

# **TERMS OF REFERENCE**

## **FOR INDIVIDUAL CONTRACT**

**POSITION TITLE:** Terminal Evaluator

**AGENCY/PROJECT NAME:** Effective and responsive island-level governance to secure and diversify climate resilient marine based coastal livelihoods and enhance climate hazard response capacity

**COUNTRY OF ASSIGNMENT:** Home-based with expected travels to Tuvalu

**DURATION:** 32 days within 12 weeks period  
February 2019 – April 2019

### **GENERAL BACKGROUND**

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 **Effective and responsive island-level governance to secure and diversify climate resilient marine-based coastal livelihoods and enhance climate hazard response capacity** (PIMS# 4541.). This Project is commonly referred to as the NAPA 2 Project.

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

### **PROJECT SUMMARY TABLE**

<b>Project Title:</b>	<b>Effective and responsive island-level governance to secure and diversify climate resilient marine-based coastal livelihoods and enhance climate hazard response capacity</b>			
GEF Project ID:	00073054		<i>at endorsement (Million US\$)</i>	<i>at completion (Million US\$)</i>
UNDP Project ID:	00086021	GEF financing:	\$4,200,000	\$4,200,000
Country:	Tuvalu	IA/EA own:	NIL	NIL
Region:	RBAP	Government:	14,497,206	
Focal Area:	CCA	Other:	4,430,484	
FA Objectives, (OP/SP):	1.1 & 5.1	Total co-financing:	19,838,880	
Executing Agency:	Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Trade,	Total Project Cost:	\$24,038,880	

	Environment and Labor			
Other Partners involved:	Ministry of Natural Resource, Ministry of Home Affairs and Rural Development	ProDoc Signature (date project began):		30 August, 2013
		(Operational) Closing Date:	Proposed: 30 August, 2017	Actual: 31 December 2018

## OBJECTIVE AND SCOPE OF THE ASSIGNMENT

The NAPA 2 Project focusses on implementing three such priorities outlined in its NAPA, namely “strengthening of community-based conservation programmes on highly vulnerable near-shore marine ecosystems,” “adaptation to near-shore coastal shellfish fisheries resources and coral reef ecosystem productivity,” and “strengthening community disaster preparedness and response potential.” These priorities are addressed through the following interlinked Components:

Component 1 includes activities for building resilience in marine-based livelihoods to climate impacts through an integrated package of measures that seek to enhance traditional fishing practices and food preservation techniques, facilitate a shift in fishing practices from vulnerable reef resources to more resilient pelagic resources, and strengthen community management of reef resources. These adaptation measures are supported by targeted education, awareness raising and information exchange.

Component 2: Disaster risk management focusses on improving access to disaster early warning systems for people on outer islands. This will include establishing multiple communication channels, both at the national and outer island levels, to ensure reliable communications in the face of intensifying cyclone events in a changing climate and building community capacity to take advantage of the improved communication systems.

Component 3 focusses on integrating locally-specific climate change concerns into existing outer Island Strategic Plans and building capacities of outer island administrations and communities to identify, budget, execute and monitor adaptation investments that are financed by domestic and external resources. This will be supplemented by enhanced awareness among the central government agencies about their existing domestic expenditures on climate sensitive sectors and the adaptation gaps. It is expected that enhanced capacity to guide the future adaptation financing at the outer island level using the climate-smart Island Strategic Plans and to identify gaps and potential adaptation financing at the national level will enable the Government of Tuvalu to effectively combine and sequence available resources to reduce the vulnerability of the country to the impacts of climate change.

The Department of the Environment under the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Environment, Trade, Labour and Tourism is response for execution of this Project. Component 1 is executed through the Department of Fisheries (Ministry of Natural Resources) whilst Component 3 is executed by the Department of Rural Development (Name of Ministry of Home Affairs and Rural Development). Quarterly reporting both financial and narrative are submitted through the Department of Environment to the UNDP Pacific Office based in Suva.

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 method<sup>1</sup> 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. The evaluator is expected to amend, complete and submit this matrix as part of an evaluation inception report, and shall include it as an annex to the final report.

The evaluation must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The evaluator is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with government counterparts, in particular the GEF operational focal point, UNDP Country Office, project team, UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based in the region and key stakeholders. The evaluator is expected to conduct a field mission to Tuvalu, *to three islands being Vaitupu and Nukufetau including Funafuti*. Interviews will be held with the following organizations and individuals at a minimum: Department of Environment, Department of Rural Development, UNDP, Department of Fisheries, Tuvalu Red Cross, Tuvaluan Association of Non-Governmental Organizations, project consultants, Office of the Prime Minister, Secretariat of the Pacific Community (SPC), Disaster Management Office, Commonwealth Local Government Forum, Tuvalu Media Department, Island Councils (Kaupule), community members and other important stakeholders.

The evaluator will review all relevant sources of information, such as the project document, project reports – including Annual APR/PIR, project budget revisions, midterm review, progress reports, GEF focal area tracking tools, project files, national strategic and legal documents, and any other materials that the evaluator considers useful for this evidence-based assessment. A list of documents that the project team will provide to the evaluator for review is included in [Annex B](#) of this Terms of Reference.

## EVALUATION CRITERIA & RATINGS

An assessment of project performance will be carried out, based against expectations set out in the Project Logical Framework/Results Framework (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	

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

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.

## 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.<sup>2</sup>

## 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,

<sup>2</sup> A useful tool for gauging progress to impact is the Review of Outcomes to Impacts (ROtI) method developed by the GEF Evaluation Office: [ROtI Handbook 2009](#)

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/ PROVISION OF MONITORING AND PROGRESS CONTROLS**

The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation resides with the UNDP Pacific Office in *Fiji*. The UNDP Pacific Office will contract the evaluators and ensure the timely provision of per diems and travel arrangements within the country for the evaluation team. The NAPA 2 Project Team will be responsible for liaising with the evaluator to set up stakeholder interviews, arrange field visits, coordinate with the Government etc. The consultant is expected to visit 3 islands in Tuvalu including Funafuti. The Project Team will facilitate travel arrangements in country.

## **EVALUATION TIMEFRAME, DUTY STATION and EXPECTED PLACES OF TRAVEL**

The total duration of the evaluation will be 32 days over a time of 12 weeks according to the following plan:

Activity	Timing	Completion Date
<b>Preparation</b>	<i>Feb 1-4 – (4 days)</i>	<i>Feb 5</i>
<b>Evaluation Mission</b>	<i>Feb 11 - 26 (16 days)</i>	<i>Feb 27</i>
<b>Draft Evaluation Report</b>	<i>Mar 1 – 8 (8 days)</i>	<i>Mar 8</i>
<b>Final Report</b>	<i>April 1 - 4 (4 days)</i>	<i>April 5</i>

Duty Station: Home-based with expected travels

Expected places of travel: A field mission to *three islands i.e. Vaitupu, Nukufetau, Funafuti in Tuvalu.*

## **EVALUATION DELIVERABLES**

The evaluation team is expected to deliver the following:

Deliverable	Content	Timing	Responsibilities
<b>Inception Report</b>	Evaluator provides clarifications on timing and method	February	Evaluator submits to UNDP CO
<b>Presentation</b>	Initial Findings	End of evaluation mission: February 27	To project management, UNDP CO
<b>Draft Final Report</b>	Full report, (per annexed template) with annexes	March 8	Sent to CO, reviewed by RTA, PCU, GEF OFPs
<b>Final Report*</b>	Revised report	April 5	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.

## **DEGREE OF EXPERIENCE AND QUALIFICATIONS**

---

The consultant shall have prior experience in evaluating similar projects. Experience with GEF financed projects is an advantage. The evaluator selected should not have participated in the project preparation and/or implementation and should not have conflict of interest with project related activities.

The consultant must present the following

### **Qualifications:**

- A Master’s degree in Natural Resource Management, Conservation, Development, or other closely related field and /or at least 10 years of relevant work experience;

### **Experience/Attributes**

- Minimum of 5 years of experience facilitating leading and/or facilitating evaluations for development agencies
- Previous experience with results-based monitoring and evaluation methodologies;
- Strong networks and experience with stakeholder engagement
- Technical knowledge in the targeted focal area(s): *climate change adaptation, mitigation,*
- Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender and biodiversity, land degradation and international waters; experience in gender sensitive evaluation and analysis.
- Excellent communication skills;
- Proficient in English and local language
- Project evaluation/review experiences within United Nations system and managing evaluation teams will be considered an asset

### **Evaluation Criteria for selection of the best offer**

#### **Cumulative analysis**

The award of the contract shall 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 set of weighted technical criteria (70%). and financial criteria (30%). Financial score shall be computed as a ratio of the proposal being evaluated and the lowest priced proposal received by UNDP for the assignment.

<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Max. Point</b>
<b>Qualification</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A Master’s degree in Natural Resource Management, Conservation, Development, or other closely related field and /or at least 10 years of relevant work experience;</li> </ul>	10%

<p><b>Experience</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Minimum of 5 years of experience facilitating leading and/or facilitating evaluations for development agencies</li> <li>• Previous experience with results-based monitoring and evaluation methodologies;</li> <li>• Technical knowledge in the targeted focal area(s): <i>climate change adaptation, mitigation,</i></li> <li>• Strong networks and experience with stakeholder engagement</li> <li>• Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender and biodiversity, land degradation and international waters; experience in gender sensitive evaluation and analysis.</li> </ul>	<p>15%</p> <p>10%</p> <p>15%</p> <p>10%</p> <p>10%</p>
<p><b>Total</b></p>	<p>70%</p>

Only candidates obtaining a minimum of 49 points (70% of the total technical points) would be considered for the Financial Evaluation. The financial proposal for such candidates will be weighted at 30% of overall evaluation.

## EVALUATOR ETHICS

---

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

## PAYMENT MODALITIES AND SPECIFICATIONS

---

%	Milestone
30%	At submission and approval of inception report which will include list of stakeholders to be consulted and methodologies
30%	Following submission and approval of the 1ST draft terminal evaluation report
40%	Following submission and approval (UNDP-CO and UNDP RTA) of the final terminal evaluation report

## REVIEW TIME REQUIRED

---

The review and approval of payments will be made by the assigned supervisor(s) within 30 days after the submitted report is deemed complete.

## CONSULTANT PRESENCE REQUIRED ON DUTY STATION/UNDP PREMISES

---

Only during the field mission

### Proposal Submission

Offerors must send the following documents.

- i) **Signed CV form including names of at least 3 referees**
- iii) **Completed template for confirmation of Interest and Submission of Financial Proposal**

Consultant must send a financial proposal based on a **Lump Sum Amount**. The total amount quoted shall be all-inclusive and include all costs components required to perform the deliverables identified in the TOR, including professional fee, travel costs\*, living allowance (if any work is to be done outside the IC's duty station) and any other applicable cost to be incurred by the IC in completing the assignment. The contract price will be fixed output-based price regardless of extension of the herein specified duration. Payments will be done upon completion of the deliverables/outputs.

\* The travel costs to be included in the Lump Sum amount should cover the travel only from your home country to Fiji, including two working days in Fiji. The costs of airfare from Fiji to Tuvalu, domestic travel in Tuvalu and living allowances while in Tuvalu will be paid according to the UNDP official policy.

In general, UNDP shall not accept travel costs exceeding those of an economy class ticket. Should the IC wish to travel on a higher class he/she should do so using their own resources

In the event of unforeseeable travel not anticipated in this TOR, payment of travel costs including tickets, lodging and terminal expenses should be agreed upon, between the respective business unit and the Individual Consultant, prior to travel and will be reimbursed.



**APPROVAL**

---

This TOR is approved by:

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Yusuke Taishi'.

Signature:

Name and designation: Yusuke Taishi

Date of signing: Regional Technical Advisor, UNDP-GEF

## ANNEX A: PROJECT LOGICAL FRAMEWORK

<p><b>This project will contribute to achieving the following Programme Outcome as defined in Sub-Regional Programme Document 2013-2017:</b></p> <p><b>UNDAF Sub-Regional Programme Outcome 4 (UNDAF Outcome 1.1)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Improved resilience of PICTs, with particular focus on communities, through integrated implementation of sustainable environment management, climate change adaptation/mitigation and disaster risk management</li> </ul> <p><b>Sub-Regional Programme Outcome 2 (UNDAF Outcome 5.1)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Regional, national, local and traditional governance systems are strengthened, respecting and upholding human rights, especially women’s rights in line with international standards</li> </ul>						
<p><b>Sub-Regional Programme Outcome Indicators (UNDP Sub-Regional Program Document):</b></p> <p><b>Outcome 4</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Share of budget resources earmarked for environmental sustainability, disaster risk management, climate change adaptation and mitigation; share of population with sustainable access to improved water sources and to renewable energy (disaggregated by gender and age); ratio of protected area to maintain biological diversity</li> </ul> <p><b>Outcome 2</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Number of countries to develop service delivery mechanisms to ensure greater equity and inclusion of most vulnerable in the population..</li> </ul>						
<p><b>Primary applicable Key Environment and Sustainable Development Key Result Area: 3. Promote climate change adaptation</b></p>						
<p><b>Applicable GEF Strategic Objective and Program:</b></p> <p>CCA-1: “Reduce vulnerability to the adverse impacts of climate change, including variability, at local, national, regional and global level”</p> <p>CCA-2: “Increase adaptive capacity to respond to the impacts of climate change, including variability, at local, national, regional and global level.”</p>						
<p><b>Applicable GEF Expected Outcomes:</b></p> <p><u>Outcome 1.1:</u> Mainstreamed adaptation in broader development frameworks at country level and in targeted vulnerable areas</p> <p><u>Outcome 1.3:</u> Diversified and strengthened livelihoods and sources of income for vulnerable people in targeted areas</p> <p><u>Outcome 2.1:</u> Increased knowledge and understanding of climate variability and change-induced risks at country level and in targeted vulnerable areas</p>						
<p><b>Applicable GEF Outcome Indicators:</b></p> <p><u>Outcome Indicator 1.1.1:</u> Adaptation actions implemented in national/sub-regional development frameworks (no. and type)</p> <p><u>Outcome Indicator 1.3.1:</u> Households and communities have more secure access to livelihood assets (Score) – Disaggregated by gender</p> <p><u>Outcome Indicator 2.1.1:</u> Relevant risk information disseminated to stakeholders (Yes/No)</p>						
	<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Targets End of Project</b>	<b>Source of verification</b>	<b>Risks and Assumptions</b>	
<b>Project Objective<sup>1</sup></b>	Resilience of island communities to climate change variability and risks is strengthened through participatory island-level planning, budgeting and execution and community-led investments	Take up of climate resilient marine-based livelihood options	Traditional techniques that are resilient to changes in marine ecosystems have been lost or are not passed down by old people while access to new techniques, materials and information from off island and overseas is poor. These are limiting options for pursuing resilient,	By the end of the Project at least 40% of the targeted households adopted at least one form of traditional resilient marine livelihood methods (including canoe building, traditional fishing methods, postharvest fish processing, or aquaculture) (gender-disaggregated data will be presented)	Project terminal evaluation report Project surveys and technical assessment reports	<p><b>Assumptions:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Tangible socio-economic benefits are generated for and recognized by the project beneficiaries</li> <li>Project activities are fully participatory</li> <li>Project team has access to a dedicated vessel to meet expectations of communities</li> </ul>

<sup>1</sup> Objective (Atlas output) monitored quarterly ERBM and annually in APR/PIR

		appropriate and safe low-cost livelihoods.			<p>and timely delivery of project activities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sufficient political commitment from key stakeholder governments are ensured throughout the life cycle of the project</li> <li>• The government is able to attract high-quality project staff</li> </ul> <p><b>Risks:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is insufficient ownership by communities for greater impact and sustainability</li> <li>• Local capacity constrains for implementation</li> <li>• Logistics of working in outer island</li> </ul>
	Percentage of the Tuvaluan population covered by the 24/7 early warning system	The existing communications systems are inadequate to send early warning message in a timely manner	95% of Tuvaluan receives early warning in a timely manner using one of the multiple communication lines (gender-disaggregated data will be presented)	Mock drills	
	Outer island communities able to access climate/development funds using climate-mainstreamed ISPs	No climate resilience investments made using the ISPs as a guiding tool	By the end of the project at least eight adaptation priority actions (one in each island) at the island level, outlined in ISPs, are financed by either domestic or external resources and executed.	Assessments of annual budget reports from outer islands Mid-term and terminal evaluation reports	
<p><b>Outcome 1<sup>2</sup></b> Marine based coastal livelihoods of Tuvaluan outer islands made resilient to declining productivity induced by climate variability and change</p> <p>Scores (from 1 to 5) in this section are “Households having access to secure assets to marine livelihood assets” assigned based on the results of the Baseline survey as per the AMAT framework. Scores are: 1. No access to marine livelihood assets; 2. Poor access to ...; 3. Moderate access to ...; 4. Secure access to ...; 5. Very secure access to ...</p>	<p>1.1 Households and communities have more secure access to livelihood assets – disaggregated by gender [AMAT 1.3.1]</p> <p>1.2 The area of Marine Protected Areas (MPAs) or Locally Managed Marine Areas (LMMAs) managed in a climate-resilient manner</p>	<p>Few households have access to traditional and resilient livelihood assets and methods (Score=2)</p> <p>Currently 76 km<sup>2</sup> of island reef areas is under marine management (includes Funafuti Conservation Area at 33km<sup>2</sup>) but currently no systematic management arrangement or resource monitoring framework is in place</p>	<p>Score improved to 4: By the end of the project at least 50% of targeted outer islands households have access to climate resilient marine-based livelihood methods introduced/strengthened in the project (gender-disaggregated data will be presented)</p> <p>The area of MPA/MMAs is clarified and some form of management applied to at least a quarter of the reef area on each outer island (area to be calculated) with a corresponding climate-resilient community management plan or Kaupule by-law. Capacity to undertake creel surveys and maintain the database developed among community-based MPA/MMA management groups.</p>	<p>Questionnaires (repeated and modified for survey of key informants, women, youth and fishers) Mid-term and terminal evaluation reports Records of marine managed areas and presence of by-laws or management plan Creel survey results linked to management responses.</p>	<p><b>Assumptions:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• People on outer islands see traditional and resilient methods as desirable given development imperatives and lifestyle preferences.</li> <li>• People on outer islands see managed areas as a common resource, not just for VIP visitors</li> </ul> <p><b>Risks:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Shipping schedules and weather impede transmission of trainers and materials.</li> <li>• People fail to carry out creel surveys systematically</li> <li>• Unexpected increase in shipping schedules and costs makes it too difficult to run annual events.</li> </ul>

<sup>2</sup> All outcomes monitored annually in the APR/PIR. It is highly recommended not to have more than 4 outcomes.

	1.3 The level of awareness about links between improved marine ecosystem management and sustainability and resilience of subsistence marine-based livelihoods	Current understanding of the links between marine resource monitoring, management and livelihoods is low.	At least 50% of Fisheries staff, Kaupule, women, youth and fishers interviewed confirm a clear link between resource management and resilience of livelihoods (gender-disaggregated data will be presented)	Questionnaires (repeated and modified for survey of key informants, women, youth and fishers) Mid-term and terminal evaluation reports	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Uptake of knowledge is low and resilience not significantly improved.</li> </ul>
<p>Outputs supporting Outcome 1</p> <p>1.1. Climate-resilient marine-based livelihood techniques are implemented benefiting at least 50% of the population</p> <p>1.2. Capacity of local administrations, CSOs, communities and Community Fisheries Centers enhanced to integrate climate risks in the community-based management of MMA/MPA including zoning guidance, marine resource stock surveys and monitoring and enforcement</p> <p>1.3. Awareness enhanced for at least 2000 people including island Kaupules, central government staff, CSOs, and community members to understand and respond to the impacts of climate induced risks on marine based coastal livelihoods</p>					
<p><b>Outcome 2</b> Capacity of outer islands enhanced to respond to increasing/intensifying climate induced hydro-meteorological risks</p>	2.1. Relevant risk information disseminated to stakeholders [AMAT 2.1.1.]	The existing warning/communication system with triple-backup system (satellite phone, landline and electricity-powered radio) is inadequate to warn communities within a reasonable time due to deficiencies in power systems for telephone systems in the outer islands.	By the end of the project at least 95% of populations are able to receive and respond to early warnings and take the appropriate actions following the warning (gender-disaggregated data will be presented)	Observations and reports from the annual mock drills Mid-term and terminal evaluation reports	<p><b>Assumptions:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>AM Radio infrastructure, which is the primary baseline project for covering 100% of population continues to operate under extreme conditions</li> <li>Disaster Management Arrangement Bill is revised in a timely manner to planned to be revised with assistance from SOPAC</li> <li>There is sufficient technical capacity and human resources for installation of communication equipment</li> </ul> <p><b>Risks:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>High turn-over among key stakeholders in the government and NGO sector during the project implementation results in loss of knowledge and experience</li> <li>Bureaucratic process causes delays in the revision of the Disaster Management Arrangement Bill</li> <li></li> </ul>

Outputs supporting Outcome 2					
1.1. Each island is equipped with robust communication facilities and early warning system facilities					
1.2. Raised awareness and preparedness of outer island communities for climate-induced extreme events					
<b>Outcome 3</b> Enhanced capacity of communities to access internal/external financing for community-based climate change adaptation through existing participatory development planning processes	3.1 Local development framework (i.e. ISP)_that integrate climate risks	Only two islands have some reference to ISPs. Annual budgeting exercise has been undertaken only in one island.	By the end of the project, all outer islands have their ISPs revised to integrate climate risks Annual budgeting process building on the ISP is in place	BTOR from the periodic monitoring visits Presence of the revised ISP and annual budget documents Mid-term and terminal evaluation reports	<b>Assumptions:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• By the commencement of the project, all remaining islands complete ISPs</li> <li>• There is high level commitment and buy-ins from officials in the central and outer island government to revise their ISPs and use domestic resources for adaptation purposes</li> <li>• Communities are prepared to set aside time and funds for monitoring of available resources and execution of adaptive investments</li> <li>• There is compliance of the Falekaupule Act by Kaupules</li> <li>• Available domestic resources to outer islands (SDE, FTF and core revenues) remain viable sources</li> </ul> <b>Risks:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agreements are not made among communities on the adaptation priority actions financed by domestic resources</li> <li>• Limited capacity within technical agencies to support the execution of island-level priority actions</li> <li>• Disruptions in periodic visits result in non-completion of annual budgets</li> </ul>
	3.2 Adaptation actions implemented from island level plans (no. and type) [AMAT 1.1.1]	No adaptation action has been implemented based on Island Strategic Plans	By the end of the project at least eight adaptation priority actions (one in each island) at the island level, outlined in ISPs, are financed by either domestic or external resources and executed.	Audited Island accounts Compiled report produced by the ISP officer on the consolidated island-level budgets and use	
Outputs supporting Outcome 3					
1.1. All outer Island Strategic Plans integrate island-specific climate risks through existing gender-sensitive, participatory processes					
1.2. Capacity of Kaupules, Falekaupules and community members for monitoring adaptation investments strengthened					
1.3. National and outer island capacity to leverage, sequence and combine domestic resource for climate change adaptation investments strengthened					

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

---

*Quarterly reports*

*Technical Reports*

*Documentary*

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

*Project Implementation Plan*

*Implementing/Executing partner arrangements*

*List and contact details for project staff, key project stakeholders, including Project Boards, and other partners to be consulted*

*Project sites, highlighting suggested visits*

*Mid Term Review (MTR) Report*

*Annual Project Implementation (APR/PIR) Reports*

*Project budget and financial data*

*Project Tracking Tool, at baseline, at mid-term, and at terminal points*

*UNDP Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF)*

*UNDP Country Programme Document (CPD)*

*UNDP Country Programme Action Plan (CPAP)*

*GEF focal area strategic program objectives*

## ANNEX C: EVALUATION QUESTIONS

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

Evaluative Criteria Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
<b>Relevance: How does the project relate to the main objectives of the GEF focal area, and to the environment and development priorities at the local, regional and national levels?</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Which national development strategies including climate change policy did the project contribute to?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Level of contribution to GEF tracking tools</li> <li>Level of community ownership at national and island level</li> <li>Participation at international meetings</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Quarterly reports</li> <li>Filed visits and discussions with stakeholders</li> <li>Project staff</li> <li>Project partners</li> <li>GEF Tracking tools</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Document analysis document analysis, data analysis, interviews with project staff, interviews with stakeholders, etc.)</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>How did the project contribute to Island Strategic Plans?</li> </ul>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>What regional &amp; international commitments/agreements did the project contribute to?</li> </ul>			
<b>Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved?</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>What were key achievements? What some factors which contributed to these achievements?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Level of execution of outputs under three outcomes</li> <li>Level of community ownership and implementation of activities at island level</li> <li>Level of stakeholder collaboration and support for execution of activities</li> <li>Identification and justification for activities beyond control of government</li> <li>Level of ownership of project amongst Department of Rural Development, Fishery and Environment</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Quarterly reports</li> <li>Filed visits and discussions with stakeholders</li> <li>Project staff</li> <li>Project partners</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Document analysis document analysis, data analysis, interviews with project staff, interviews with stakeholders, etc.)</li> <li></li> <li></li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>What were some delays/challenges? What some factors which contributed to these delays/challenges?</li> </ul>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Were there any factors beyond the control of the Project and Government?</li> </ul>			
<b>Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards?</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Were annual work plans executed in a timely manner? If so, please explain?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Technical and financial delivery of annual work plan</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Quarterly reports</li> <li>Field visits and discussions with stakeholders, Project</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Document analysis document analysis, data analysis,</li> </ul>

		staff and Project partners	interviews with project staff, interviews with stakeholders, etc.)
<b>Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, social-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What risk were experienced during implementation of the project?</li> <li>• In what ways did they affect the project?</li> <li>• How were they addressed/managed?</li> <li>• How and why should they be managed beyond the life of the project?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Type of risks identified</li> <li>• Impacts of risk to project</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Quarterly reports</li> <li>• Field visits and discussions with stakeholders, Project staff and Project partners</li> <li>• PIR</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Document analysis document analysis, data analysis, interviews with project staff, interviews with stakeholders, etc.)</li> </ul>
<b>Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward, reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status?</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Did impacts of the project contribute to reduced environmental stress and/or improve ecological stress?</li> <li>• IF so, in what ways? Please explain?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Nature/type of contribution of impacts to environmental stress and/or improve ecological stress?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Quarterly reports</li> <li>• Field visits and discussions with stakeholders, Project staff and Project partners</li> <li>• PIR</li> <li>•</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Document analysis document analysis, data analysis, interviews with project staff, interviews with stakeholders, etc.)</li> </ul>



**ANNEX D: RATING SCALES**

---

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

#### 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: \_\_\_\_\_

---

<sup>5</sup>[www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct](http://www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct)

## ANNEX F: EVALUATION REPORT OUTLINE<sup>6</sup>

---

- i.** Opening page:
  - Title of UNDP supported GEF financed project
  - UNDP and GEF project ID#s
  - Evaluation time frame and date of evaluation report
  - Region and countries included in the project
  - GEF Operational Program/Strategic Program
  - Implementing Partner and other project partners
  - Evaluation team members
  - Acknowledgements
- ii.** Executive Summary
  - Project Summary Table
  - Project Description (brief)
  - Evaluation Rating Table
  - Summary of conclusions, recommendations and lessons
- iii.** Acronyms and Abbreviations  
(See: UNDP Editorial Manual<sup>7</sup>)
- 1.** Introduction
  - Purpose of the evaluation
  - Scope & Methodology
  - Structure of the evaluation report
- 2.** Project description and development context
  - Project start and duration
  - Problems that the project sought to address
  - Immediate and development objectives of the project
  - Baseline Indicators established
  - Main stakeholders
  - Expected Results
- 3.** Findings  
(In addition to a descriptive assessment, all criteria marked with (\*) must be rated<sup>8</sup>)
- 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

---

<sup>6</sup>The Report length should not exceed 40 pages in total (not including annexes).

<sup>7</sup> UNDP Style Manual, Office of Communications, Partnerships Bureau, updated November 2008

<sup>8</sup> See Annex D for rating scales.

- Monitoring and evaluation: design at entry (\*), implementation (\*), and overall assessment (\*)
- 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, if applicable

**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):*

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