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|  |
| --- |
| **I. Position Information**  |
| **Post Title:** Terminal Evaluation of a "Building Adaptive Capacity to Catalyse Active Public and Private Sector Participation to Manage the Exposure and Sensitivity of Water Supply Services to Climate Change in Sierra Leone” (PIMS 4613)**Location:** Freetown, Sierra Leone**Application Deadline: To be inserted at point of advert****Type of Contract:** Individual(International and National)Consultants **Post Level:** N/A**Duration of Contract:** 30 working days   |
| II. Background |
| UNDP supports countries in addressing development, climate change, and ecosystem sustainability in an integrated manner.  As a Global Environment Facility (GEF) Implementing Agency, UNDP offers countries highly specialized technical services for programme/project formulation, due diligence, mobilization of required co-financing, implementation oversight, results management and evaluation, performance-based payments and knowledge management.UNDP-GEF’s Green, Low-emission, Climate-resilient Development strategies team works to support countries to attract and direct public and private investment towards catalyzing and supporting sustainable economic growth through initiatives focused on integrated Climate Change Strategies, Advancing Cross-sectoral Climate Resilient Livelihoods and Strengthening Climate Information and Early Warning Systems for Climate Resilient Development.The "Building Adaptive Capacity to Catalyze Active Public and Private Sector Participation to Manage the Exposure and Sensitivity of Water Supply Services to Climate Change in Sierra Leone (PIMS 4613)" project aimed to enhance adaptive capacity of decision-makers in the public and private sector involved in water provision to plan for and respond to climate change risks on water resources. The project sought to complement a number of water-related projects established by the UNDP and other funders in Sierra Leone. Within water resources management, the project focused on addressing the skills deficit of water managers and the insufficient policy framework to secure the vital economic and the functionality of water management systems in a changing climate." The essentials of the project to be evaluated are as follows:Project Summary Table

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Project Title:  | Building adaptive capacity to catalyze active public and private sector participation to manage exposure and sensitivity of water supply services to climate change |
| GEF Project ID: |  4599 |   | *at endorsement (Million US$)* | *at completion (Million US$)* |
| UNDP Project ID: | 000866332 | GEF financing:  | 2,940,000 | 2,940,000 |
| Country: | Sierra Leone | IA/EA own: |  |  |
| Region: | Africa | Government: |  | 9,000,000 |
| Focal Area: | Climate Change | Other: |  | 1,000,000 |
| FA Objectives, (OP/SP): |  |  |  |  |
| Executing Agency: | Ministry of Water Resources | Total Project Cost: |  | 13,090,000 |
| Other Partners involved: |  | ProDoc Signature (date project start):  | June 27th, 2014 |
| (Operational) Closing Date: | Proposed: October 2017 | Actual:December 31st, 2019 |

The project had several entry points and overall focuses on capacity building for climate resilient decision-making in the water sector. Outcome 1: **"Critical public policies governing the management of water resources revised to incentivize climate smart investment by the private sector"**, was to be achieved through specific technical capacity development activities and igniting informed public and private sector dialogues. Based on focused capacity needs assessments a suite of professional updating activities will be designed especially for staff of the newly formed Ministry of Water Resources, the Guma Valley Corporation and other specified key target groups. Outcome 2: **"Water supply infrastructure in Freetown and Pujehun, Kambia and Kono districts made resilient against climate change induced risks"** focused on pioneering innovations that particularly address the dry season water supply problems, which are likely worsened by anticipated climate change impacts. On request of the MWR rainwater-harvesting (RWH) innovations were established as learning experiments, capturing and storing drinking water quality rainwater during the rainy season and saving it for use in the dry season. In Freetown existing springs that were already being developed by Guma Water Supply Company as supplementary water sources were protected from degradation. Rainwater harvesting for supplementation of the sources will be attempted through construction of stand-along RWH infrastructure. Innovative designs of collective “rooftops” for water capture in high density living areas were tested. In Pujehun, Kono and Kambia districts – the focal areas for planned African Development Bank (AfDB) water supply investments – this project contributed to the building of capacities of district level water professionals for climate resilient planning and decision-making. Implementation of the Project has been completed in December 2019. In accordance with UNDP and GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Procedures, all full and medium-sized UNDP support and GEF financed projects are required to undergo a terminal evaluation upon completion of implementation. These terms of reference set out the expectations for the terminal evaluation of a “Building Adaptive Capacity to Catalyze Active Public and Private Sector Participation to Manage the Exposure and Sensitivity of Water Supply Services to Climate Change in Sierra Leone”. The UNDP therefore requests applications from suitably qualified international and national (Sierra Leonean) candidates to e to conduct the terminal evaluation, in line with the provisions of the terms of references (ToRs), as follows:  |
| **III. Objectives and Scope of Evaluation** |
| The objectives of the evaluation are to assess the achievement of project results, and to draw lessons that can both improve the sustainability of benefits from this project, and aid in the overall enhancement of UNDP programming. The terminal evaluation (TE) will cover implementation of the entire project, since inception in June 2014 to December 2019. The evaluation will include review of the project design and assumptions made at the beginning of the project development process. The evaluation will also include development of the programme’s Theory of Change (ToC) retrospectively. It will assess the extent to which the project results have been achieved, partnerships established, capacities built, and cross cutting issues of mainstreaming gender, human rights and south-south cooperation have been addressed. The terminal evaluation (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.  |
|  |
| **IV. Evaluation Approach and Method** |
| An overall approach and method for conducting project terminal evaluations of UNDP supported GEF financed projects have developed over time. The evaluator is expected to frame the evaluation effort using the criteria of **relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and impact,** as defined and explained in the UNDP Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-supported, GEF-financed Projects. A set of questions covering each of these criteria have been drafted and are included with this TOR (*fill in* [*Annex C*](#_TOR_Annex_C:)) The evaluator is expected to amend, complete and submit this matrix as part of an evaluation inception report, and shall include it as an annex to the final report. The evaluation must provide evidence‐based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The evaluator is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with government counterparts, in particular the GEF operational focal point, UNDP Country Office, project team, UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based in the region and key stakeholders. The evaluator is expected to conduct a field mission to the three districts of Kambia, Kono and Pujehun and sites in Freetown where project activities have been implemented. Interviews will be held with stakeholders that were involved in project implementation at all sites visited including administrative organizations such as District Councils, Ministry of Water Resources and community management entities established to implement the project. The evaluator(s) will review all relevant sources of information, such as the project document, project reports – including Annual APR/PIR, project budget revisions, mid-term review, progress reports, consultancy 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(s) for review is included in [Annex B](#_TOR_Annex_B:) of this Terms of Reference. |
| **V. Evaluation Ethics, Criteria and Ratings** |
| Evaluation consultants will be held to the highest ethical standards and are required to sign a Code of Conduct (Annex E) upon acceptance of the assignment. UNDP evaluations are conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the [UNEG 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluations'](http://www.unevaluation.org/ethicalguidelines)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](#_TOR_Annex_D:).

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

 |
| **VI. Project Finance / Co-Finance** |
| The Evaluation will assess the key financial aspects of the project, including the extent of co-financing planned and realized. Project cost and funding data will be required, including annual expenditures. Variances between planned and actual expenditures will need to be assessed and explained. Results from recent financial audits, as available, should be taken into consideration. The evaluator(s) will receive assistance from the Country Office (CO) and Project Team to obtain financial data in order to complete the co-financing table below, which will be included in the terminal evaluation report.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Co-financing(type/source) | UNDP own financing (mill. US$) | Government(mill. US$) | Partner Agency(mill. US$) | Total(mill. US$) |
| Planned | Actual  | Planned | Actual | Planned | Actual | Actual | Actual |
| Grants  | 150,000 | 150,000 | 9,000,000 |  | 1,000,000 |  |  |  |
| Loans/Concessions  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| * In-kind support
 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| * Other
 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Totals | 150,000 | 150,000 | 9,000,000 |  | 1,000,000 |  |  |  |

 |
|  |
| **VII. 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, gender equality, the prevention and recovery from natural disasters.  |
| **VIII. 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.[[1]](#footnote-1)  |
| **IX. Conclusions, Recommendations and 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.  |
| **X. Implementation Arrangements**  |
| The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation will be Team Leader/Acting Team Leader, Environment, Energy and Natural Resource Management Cluster, in the UNDP CO in Sierra Leone. The UNDP CO will contract the evaluators and ensure the timely provision of logistics, including part payments, in line with contractual deliverables, travel arrangements, etc., within the country for the evaluation team. The Project Team will be responsible for liaising with the Evaluators team to set up stakeholder interviews, arrange field visits, coordinate with the Government etc.  |
| **XI. Evaluation Timeframe**  |
| The total duration of the evaluation will be thirty (30) working days, from date of contract signing, according to the following plan:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Activity** | **Timing** | **Completion Date** |
| **Work Plan Preparation** | 5 days  | 7th March 2020 |
| **Evaluation Mission** | 15 days  | 14-27th March 2020 |
| **Draft Evaluation Report** | 5 days  | 3rd April 2020 |
| **Final Report** | 5 days  | 10th April 2020 |

\*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.  |
| **XII. Evaluation Deliverables**  |
| The evaluation team is expected to deliver the following:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Deliverable** | **Content**  | **Timing** | **Responsibilities** |
| **Inception Report** | Evaluator provides clarifications on timing and method  | No later than 2 weeks before the evaluation mission. (7th March 2020) | Evaluator submits to UNDP CO  |
| **Presentation** | Initial Findings  | End of evaluation mission (27th March 2020) | To project management, UNDP CO |
| **Draft Final Report**  | Full report, (per annexed template) with annexes | Within 2 weeks of the evaluation mission (3rd April 2020) | Sent to CO, reviewed by RTA, PCU, GEF OFPs |
| **Final Report\*** | Revised report  | Within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft (10th April 2020) | 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. |
| **XIII. Team Composition**  |
| The evaluation team will be composed of 1 International and 1 national (Sierra Leone National) evaluators/consultants. The consultants shall have prior experience in evaluating similar projects. Experience with GEF financed projects is an advantage. The International Evaluator will be the team leader and be responsible for finalizing the report. The evaluators selected should not have participated in the project preparation and/or implementation and should not have conflict of interest with project related activities.**The Academic Qualifications and experience requirements for International Consultant:*** Minimum ten (10) years of relevant professional experience in conducting evaluations of development programmes and projects supported by the UN or other similar international organizations (10 points);
* Experience working with the GEF or GEF-evaluations (10 points);
* Experience working in West Africa or other African countries with similar context (10 points);
* Minimum seven (7) years of work experience in climate change adaptation (20 points);
* Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender and climate change vulnerability and adaptation; experience in gender sensitive evaluation and analysis (10 points);
* A Master’s degree in Climate Change, Water Resource Management, Geography, Environment, Social Sciences, or other closely related field (20 points);
* Proven experience in leading an evaluation mission as a team leader (10 points);
* Excellent written and oral communication skills in English (10 points).
 |
| **XIV. Application Procedures**  |
| Applicants are requested to apply online (indicate the site, such as http://jobs.undp.org, etc.) by (**to be inserted** **at point of advert).** Individual consultants are invited to submit applications together with their CV for these positions. The application should contain a current and complete C.V. in English, with indication of the e‐mail and phone contact. Shortlisted candidates will be requested to submit technical and financial proposals, indicating the methodology and sample evaluation questions they will use to deliver on the assignment and at what total cost of the assignment (including daily fee, per diem and travel costs). UNDP applies a fair and transparent selection process that will take into account the competencies/skills of the applicants as well as their financial proposals. Qualified women and members of social minorities are encouraged to apply.  |
| **XV. Payment Modalities and Specifications**  |
| Payment to the consultants will be made in 3 instalments upon satisfactory submission of the following deliverables:* 1st instalment: 10% upon submission of inception report.
* 2nd Instalment: 40% upon submission and approval of draft terminal evaluation report.
* 3rd Instalment: 50% upon submission and approval (UNDP-CO and UNDP RTA) of the final terminal evaluation report.
 |
| **XVI. Evaluation Criteria** |
| **Criteria for Selection of the Best Offer**Combined Scoring method — where the qualifications and methodology will be weighted a maximum of 70% and combined with the price offer which will be weighted a maximum of 30%.**Education: 10%*** Advanced University degree in social sciences

**Experience: 15%*** Must have undertaken research in Sierra Leone and or the region relating to local governance, institutional strengthening and policy development in the last ten years
* Must be familiar with state and non-state actors working in the above fields
* Demonstrated understanding of policies and laws relating to local governance in Sierra Leone or the region
* The Consultant must have in-depth understanding of the political structure and local governance in Sierra Leone
* Experience in supporting policy development is an added asset

**Clear understanding of the assignment: 10%*** Clear understanding of the assignment as demonstrated in the proposal, overall proposed methodology (comprehensiveness and completeness) time frame, feedback/validation workshop.

*Analytical capabilities 10%** Strategic vision, strong technical and analytical capabilities and demonstrated ability to collect, analyze and interpret data.
* Quantitative and qualitative data management skills
* Competence in the use of collective intelligence will be an advantage

*Interpersonal and communication skills: 5%** Strong interpersonal skills and communication skills,
* Proven ability to work in a team, develop synergies and establish effective working relations within MDAs, with persons of different UN Agencies, government counterparts, donors and NGOs
* Strong written communication skills to produce external communication materials.
* Demonstrated ability to train and build capacity of others

*Integrity 5%** Demonstrates integrity by modelling the UN's values and ethical standards

*Managing complexity 10%** Demonstrates openness to change and ability to receive/integrate feedback;
* Negotiating skills, and the ability to cope with situations which may pose conflict,
* Ability to solve complex problems with minimal supervision
* Ability to work with small multi-disciplinary, multi-national teams to deliver quality products in high stress, short deadline situations.

*Results-orientation 5%** Demonstrated understanding of results-based management.
* Ability to prioritize.
* Use of results language for communication
* Writing and communication will be in English and must have excellent communication skills in English. The consultant must bring his/her own computing equipment.

. |

**Annex A: Project LOGICAL FRAMEWORK**

|  |
| --- |
| **This project will contribute to achieving the following Country Program Outcome as defined in CPAP or CPD:** **Expected CP Outcome(s):** **Transitional Joint Vision for Sierra Leone of the United Nations Family (2013-14):** Cluster 3 goal: To ensure that natural resources are sustainably and equitably managed and threats and impacts from natural and man-made disasters are reduced  |
| **Country Program Outcome Indicators:****Transitional Joint Vision for Sierra Leone of the United Nations Family (2013-14): Cluster 3 indicators:** 1. Percentage change in mortality and casualties and economic impacts of natural and man-made disasters compared to 2011
2. Percentage change in Sierra Leone’s environmental performance index as compared to 2010 (as measured by UNDP’s Human Development Reports)
 |
| **Primary applicable Key Environment and Sustainable Development Key Result Area (same as that on the cover page, circle one): 1. Mainstreaming environment and energy OR****2. Catalyzing environmental finance OR 3. Promote climate change adaptation OR 4. Expanding access to environmental and energy services for the poor.** |
| **Applicable GEF Strategic Objective and Program:** Adaptation to Climate Change: Objective 1: Reduce vulnerability to the adverse impacts of climate change, including variability, at local, national, regional and global level and Objective 2: Increase adaptive capacity to respond to the impacts of climate change, including variability, at local, national, regional and global level |
| **Applicable GEF Expected Outcomes:** Outcome 1.1: Mainstreamed adaptation in broader development frameworks at country level and in targeted vulnerable areas, Outcome 1.2: Reduced vulnerability in development sectors, Outcome 2.1: Increased knowledge and understanding of climate variability and change-induced risks at country level and in targeted vulnerable areas, Outcome 2.3: Strengthened awareness and ownership of adaptation and climate risk reduction processes at local level, Outcome 3.1: Successful demonstration, deployment, and transfer of relevant adaptation technology in targeted areas |
| **Applicable GEF Outcome Indicators: (following AMAT tool)**Indicator 1.1.1: Adaptation actions implemented in national/regional development frameworks.Indicator 1.2.3: Number of additional people provided with access to safe water supply and basic sanitation services given existing and projected climate change Indicator 2.2.1: No. and type of targeted institutions with increased adaptive capacity to reduce risks of and responses to climate variability.Indicator 2.3.2: % of targeted population awareness of predicted adverse impacts of climate change and appropriate responses  |
|  | **Indicator** | **Baseline** | **Targets** **End of Project** | **Source of verification** | **Risks and Assumptions** |
| **Project Objective[[2]](#footnote-2)**  E*nhance the adaptive capacity of decision-makers in the public and private sector involved in water provision to plan for and respond to climate change risks on water resources.*  **(equivalent to output in ATLAS)** | Indicator 2.2.1: No. and type of targeted institutions with increased adaptive capacity to reduce risks of and responses to climate variability. (AMAT indicator 2.2.1) | Technocrats from MWR and EPA in Freetown, but particularly regional technical staffs have extremely limited opportunity for professional updating, and usually find it difficult to address newly emerging technical issues and practices into their ongoing work. One of the major limitations is the lack of capacity to deal with climate risks and understandings of managing these risks in the water sector. | At least capacities of 2 line ministries and 2 Districts Council to mainstream adaptation concerns within water policies and local development plans are strengthened; and capacities of two research /training center to deliver relevant trainings on climate change issues of are strengthened. | Baseline capacity assessment to be undertaken at project onsetAPRs/PIRPolicy reviews as part of APRs/PIRMTR  | Unavailability of requisite human resources and dataInsufficient institutional support and political commitment |
| **Outcome 1[[3]](#footnote-3):** Critical public policies governing the management of water resources revised to incentivize climate smart investment by the private sector.**(equivalent to activity in ATLAS)** | Indicator 1.1.1: Adaptation concerns and actions mainstreamed within at least the Guma Reservoir Management process (AMAT indicator 1.1.1) | The overall risk that climate change may pose on the sustainability of water supply to the capital not well integrated into Guma Reservoir management;  | CC resilience plan for Guma reservoir established  | Policy and resilience plan reviewPolicy reviews as part of APRs/PIR | Timing of interventions well attuned to policy development/review;Political will is lacking |
| Indicator 2.2.1: No. and type of targeted institutions with increased adaptive capacity to reduce risks of and responses to climate variability. (AMAT indicator 2.2.1) | Key decision-makers who are supposed to lead the implementtaion of the policy have limited knowledge of climate change impacts or adaptation responses. Information, including inventory and mapping, is inadequate and staffs from MWR have limited expertise to internalize climate changes into existing local deve planLow interplay between public and private sector on adaptation strategies investmentExisting coping strategies and adaptation action not documented at all, including for the water sector. | 15% of staff from targeted institutions aware of predicted impacts of climate change and appropriate responses60% of targeted stakeholders have access to relevant disseminated adaption experiences from the project | Baseline capacity assessment to be undertaken at project onset Awareness raising activitiesPolicy reviews as part of APRs/PIR | Insufficient institutional support and political commitment |
| **Outcome 2:** Water supply infrastructure in Freetown and Puhejun, Kambia and Kono districts made resilient against climate change induced risks.**(equivalent to activity in ATLAS)** | Indicator 1.2.3: Number of additional people provided with access to safe water supply and basic sanitation services given existing and projected climate change (AMAT indicator 1.3.1.1) | Type and level: 0(aside already existing local coping mechanism) | 5.000 at intervention sites in Freetown and three districts | Project reports e.g. trainings, pilot interventions, APRs, PIRsLocal level assessments at demonstration sites (Questionnaire based appraisal - CBA)APRs/PIR | Target population do not see the benefit of new practices or social conflicts hinder taking up the practices;Low Capacities of WASH comities to support the implementation of appropriate climate resilient technologies  |

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

*•* *Project Identification Form, CEO Endorsement & Project Document including the Logical Framework Analysis (LFA);*

*• Inception Report*

*• Project Implementation Plan/ Annual Workplan and Project periodic reports*

*• Project mid-term evaluation and other relevant evaluations and assessments*

*• Project best practice documents*

*• List and contact details of project staff, key project stakeholders including project boards and other partners*

*• Project sites, highlighting suggested visits*

*• Annual Project Implementation Reports (PIR)*

*• Project Tracking tools*

*• Financial Data including Co-financing data and audit reports*

*• UNDP Development Assistant Framework (UNDAF)*

*• UNDP Monitoring and Evaluation Frameworks*

*• UNDP Country Programme Document (CPD) and Country Programme Action Plan*

*• GEF focal area strategic program objectives*

*• Minutes of Project Steering Committee Meetings*

*• Project completion reports*

*• Sample Project communication materials e.g. press releases, brochures, documentaries etc.*

Annex C: Evaluation Questions

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

| **Evaluative Criteria Questions** | **Indicators** | **Sources** | **Methodology** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Relevance: How does the project relate to the main objectives of the GEF focal area, and to the environment and development priorities at the local, regional and national levels?  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved? |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards? |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, social-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results? |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward, reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status?  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

Annex D: Rating Scales

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| ***Ratings for Effectiveness, Efficiency, Overall Project Outcome Rating, M&E, IA & EA Execution:*** | ***Sustainability ratings:***  | ***Relevance ratings:*** |
| 6. Highly Satisfactory (HS): no shortcomings 5. Satisfactory (S): minor shortcomings4. Moderately Satisfactory (MS): moderate shortcomings3. Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): significant shortcomings2. Unsatisfactory (U): major shortcomings1. Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): severe shortcomings | 4. Likely (L): negligible risks to sustainability | 2. Relevant (R) |
| 3. Moderately Likely (ML): moderate risks | 1. Not relevant (NR) |
| 2. Moderately Unlikely (MU): significant risks1. Unlikely (U): severe risks |  |
| *Additional ratings where relevant:*Not Applicable (N/A) Unable to Assess (U/A) |

Annex E: Evaluation Consultant Code of Conduct and Agreement Form

**Evaluators:**

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

**Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form[[4]](#footnote-4)**

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

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

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

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

Signed at *place* on *date*

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

Annex F: Evaluation Report Outline[[5]](#footnote-5)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **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[[6]](#footnote-6)) |
| **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[[7]](#footnote-7))  |
| **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 (\*)
* 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 by comment number (“#” column):*

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

**Prepared by:**

**Project Manager, EEPUC:** Andrew Katta \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**Reviewed by:**

**Team Lead, SLED Cluster:** Tanzila Sankoh \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**Approved by:**

**DRR Operations/Programmes:** Rokya Ye Dieng: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

1. A useful tool for gauging progress to impact is the Review of Outcomes to Impacts (ROtI) method developed by the GEF Evaluation Office:  [ROTI Handbook 2009](http://www.thegef.org/gef/sites/thegef.org/files/documents/M2_ROtI%20Handbook.pdf) [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. *Objective (Atlas output) monitored quarterly ERBM and annually in APR/PIR* [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. *All outcomes monitored annually in the APR/PIR. It is highly recommended not to have more than 4 outcomes.* [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. The Report length should not exceed *40* pages in total (not including annexes). [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. UNDP Style Manual, Office of Communications, Partnerships Bureau, updated November 2008 [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. See Annex D for rating scales. See UNDP-GEF TE Guidance section 3.5, page 37 for ratings explanations. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)