1.1]	No local institution to address or understand the GLOF risks which is creating unnecessary havoc of outbursts. Limited access to information as well as Government level institution in the Khumbu region (Imja lake and surrounding) to address or disseminate GLOF risks	No. of representatives from Solokhumbu DDRC, Sagarmatha National Park, the Imja GLOF Risk Management Committee, the CBEWS Task Forces trained to manage and minimize GLOF risks. No. & type of information materials disseminated to local and non-local people (i.e. tourists) by different agencies on GLOF risks, risk reduction measures and what to do in the event of a GLOF. By the end of the project, DHM is operating a GLOF Risk Monitoring System and has a mechanism in place to	Project monitoring reports Terminal Evaluation Report Targeted surveys on awareness and availability of GLOF-risk information materials at the start and end of the project. Information materials on GLOF risks DHM Annual Report District Disaster Management Plans District Development Plans	Political stability and security situation is favorable to implement planned activities. There will be no/limited transfers of trained technical staff in other ministries/departments or in other non-government organizations Institutions established at the community and district level are functional and supportive to implement the project activities.

	Indicator	Baseline	Targets End of Project	Source of verification	Risks and Assumptions
			communicate GLOF risk warnings to MoHa and NEOC.		
Outcome 2⁶: Human and material losses from recurrent flooding events in 4 flood-prone districts of the Tarai and Churia Range reduced	Number of additional people provided with access to safe water supply and basic sanitation services [refer to AMAT 1.2.3]	Existing tubewells in 6 VDCs get flooded during the flooding season making it difficult for 22,500 population. Water Supply/drainage systems in 4 VDCs gets flooded in monsoon making it difficult for 14,500 population	At least 70% population in 3 Districts/6 VDCs have access to 24 elevated tubewells and/or a flood-proofed drainage system	Survey, Gender disaggregated Interviews, field monitoring and testing	If concentrated rainfall occurs for 24 hours currently the districts are not equipped to deal with floods like 1993 flood disaster in central and eastern Nepal. In such a scenario the activities and modalities of the current project will be affected. Political stability and security situation in Tarai is favorable to implement planned activities. Less/no extreme climate events occur that can accelerate intensive rainfall by triggering floods, debris flow and landslides in the targeted locations.

⁶ All outcomes monitored annually in the APR/PIR.

	Indicator	Baseline	Targets End of Project	Source of verification	Risks and Assumptions
					<p>Tube well and drainage system remain functional through the year (during monsoon)</p> <p>Local community/ authorities value and support the interventions undertaken by the project</p> <p>Land to install tube-wells made available by local people and Government authorities.</p>
	<p>Number of people and value of their material assets covered by a CBEWS in the four target project districts</p> <p>[refer to AMAT 2.2.2.1 / 3.1.1.1 / 3.2.1.1]</p>	<p>There are no EWS in the 4 project target districts; 3 VDCs (Mahasthan, Hattilet and Aurahi) communities in Mahottari district – Janagha River) have been trained in CBEWS UNDP/CDRMP-programme.</p> <p>The total population of the most flood-prone VDCs in all the is: 64,700 people</p>	<p>100 % f population covered by Community Based Early Warning Systems in all target flood-prone river basins (Refer to the previous section page 4- target 3rd paragraph)</p>	<p>Gender disaggregated interviews, Field survey, Monitoring and mock drill</p>	<p>Local community/ authorities value and support the interventions undertaken by the project including CBEWS</p> <p>Linkages among community, DEOC and NEOC should be intact...thereby establishing a last mile connectivity.</p> <p>Local community/ authorities value and</p>

	Indicator	Baseline	Targets End of Project	Source of verification	Risks and Assumptions
		Value of material assets vulnerable to flood impacts in these VDCS will be established at the start of the project.			support the interventions undertaken by the project
	<p>Number of targeted institutions with increased capacity to minimize exposure to flood risks in the Tarai & Churia Range</p> <p>[refer to AMAT 2.2.1.1 / 3.2.1.1]</p>	<p>Weak system for flood risk management. DWIDP currently focuses only construction work.</p> <p>Number of trained staff in DWIDP on flood risk management is very limited.</p> <p>DDRC is mostly involved in rescue and relief for post disaster work and their activity in the targeted districts is limited.</p>	<p>By the end of the project, at least 8 gender sensitive Village Disaster Management Plans prepared by Village Disaster Management Committees in the Tarai & Churia Range</p> <p>By the end of the project, at least two vulnerable VDCS of four districts will have CBEWSs and which are being effectively maintained by local communities (including women) under the leadership of the Village Management Committees.</p>	<p>Project monitoring reports</p> <p>Terminal Evaluation Report</p> <p>Village Disaster Management Plans are incorporated into the Districts and VDC development plans</p> <p>Results of random testing of CBEWS operation in a sample of villages by the project.</p> <p>DWIDP Annual Report</p> <p>District Disaster Management Plans</p> <p>District Development Plans</p>	<p>Political stability and security situation in Tarai is favorable to implement planned activities.</p> <p>There will be no/limited transfers of trained technical staff in other ministries/departments or in other non-government organizations</p> <p>Institutions established at the community and district level are functional and supportive to implement the project activities.</p>

ANNEX B: LIST OF DOCUMENTS TO BE REVIEWED BY THE EVALUATORS

GEF Project Information Form (PIF), Project Document, and Log Frame Analysis (LFA)

UNDP Initiation Plan

UNDP Project Document

UNDP Environmental and Social Screening results

Project Inception Report

Project Implementation Plan

All Project Implementation Reports (PIR's)

Mid Term Report

Quarterly & Annual progress reports and work plans of the various implementation task teams

Audit reports

Oversight mission reports

All monitoring reports prepared by the project

Financial and Administration guidelines used by Project Team

Finalized GEF focal area Tracking Tools at CEO endorsement and midterm

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

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

(Note: 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. Refer to Annex 4 of the TE Guidance for a completed, sample evaluation criteria matrix)

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
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is the project relevant to National priorities and commitment under international conventions? Is the project relevant to the local communities? Is the CFGORRP relevant intervention? Is it relevant to bring benefits to poor women and people from vulnerable community? Has it responded to real needs and priorities of the targeted community in the context of the project district/VDCs? Has it adapted to changing conditions? Does CFGORRP contribute to GoN national objectives? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Relationships established, level of coherence between project design and implementation approach, specific activities conducted, quality of risk mitigation strategies, etc. Achievement on targeted outputs and delivery of inputs and activities Level of stakeholder participation in project design and ownership in project 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Achievements of expected outcomes and objectives measured in progress of indicators What were the major factors influencing the achievement or non-achievement of the objectives? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Progress measured based on indicators set up in project document 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Management of challenges & risks 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identification of risks and challenges and management to have no or less impacts on project 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none">

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommendations of Mid Term Review have been implemented • Relevant lessons from project 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Management response prepared and updated by the project • Lessons from the project to replicate in other projects in future 	•	•
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Efficient project management • Were objectives achieved on time? • Was the programme or project implemented in the most efficient way compared to alternatives? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Management system of the project including admin finance system, monitoring system as per the norms and standard • Project Implementation and Adaptive Management • Changes in logical model and work plans made • Use of resources to meet the project targets • Collaboration among organizations to meet the project objectives • Technical support from partners • 	•	•
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conditions necessary for results and outcomes being sustained after the project • To what extent did the benefits of a programme or project continue after donor funding ceased? • What were the major factors which influenced the achievement or non-achievement of sustainability of the programme or project? • How sustainable (or likely to be sustainable) are the outputs and outcomes of the CFGORRP interventions? • Are CFGORRP interventions well designed and exit strategy well planned? What could be done to strengthen exit strategies and ensure sustainability of interventions made? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Capacity development to sustain results • Policy or institutional measures are required to sustain the outputs • Stakeholders ownership • 	•	•

- Project impacts

- Impacts created or likely to create by project execution based on logical model of project
- What works better for attaining the broader results
- If there are any unintended and negative impacts due to the project
- What real difference has the activity made to the beneficiaries?

•

•

ANNEX D: RATING SCALES

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

ANNEX E: EVALUATION CONSULTANT CODE OF CONDUCT AND AGREEMENT FORM

Evaluators:

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

Evaluation Consultant Agreement 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 F: EVALUATION REPORT OUTLINE⁸

- 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 Manual⁹)
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 rated¹⁰)
- 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 (*), implementation (*), and overall assessment (*)

⁸The Report length should not exceed 40 pages in total (not including annexes).

⁹ UNDP Style Manual, Office of Communications, Partnerships Bureau, updated November 2008

¹⁰ See Annex D for rating scales.

- Implementing Agency (UNDP) execution (*) and Executing Agency execution (*), overall project implementation/ execution (*), coordination, and operational issues
- 3.3** Project Results
- Overall results (attainment of objectives) (*)
 - Relevance (*)
 - Effectiveness (*)
 - Efficiency (*)
 - Country ownership
 - Mainstreaming
 - Sustainability: financial resources (*), socio-economic (*), institutional framework and governance (*), environmental (*), and overall likelihood (*)
 - Impact
- 4.** Conclusions, Recommendations & Lessons
- Corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project
 - Actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the project
 - Proposals for future directions underlining main objectives
 - Best and worst practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance and success
- 5.** Annexes
- 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

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: _____

ANNEX H: TE REPORT AUDIT TRAIL

The following is a template for the evaluator to show how the received comments on the draft TE report have (or have not) been incorporated into the final TE report. This audit trail should be included as an annex in the final TE report.

To the comments received on (date) from the Terminal Evaluation of (project name) (UNDP PIMS #)

The following comments were provided in track changes to the draft Terminal Evaluation report; they are referenced by institution ("Author" column) and track change comment number ("#" column):

OFFEROR'S LETTER TO UNDP CONFIRMING INTEREST AND AVAILABILITY FOR THE INDIVIDUAL CONTRACTOR (IC) ASSIGNMENT

Ref.: UNDP/PN/41/2017 – International Consultant – Team Leader – Final Evaluation

Date _____

United Nations Development Programme
Procurement Unit
Nepal

Dear Sir/Madam:

I hereby declare that :

- a) I have read, understood and hereby accept the Terms of Reference describing the duties and responsibilities of [*indicate title of assignment*] under the [*state project title*];
- b) I have also read, understood and hereby accept UNDP's General Conditions of Contract for the Services of the Individual Contractors;
- c) I hereby propose my services and I confirm my interest in performing the assignment through the submission of my Personal History Form (P11) which I have duly signed and attached hereto as Annex 1;
- d) In compliance with the requirements of the Terms of Reference, I hereby confirm that I am available for the entire duration of the assignment, and I shall perform the services in the manner described in my proposed approach/methodology which I have attached hereto as Annex 3 *[delete this item if the TOR does not require submission of this document]*;
- e) I hereby propose to complete the services based on the following payment rate : *[pls. check the box corresponding to the preferred option]*:
 - ☐ An all-inclusive daily fee of *[state amount in words and in numbers indicating currency]*
 - ☒ **A total lump sum of [state amount in words and in numbers, indicating exact currency], payable in the manner described in the Terms of Reference.**
- f) For your evaluation, the breakdown of the abovementioned all-inclusive amount is attached hereto as Annex 2;
- g) I recognize that the payment of the abovementioned amounts due to me shall be based on my delivery of outputs within the timeframe specified in the TOR, which shall be subject to UNDP's review, acceptance and payment certification procedures;
- h) This offer shall remain valid for a total period of _____ days *[minimum of 90 days]* after the submission deadline;
- i) I confirm that I have no first degree relative (mother, father, son, daughter, spouse/partner, brother or sister) currently employed with any UN agency or office *[disclose the name of the relative, the UN office employing the relative, and the relationship if, any such relationship exists];*

j) If I am selected for this assignment, I shall *[pls. check the appropriate box]*:

- ☐ Sign an Individual Contract with UNDP;
- ☐ Request my employer *[state name of company/organization/institution]* to sign with UNDP a Reimbursable Loan Agreement (RLA), for and on my behalf. The contact person and details of my employer for this purpose are as follows:
-

k) I hereby confirm that *[check all that applies]*:

- ☐ At the time of this submission, I have no active Individual Contract or any form of engagement with any Business Unit of UNDP;
- ☐ I am currently engaged with UNDP and/or other entities for the following work :

Assignment	Contract Type	UNDP Business Unit / Name of Institution/Company	Contract Duration	Contract Amount

- ☐ I am also anticipating conclusion of the following work from UNDP and/or other entities for which I have submitted a proposal :

Assignment	Contract Type	Name of Institution/ Company	Contract Duration	Contract Amount

- l) I fully understand and recognize that UNDP is not bound to accept this proposal, and I also understand and accept that I shall bear all costs associated with its preparation and submission and that UNDP will in no case be responsible or liable for those costs, regardless of the conduct or outcome of the selection process.
- m) ***If you are a former staff member of the United Nations recently separated, pls. add this section to your letter:*** I hereby confirm that I have complied with the minimum break in service required before I can be eligible for an Individual Contract.
- n) I also fully understand that, if I am engaged as an Individual Contractor, I have no expectations nor entitlements whatsoever to be re-instated or re-employed as a staff member.

Full Name and Signature:

Date Signed:

Annexes *[pls. check all that applies]*:

- ☐ Duly signed P11 Form
- ☐ Breakdown of Costs Supporting the Final All-Inclusive Price as per Template

BREAKDOWN OF COSTS SUPPORTING THE ALL-INCLUSIVE FINANCIAL PROPOSAL

A. Breakdown of Cost by Components: **(Please use only the applicable cost headings)**

Cost Components	Unit Cost	Quantity	Total Rate for the Contract Duration
I. Personnel Costs			
Professional Fees		20 days	
Life Insurance			
Medical Insurance			
Communications			
Land Transportation			
Others (pls. specify)			
II. Travel Expenses to Join duty station			
Round Trip Airfares to and from duty station	1	Trip	
Living Allowance – for KTM			
Travel Insurance			
Terminal Expenses			
Others (pls. specify)			
III. Duty Travel			
Round Trip Airfares			
Living Allowance			
Travel Insurance			
Terminal Expenses			
Others (pls. specify)			
IV. Field visits outside duty station	Please quote lumpsum amount for field visits outside duty station (Kathmandu valley). The amount should include travel, DSA and other relevant associated costs for field visits.		