**ANNEX A**

**TERMS OF REFERENCE**

**HIRING OF INDIVIDUAL CONSULTANT FOR TERM EVALUATION OF PROJECT**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Project Title** | **“Sustainable Land Management to Combat Desertification in Pakistan”** |
| **Post Title**  |  |
| **Duty Station** | **Islamabad- Pakistan and Home based** |
| **Duration**  | **51 days during the period (04 September – 13th November 2020)** |
| **Contract** | **Individual Consultancy Contract – Short Term** |

1. **INTRODUCTION**

In accordance with UNDP and GEF M&E policies and procedures, all full- and medium-sized UNDP-supported GEF-financed projects are required to undergo a Terminal Evaluation (TE) at the end of the project. This Terms of Reference (ToR) sets out the expectations for the TE of the medium-sized project titled *“Sustainable Lane Management to Combat Desertification**in Pakistan (PIMS# 4593)”* implemented through *Ministry of Climate Change*. The project started on July 2015and is in itsfifthyear of implementation. The TE process must follow the guidance outlined in the document ‘Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects’ ([Guidance for Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-supported GEF-financed Projects](https://eur03.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=http%3A%2F%2Fweb.undp.org%2Fevaluation%2Fguideline%2Fdocuments%2FGEF%2FTE_GuidanceforUNDP-supportedGEF-financedProjects.pdf&data=02%7C01%7Cmohammad.saleem%40undp.org%7C45f089e7684e40370ec608d82e1203a5%7Cb3e5db5e2944483799f57488ace54319%7C0%7C0%7C637310002190012148&sdata=OSKOAKnEhnP95Ieo6tqz74PnpEkcoFk79ad13OgWKOE%3D&reserved=0)).

1. **PROJECT BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT**

Programme Period: 60 months

Total resources required: USD 3,791,000

Total allocated resources:

* **GEF USD 3,791,000**
* **Co-financing USD 18,080,737**
	+ Government USD 14,231,312
	+ UNDP USD 1,500,000
	+ CBOs USD 2,349,425

The proposed SLM programme is an umbrella programme that will facilitate the federal and provincial governments in implementation of the UNCCD, alignment of Pakistan’s NAP and taking on-the-ground measures that will help in meeting the obligations of the above-mentioned international conventions. Pakistan’s upscaling SLM Programme (2014-15 – 2019-20) will support implementation of UNCCD, CBD and UNFCCC and provide global benefits required to achieve objectives of these conventions. The programme is largely designed as an SLM investment programme based on the premise that maintaining function and flow of dryland ecosystem services would provide a development pathway that ensures. Sustainable management of land and natural resources in the arid and semi-arid regions. This programme will target 14 dryland districts through the application of climate resilient SLM methods and technologies using integrated approaches that cover an area of 800,000 hectares. A legal basis for land use planning will be established making land management decision making more informed and adaptive. This will balance competing environmental, social and economic objectives to improve the sustainability of land management. The programme will mobilize a large baseline investment by the federal and provincial governments to support implementation of SLM practices at wider scale across the target areas, thus transforming land use. It will facilitate the generation of community level SLM funds and other means to incentivize rural farmers to adopt SLM practices. The programme will also put in place an effective and comprehensive decision-support system for planning, monitoring and adapting climate resilient SLM at the provincial and district levels. Further it will support the documentation of lessons learnt, linking SLM actions to climate change adaptation and build capacities of provincial and local government functionaries and local communities to advance SLM. Improved SLM practices and technologies will maintain or improve the flow of agro-ecosystem services to sustain the livelihoods of local communities.

The upscaling phase of SLM programme will build on the institution model which has been successfully tested during pilot phase of the project. It will develop a partnership between the Government of Pakistan & Provinces with International donor agencies, like GEF and UNDP to combat desertification and mitigate impacts of drought. The proposed programme will undertake large-scale landscape level climate resilient and indicator-based SLM interventions in 14 dryland districts of Punjab, Sindh, Baluchistan, & Khyber Pakhtunkhwa covering more than 244 villages. There will be three main outcomes of the project and activities under these outcomes will build on the experiences and up-scale the results of the pilot phase.

#### **Outcome 1. Strong enabling environment at national and provincial levels supports up-scaling of SLM practices**

#### **Outcome 2. Effective, targeted, and adaptive implementation of SLM Land Use Planning & Decision Support System**

**Outcome 3. On-the-ground implementation of climate-resilient SLM activities is up- scaled across landscapes**

Since February 2020 due to COVID-19 pandemic in the country which badly effect project implementation and further to government strict lockdown project overall activities at halt and could not be completed in 1st and 2nd quarter 2020 which resulted slow progress and low delivery of the project.

1. **TE PURPOSE**

The TE report will assess the achievement of project results against what was expected to be achieved and draw lessons that can both improve the sustainability of benefits from this project, and aid in the overall enhancement of UNDP programming. The TE report promotes accountability and transparency, and assesses the extent of project accomplishments.

1. **TE APPROACH & METHODOLOGY**

The TE report must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful.

The TE team will review all relevant sources of information including documents prepared during the preparation phase (i.e. PIF, UNDP Initiation Plan, UNDP Social and Environmental Screening Procedure/SESP) the Project Document, project reports including annual PIRs, project budget revisions, lesson learned reports, national strategic and legal documents, and any other materials that the team considers useful for this evidence-based evaluation. The TE team will review the baseline and GEF focal area Core Indicators/Tracking Tools submitted to the GEF at the CEO endorsement and midterm stages and the terminal Core Indicators/Tracking Tools that must be completed before the TE field mission begins.

The TE team is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with the Project Team, government counterparts (the GEF Operational Focal Point), Implementing Partners, the UNDP Country Office(s), the Regional Technical Advisor, direct beneficiaries and other stakeholders.

Engagement of stakeholders is vital to a successful TE. Stakeholder involvement should include interviews with stakeholders who have project responsibilities, including but not limited to Ministry of Climate Change, Ministry of National Food Security and Research, Planning Commission of Pakistan, Pakistan Agriculture Research Council, National Agriculture Research Centre, PCRWR, Plant protection Departments, Provincial Forest Departments, Provincial Planning and Development Departments etc*.*; Executing Agencies, Senior Officials and task team/ component leaders, key experts and consultants in the subject area, Project Board, project stakeholders, academia, local government and CSOs, etc. Additionally, the TE team is expected to conduct field missions and meet with the local communities if permitted by UNDP as per the SOPs under COVID-19 pandemic.

The specific design and methodology for the TE should emerge from consultations between the TE team and the above-mentioned parties regarding what is appropriate and feasible for meeting the TE purpose and objectives and answering the evaluation questions, given limitations of budget, time and data. The TE team must use gender-responsive methodologies and tools and ensure that gender equality and women’s empowerment, as well as other cross-cutting issues and SDGs are incorporated into the TE report.

Engagement of stakeholders is vital to a successful Final Evaluation. Stakeholder involvement should include (where possible, given the COVID situation) surveys/questionnaires, focus groups, interviews with stakeholders who have project responsibilities, including but not limited to executing agencies, senior officials and task team/component leaders, key experts and consultants in the subject area, Project Steering Committee, project stakeholders, local government, CSOs, project beneficiaries, etc. If not all stakeholders are available to engage virtually, this must be documented in the Interim Evaluation report.

Data collection will be used to validate evidence of results and assessments (including but not limited to: assessment of Theory of Change, activities delivery, and results/changes occurred).

The final Evaluation report should describe the full evaluation approach taken and the rationale for the approach making explicit the underlying assumptions, challenges, strengths and weaknesses about the methods and approach of the review. The final report must also describe any limitations encountered by the Evaluation team during the evaluation process, including limitations of the methodology, data collection methods, and any potential influence of limitation on how findings may be interpreted, and conclusions drawn. Limitations include, among others: language barriers, inaccessible project sites (due to travel restrictions because of COVID), issues with access to data or verification of data sources, issues with availability of interviewees, methodological limitations to collecting more extensive or more representative qualitative or quantitative evaluation data, deviations from planned data collection and analysis set out in the ToR and Inception Report, etc. Efforts made to mitigate the limitations should also be included in the Interim Evaluation report.

The final methodological approach including interview schedule, field visits and data to be used in the evaluation must be clearly outlined in the TE Inception Report and be fully discussed and agreed between UNDP, stakeholders and the TE team.

As of 11 March 2020, the World Health Organization (WHO) declared COVID-19 a global pandemic as the new coronavirus rapidly spread to all regions of the world. Travel to the country although not restricted and travel in the country is well but to follow UNDSS SOPs for domestic travels which may not permit UNDP contract holder to travel. If it is not possible to travel within the country for the TE mission then the TE team should develop a methodology that takes this into account the conduct of the TE virtually and remotely, including the use of remote interview methods and extended desk reviews, data analysis, surveys and evaluation questionnaires. This should be detailed in the TE Inception Report and agreed with the Commissioning Unit.

If all or part of the TE is to be carried out virtually then consideration should be taken for stakeholder availability, ability or willingness to be interviewed remotely. In addition, their accessibility to the internet/computer may be an issue as many government and national counterparts may be working from home. These limitations must be reflected in the final TE report.

The TE team is expected to set its base in Islamabad. However, if the international consultant may not come to Islamabad then he/she will work remotely from his/her home country. If the international consultant manages to come to Islamabad, then his/her travel to other cities may or may not be materialized keeping current COVID-19 scenario in mind. The final decision to be taken at an appropriate time; the dates closer to the mission dates.

If a data collection/field mission is not possible then remote interviews may be undertaken through telephone or online (skype, zoom etc.). International consultants can work remotely with national evaluator support in the field if it is safe for them to operate and travel. No stakeholders, consultants or UNDP staff should be put in harm’s way and safety is the key priority.

The final report must describe the full TE approach taken and the rationale for the approach making explicit the underlying assumptions, challenges, strengths and weaknesses about the methods and approach of the evaluation.

1. **DETAILED SCOPE OF THE TE**

The TE team will assess the following four categories of project progress. See the ([Guidance for Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-supported GEF-financed Projects](https://eur03.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=http%3A%2F%2Fweb.undp.org%2Fevaluation%2Fguideline%2Fdocuments%2FGEF%2FTE_GuidanceforUNDP-supportedGEF-financedProjects.pdf&data=02%7C01%7Cmohammad.saleem%40undp.org%7C45f089e7684e40370ec608d82e1203a5%7Cb3e5db5e2944483799f57488ace54319%7C0%7C0%7C637310002190012148&sdata=OSKOAKnEhnP95Ieo6tqz74PnpEkcoFk79ad13OgWKOE%3D&reserved=0) for extended descriptions, and this guide should be used in the course of the TE exercise.

**i. Project Strategy**

Project design:

* Review the problem addressed by the project and the underlying assumptions. Review the effect of any incorrect assumptions or changes to the context to achieving the project results as outlined in the Project Document.
* Review the relevance of the project strategy and assess whether it provides the most effective route towards expected/intended results. Were lessons from other relevant projects properly incorporated into the project design?
* Review how the project addresses country priorities. Review country ownership. Was the project concept in line with the national sector development priorities and plans of the country (or of participating countries in the case of multi-country projects)?
* Review decision-making processes: were perspectives of those who would be affected by project decisions, those who could affect the outcomes, and those who could contribute information or other resources to the process, taken into account during project design processes?
* Review the extent to which relevant gender issues were raised in the project design. See Annex 9[[1]](#footnote-1) of *Guidance For Conducting Final Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects* for further guidelines.
* If there are major areas of concern, recommend areas for improvement.

Results Framework/Log frame:

* Undertake a critical analysis of the project’s log frame indicators and targets, assess how “SMART” the Final Review and end-of-project targets are (Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Relevant, Time-bound), and suggest specific amendments/revisions to the targets and indicators as necessary.
* Are the project’s objectives and outcomes or components clear, practical, and feasible within its time frame?
* Examine if progress so far has led to, or could in the future catalyse beneficial development effects (i.e. income generation, gender equality and women’s empowerment, improved governance etc...) that should be included in the project results framework and monitored on an annual basis.
* Ensure broader development and gender aspects of the project are being monitored effectively. Develop and recommend SMART ‘development’ indicators, including sex-disaggregated indicators and indicators that capture development benefits.

**ii. Progress Towards Results**

Progress towards Outcomes Analysis:

* Review the log frame indicators against progress made towards the end-of-project targets using the Progress Towards Results Matrix and following the *Guidance For Conducting Final Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects*; colour code progress in a “traffic light system” based on the level of progress achieved; assign a rating on progress for each outcome; make recommendations from the areas marked as “Not on target to be achieved” (red).

Table. Progress Towards Results Matrix (Achievement of outcomes against End-of-project Targets)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Project Strategy** | **Indicator**[[2]](#footnote-2) | **Baseline Level**[[3]](#footnote-3) | **Level in 1st PIR (self- reported)** | **Midterm Target**[[4]](#footnote-4) | **End-of-project Target** | **Midterm Level & Assessment**[[5]](#footnote-5) | **Achievement Rating**[[6]](#footnote-6) | **Justification for Rating**  |
| **Fund Level Impact:** **Outcome 1:** **Output** | Indicator: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Indicator: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Indicator: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Indicator: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  **Output**  | Indicator: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Outcome 2:** | Indicator: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Indicator: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  **Output** | Indicator: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  **Output** | Indicator: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Etc.** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**Indicator Assessment Key**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Green= Achieved | Yellow= On target to be achieved | Red= Not on target to be achieved |

In addition to the progress towards outcomes analysis:

* Compare and analyse the GEF Tracking Tool at the Baseline with the one completed right before the Final Review.
* Identify remaining barriers to achieving the project objective in the remainder of the project.
* By reviewing the aspects of the project that have already been successful, identify ways in which the project can further expand these benefits.

**iii. Project Implementation and Adaptive Management**

Management Arrangements:

* Review overall effectiveness of project management as outlined in the Project Document. Have changes been made and are they effective? Are responsibilities and reporting lines clear? Is decision-making transparent and undertaken in a timely manner? Recommend areas for improvement.
* Review the quality of execution of the Executing Agency/Implementing Partner(s) and recommend areas for improvement.
* Review the quality of support provided by the GEF Partner Agency (UNDP) and recommend areas for improvement.

Work Planning:

* Review any delays in project start-up and implementation, identify the causes and examine if they have been resolved.
* Are work-planning processes results-based? If not, suggest ways to re-orientate work planning to focus on results?
* Examine the use of the project’s results framework/ log frame as a management tool and review any changes made to it since project start.

Finance and co-finance:

* Consider the financial management of the project, with specific reference to the cost-effectiveness of interventions.
* Review the changes to fund allocations as a result of budget revisions and assess the appropriateness and relevance of such revisions.
* Does the project have the appropriate financial controls, including reporting and planning, that allow management to make informed decisions regarding the budget and allow for timely flow of funds?
* Informed by the co-financing monitoring table to be filled out, provide commentary on co-financing: is co-financing being used strategically to help the objectives of the project? Is the Project Team meeting with all co-financing partners regularly in order to align financing priorities and annual work plans?

Project-level Monitoring and Evaluation Systems:

* Review the monitoring tools currently being used: Do they provide the necessary information? Do they involve key partners? Are they aligned or mainstreamed with national systems? Do they use existing information? Are they efficient? Are they cost-effective? Are additional tools required? How could they be made more participatory and inclusive?
* Examine the financial management of the project monitoring and evaluation budget. Are sufficient resources being allocated to monitoring and evaluation? Are these resources being allocated effectively?

Stakeholder Engagement:

* Project management: Has the project developed and leveraged the necessary and appropriate partnerships with direct and tangential stakeholders?
* Participation and country-driven processes: Do local and national government stakeholders support the objectives of the project? Do they continue to have an active role in project decision-making that supports efficient and effective project implementation?
* Participation and public awareness: To what extent has stakeholder involvement and public awareness contributed to the progress towards achievement of project objectives?

Reporting:

* Assess how adaptive management changes have been reported by the project management and shared with the Project Board.
* Assess how well the Project Team and partners undertake and fulfil GEF reporting requirements (i.e. how have they addressed poorly-rated PIRs, if applicable?)
* Assess how lessons derived from the adaptive management process have been documented, shared with key partners and internalized by partners.

Communications:

* Review internal project communication with stakeholders: Is communication regular and effective? Are there key stakeholders left out of communication? Are there feedback mechanisms when communication is received? Does this communication with stakeholders contribute to their awareness of project outcomes and activities and investment in the sustainability of project results?
* Review external project communication: Are proper means of communication established or being established to express the project progress and intended impact to the public (is there a web presence, for example? Or did the project implement appropriate outreach and public awareness campaigns?)
* For reporting purposes, write one half-page paragraph that summarizes the project’s progress towards results in terms of contribution to sustainable development benefits, as well as global environmental benefits.

**iv. Sustainability**

* Validate whether the risks identified in the Project Document, Annual Project Review/PIRs and the ATLAS Risk Management Module are the most important and whether the risk ratings applied are appropriate and up to date. If not, explain why.
* In addition, assess the following risks to sustainability:

Financial risks to sustainability:

* What is the likelihood of financial and economic resources not being available once the GEF assistance ends (consider potential resources can be from multiple sources, such as the public and private sectors, income generating activities, and other funding that will be adequate financial resources for sustaining project’s outcomes)?

Socio-economic risks to sustainability:

* Are there any social or political risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project outcomes? What is the risk that the level of stakeholder ownership (including ownership by governments and other key stakeholders) will be insufficient to allow for the project outcomes/benefits to be sustained? Do the various key stakeholders see that it is in their interest that the project benefits continue to flow? Is there sufficient public / stakeholder awareness in support of the long term objectives of the project? Are lessons learned being documented by the Project Team on a continual basis and shared/ transferred to appropriate parties who could learn from the project and potentially replicate and/or scale it in the future?

Institutional Framework and Governance risks to sustainability:

* Do the legal frameworks, policies, governance structures and processes pose risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project benefits? While assessing this parameter, also consider if the required systems/ mechanisms for accountability, transparency, and technical knowledge transfer are in place.

Environmental risks to sustainability:

* Are there any environmental risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project outcomes?

Main Findings, Conclusions, Recommendations and Lessons Learned

* The TE team will include a summary of the main findings of the TE report. Findings should be presented as statements of fact that are based on analysis of the data.
* The section on conclusions will be written in light of the findings. Conclusions should be comprehensive and balanced statements that are well substantiated by evidence and logically connected to the TE findings. They should highlight the strengths, weaknesses and results of the project, respond to key evaluation questions and provide insights into the identification of and/or solutions to important problems or issues pertinent to project beneficiaries, UNDP and the GEF, including issues in relation to gender equality and women’s empowerment. Recommendations should provide concrete, practical, feasible and targeted recommendations directed to the intended users of the evaluation about what actions to take and decisions to make. The recommendations should be specifically supported by the evidence and linked to the findings and conclusions around key questions addressed by the evaluation.
* The TE report should also include lessons that can be taken from the evaluation, including best practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance and success that can provide knowledge gained from the particular circumstance (programmatic and evaluation methods used, partnerships, financial leveraging, etc.) that are applicable to other GEF and UNDP interventions. When possible, the TE team should include examples of good practices in project design and implementation.
* It is important for the conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned of the TE report to incorporate gender equality and empowerment of women.

The TE report will include an Evaluation Ratings Table, as shown below:

**ToR Table 2: Evaluation Ratings Table for**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Monitoring & Evaluation (M&E) | Rating[[7]](#footnote-7) |
| M&E design at entry |  |
| M&E Plan Implementation |  |
| Overall Quality of M&E |  |
| Implementation & Execution | Rating |
| Quality of UNDP Implementation/Oversight  |  |
| Quality of Implementing Partner Execution |  |
| Overall quality of Implementation/Execution |  |
| Assessment of Outcomes | Rating |
| Relevance |  |
| Effectiveness |  |
| Efficiency |  |
| Overall Project Outcome Rating |  |
| Sustainability | Rating |
| Financial resources |  |
| Socio-political/economic |  |
| Institutional framework and governance |  |
| Environmental |  |
| Overall Likelihood of Sustainability |  |

1. **TIMEFRAME/**

The total duration of the TE will be approximately *(51 working days)* over a time period of (4th September -13th November, 2020)*,*. The tentative TE timeframe is as follows:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **TIMEFRAME** | **ACTIVITY** |
| 20-08-2020 (14 days) | Application closes |
| 21-08-20 to 01-09-20( 12 days) | Select TE Team |
| *02-09-2020 to 03-09-20*( 02 days) | Prep the TE Team (handover of Project Documents) |
| *04-09-2020 to 11-09-2020* ( 06 days) | Document review and preparing TE Inception Report |
| *14-09-2020 to 18-09-20* ( 05 days) | Finalization andValidation of TE Inception Report- latest start of TE mission |
| 21-09-2020 to 09-10-2020( 15 days) | TE mission: stakeholder meetings, interviews, field visits (if not possible virtual meetings will be conducted) |
| 12-10-2020 to 13-10-20(02 days)  | Mission wrap-up meeting & presentation of initial findings- earliest end of TE mission |
| 14-10-20 to 22-10-20( 07 days) | Preparing draft report |
| 23-10-20 to 28-10-20(04 days) | Incorporating audit trail from feedback on draft report/Finalization of TE report  |
| 29-10-20 to 04-11-20 (05 days) | Preparation & Issue of Management Response |
| 05-11-20 to 13-11-20 (07 days) | Expected date of full TE completion |

 |

1. **TE DELIVERABLES**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **#** | **Deliverable** | **Description** | **Timing / no of days** | **Responsibilities** |
| **1** | **TE Inception Report** | TE team clarifies objectives and methods of Terminal Review | No later than 2 weeks before the TE mission: 14-09-20 to 18-09-2020 (05 days) | TE team submits to the Commissioning Unit and project management |
| **2** | **Presentation** | Initial Findings | End of TE mission:12-10-20 to 13-10-2020(02 days)  | TE Team presents to project management and the Commissioning Unit |
| **3** | **Draft Final Report** | Full report (using guidelines on content outlined in Annex B) with annexes | Within 3 weeks of the TE mission 14-10-20 to 22-10-20(07 days) | Sent to the Commissioning Unit, reviewed by RTA, Project Coordinating Unit, GEF OFP |
| **4** | **Final Report\*** | Revised report with audit trail detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final TE report | Within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft: 23-10-20 to 13-11-20 (12 days) | Sent to the Commissioning Unit |

\*All final TE reports will be quality assessed by the UNDP Independent Evaluation Office (IEO). Details of the IEO’s quality assessment of decentralized evaluations can be found in Section 6 of the UNDP Evaluation Guidelines.[[8]](#footnote-8)

1. **TE ARRANGEMENTS**

The principal responsibility for managing the TE resides with the Commissioning Unit. The Commissioning Unit for this project’s TE is the UNDP Country Office*.*

The Commissioning Unit will contract the consultants and ensure the timely provision of per diems and travel arrangements, if required to the country and within the country for the TE team. The Project Team will be responsible for liaising with the TE team to provide all relevant documents, set up stakeholder interviews, and arrange field visits.

The TE team (international consultant may accompany virtually) will meet with all the key stakeholders. For any visits outside Islamabad, the UNDP CO will arrange travel and bear the cost as per UNDP rules and policies. If the travel to other cities does not take place, then the remote arrangements shall be carried out by the project team in coordination with the UNDP CO.

Following to be noted for travel:

* International travel may or may not be required to Pakistan during the TE mission keeping COVID-19 scenario in consideration
* The BSAFE course must be successfully completed prior to commencement of travel, if required;
* Individual Consultants are responsible for ensuring they have vaccinations/inoculations when travelling to certain countries, as designated by the UN Medical Director.
* Consultants are required to comply with the UN security directives set forth under: <https://dss.un.org/dssweb/>
* All related travel expenses will be covered and will be reimbursed as per UNDP rules and regulations upon submission of an F-10 claim form and supporting documents, as and if required.
1. **TE TEAM COMPOSITION**

A team of two independent evaluators will conduct the TE. The team leader will be responsible for the overall design and writing of the TE report. The team expert will assess emerging trends with respect to regulatory frameworks, budget allocations, capacity building, work with the Project Team in developing the TE itinerary, etc.)

The evaluator(s) who have participated in the project preparation, formulation and/or implementation (including the writing of the project document), must not conduct this project’s Mid-Term Review and should not have a conflict of interest with the project’s related activities.

The selection of evaluators will be aimed at maximizing the overall “team” qualities in the following areas:

Education

* Master’s degree in Agriculture, Forestry, Natural Resources, or other closely related field

Experience

* Relevant experience with results-based management evaluation methodologies;
* Experience applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios;
* Competence in adaptive management, as applied to one of the Five GEF Thematic Areas;
* Experience in evaluating projects;
* Experience working in the region where evaluation will be conducted;
* Experience in relevant technical areas for at least 10 years;
* Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender and Sustainable Land Management and Biodiversity and experience in gender responsive evaluation and analysis;
* Excellent communication skills;
* Demonstrable analytical skills;
* Project evaluation/review experience within United Nations system will be considered an asset.

Language

* Fluency in written and spoken English.
1. **EVALUATION**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Individual consultants will be evaluated based on the Cumulative analysis. The award of the contract should be made to the individual consultant whose offer has been evaluated and determined as:1. Responsive/compliant/acceptable, and
2. Having received the highest score out of a pre-determined set of weighted technical and financial criteria specific to the solicitation.
	1. Technical Criteria weight: 70%
	2. Financial Criteria weight: 30%

Only candidates obtaining a minimum of 49 out of 70 points will be considered for the FinancialEvaluation

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Criteria** | **Weight** | **Max. Point** |
| ***Technical Competencies*** | **70** |  |
| * Master’s degree in Agriculture, Forestry, Natural Resources, or other closely related field
 | 10 |  |
| * Relevant experience with results-based management evaluation methodologies;
* Experience applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios;
* Competence in adaptive management, as applied to one of the Five GEF Thematic Areas;
* Experience in evaluating projects;
* Experience working in the region where evaluation will be conducted;
* Experience in relevant technical areas for at least 10 years;
* Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender and Sustainable Land Management and Biodiversity and experience in gender responsive evaluation and analysis;
 | 30 |  |
| * Excellent communication skills;
* Demonstrable analytical skills;
* Project evaluation/review experiences within United Nations system will be considered an asset
 | 30 |  |
| Financial proposal  | **30** |  |
| **Total Score** | **Technical score 70+30 Financial** |

|  |
| --- |
| **Weight per Technical Competence** |
| Weak: Below 70% | The individual consultant/contractor has demonstrated a **WEAK** capacity for the analyzed competence  |
| Satisfactory : 70-75% | The individual consultant/contractor has demonstrated a **SATISFACTORY** capacity for the analyzed competence |
| Good: 76-85% | The individual consultant/contractor has demonstrated a **GOOD** capacity for the analyzed competence |
| Very Good: 86-95% | The individual consultant/contractor has demonstrated a **VERY GOOD** capacity for the analyzed competence |
| Outstanding: 96-100% | The individual consultant/contractor has demonstrated a **OUTSATNDING** capacity for the analyzed competence |

 |

1. **EVALUATOR ETHICS**

The TE team will be held to the highest ethical standards and is required to sign a code of conduct upon acceptance of the assignment. This evaluation will be conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG ‘Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation (Annex’ E). The evaluator must safeguard the rights and confidentiality of information providers, interviewees and stakeholders through measures to ensure compliance with legal and other relevant codes governing collection of data and reporting on data. The evaluator must also ensure security of collected information before and after the evaluation and protocols to ensure anonymity and confidentiality of sources of information where that is expected. The information knowledge and data gathered in the evaluation process must also be solely used for the evaluation and not for other uses without the express authorization of UNDP and partners.

1. **PAYMENT SCHEDULE**
* 20% payment upon satisfactory delivery of the final TE Inception Report and approval by the Commissioning Unit
* 40% payment upon satisfactory delivery of the draft TE report to the Commissioning Unit
* 40% payment upon satisfactory delivery of the final TE report and approval by the Commissioning Unit and RTA (via signatures on the TE Report Clearance Form) and delivery of completed TE Audit Trail

Criteria for issuing the final payment of 40%[[9]](#footnote-9):

* The final TE report includes all requirements outlined in the TE TOR and is in accordance with the TE guidance.
* The final TE report is clearly written, logically organized, and is specific for this project (i.e. text has not been cut & pasted from other TE reports).
* The Audit Trail includes responses to and justification for each comment listed.

1. **APPLICATION PROCESS[[10]](#footnote-10)**

*(Adjust this section if a vetted roster will be used)*

Recommended Presentation of Proposal:

1. **Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability** using the [template](https://intranet.undp.org/unit/bom/pso/Support%20documents%20on%20IC%20Guidelines/Template%20for%20Confirmation%20of%20Interest%20and%20Submission%20of%20Financial%20Proposal.docx)[[11]](#footnote-11) provided by UNDP;
2. **CV** and a **Personal History Form** ([P11 form](http://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/corporate/Careers/P11_Personal_history_form.doc)[[12]](#footnote-12));
3. Brief description **of approach to work/technical proposal** of why the individual considers him/herself as the most suitable for the assignment, and a proposed methodology on how they will approach and complete the assignment; (max 1 page)
4. **Financial Proposal** that indicates the all-inclusive fixed total contract price and all other travel related costs (such as flight ticket, per diem, etc), supported by a breakdown of costs, as per template attached to the [Letter of Confirmation of Interest template](https://popp.undp.org/_layouts/15/WopiFrame.aspx?sourcedoc=/UNDP_POPP_DOCUMENT_LIBRARY/Public/PSU_%20Individual%20Contract_Offerors%20Letter%20to%20UNDP%20Confirming%20Interest%20and%20Availability.docx&action=default). If an applicant is employed by an organization/company/institution, and he/she expects his/her employer to charge a management fee in the process of releasing him/her to UNDP under Reimbursable Loan Agreement (RLA), the applicant must indicate at this point, and ensure that all such costs are duly incorporated in the financial proposal submitted to UNDP.

All application materials should be submitted to the address (insert mailing address) in a sealed envelope indicating the following reference “Consultant for Terminal Evaluation of *(project title)*” or by email at the following address ONLY: *(insert email address)* by *(time and date)*. Incomplete applications will be excluded from further consideration.

**Criteria for Evaluation of Proposal:** Only those applications which are responsive and compliant will be evaluated. Offers will be evaluated according to the Combined Scoring method – where the educational background and experience on similar assignments will be weighted at 70% and the price proposal will weigh as 30% of the total scoring. The applicant receiving the Highest Combined Score that has also accepted UNDP’s General Terms and Conditions will be awarded the contract.

1. **TOR ANNEXES**

*(Add the following annexes to the final ToR)*

* ToR Annex A: Project Logical/Results Framework
* ToR Annex B: Project Information Package to be reviewed by TE team
* ToR Annex C: Content of the TE report
* ToR Annex D: Evaluation Criteria Matrix template
* ToR Annex E: UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluators
* ToR Annex F: TE Rating Scales
* ToR Annex G: TE Report Clearance Form
* ToR Annex H: TE Audit Trail

**ToR Annex A: Project Logical/Results Framework**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| The TE team will assess the following four categories of project progress. See the [Guidance for Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-supported GEF-financed Projects](https://eur03.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=http%3A%2F%2Fweb.undp.org%2Fevaluation%2Fguideline%2Fdocuments%2FGEF%2FTE_GuidanceforUNDP-supportedGEF-financedProjects.pdf&data=02%7C01%7Cmohammad.saleem%40undp.org%7C45f089e7684e40370ec608d82e1203a5%7Cb3e5db5e2944483799f57488ace54319%7C0%7C0%7C637310002190012148&sdata=OSKOAKnEhnP95Ieo6tqz74PnpEkcoFk79ad13OgWKOE%3D&reserved=0)).for extended descriptions, and this guide should be used in the course of the TE exercise.**i. Project Strategy**Project design: * Review the problem addressed by the project and the underlying assumptions. Review the effect of any incorrect assumptions or changes to the context to achieving the project results as outlined in the Project Document.
* Review the relevance of the project strategy and assess whether it provides the most effective route towards expected/intended results. Were lessons from other relevant projects properly incorporated into the project design?
* Review how the project addresses country priorities. Review country ownership. Was the project concept in line with the national sector development priorities and plans of the country (or of participating countries in the case of multi-country projects)?
* Review decision-making processes: were perspectives of those who would be affected by project decisions, those who could affect the outcomes, and those who could contribute information or other resources to the process, taken into account during project design processes?
* Review the extent to which relevant gender issues were raised in the project design. See Annex 9[[13]](#footnote-13) of *Guidance For Conducting Final Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects* for further guidelines.
* If there are major areas of concern, recommend areas for improvement.

Results Framework/Log frame:* Undertake a critical analysis of the project’s log frame indicators and targets, assess how “SMART” the Final Review and end-of-project targets are (Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Relevant, Time-bound), and suggest specific amendments/revisions to the targets and indicators as necessary.
* Are the project’s objectives and outcomes or components clear, practical, and feasible within its time frame?
* Examine if progress so far has led to, or could in the future catalyse beneficial development effects (i.e. income generation, gender equality and women’s empowerment, improved governance etc...) that should be included in the project results framework and monitored on an annual basis.
* Ensure broader development and gender aspects of the project are being monitored effectively. Develop and recommend SMART ‘development’ indicators, including sex-disaggregated indicators and indicators that capture development benefits.

**ii. Progress Towards Results**Progress towards Outcomes Analysis:* Review the log frame indicators against progress made towards the end-of-project targets using the Progress Towards Results Matrix and following the *Guidance For Conducting Final Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects*; colour code progress in a “traffic light system” based on the level of progress achieved; assign a rating on progress for each outcome; make recommendations from the areas marked as “Not on target to be achieved” (red).

Table. Progress Towards Results Matrix (Achievement of outcomes against End-of-project Targets)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Project Strategy** | **Indicator**[[14]](#footnote-14) | **Baseline Level**[[15]](#footnote-15) | **Level in 1st PIR (self- reported)** | **Midterm Target**[[16]](#footnote-16) | **End-of-project Target** | **Midterm Level & Assessment**[[17]](#footnote-17) | **Achievement Rating**[[18]](#footnote-18) | **Justification for Rating**  |
| **Objective:****To promote sustainable management of land and natural resources in the arid and semi-arid regions of Pakistan in order to restore degraded ecosystems and their essential services, reduce poverty, and increase resilience to climate change** | Area of rain-fed farmland in target districts with reduced land degradation resulting from introduced SLM practices | 100,000 ha |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Area of degraded forests and rangelands and shifting sand-dunes in target districts benefiting from introduced SLM techniques | Forests: 43,500 haSand-dunes: 11,700 haRangelands: 175,000 ha |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Project communities are participating in SLM interventions and have increased their average household income earned from dryland farming and NRM activities as compared to baseline. | 5% of households participating YR13,000 US$ average income |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total amount of CO2 equivalent greenhouse gas sequestered in the target districts due to effective application of SLM practices | 7 million tons CO2 equivalent |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Outcome 1:****Strong enabling environment at national and provincial levels supports up-scaling of SLM practices** | Number of provincial land use policieswith SLM and NAP mainstreamed, being implementedNumber of key sectoral policies, especially agriculture and forests address desertification issues and SLM principlesFunctioning National & Provincial Desertification Control Cells | National & provincial coordination units established during SLMP Phase I |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Outcome2:** **Effective, targeted, and adaptive implementation of SLM Land Use Planning & Decision Support System** | Number of integrated participatory district level SLM land use plans being implemented (developed with the participation of key sectoral representatives and NGOs/CBOs)SLM Information System and Decision Support System operational and being used |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Outcome 3:****On-the-ground implementation of climate-resilient SLM activities is up-scaled across landscapes** | Number of villages and households in target districts participating in SLM activitiesNumber of farms in target districts implementing soil and water conservation measures and on-farm management practices% of livestock owners in target districts participating in agreements to restore degraded rangelands% of households participating in agreements to restore degraded dryland forestsNumber of community-financed viable local SLM funds, resource specific business plans, public-private partnerships and targeted matching grants designed and supporting up-scaling | 63 villages2,300 households12,600 farmers2%1%5 Funds1 Business plans1 PPPs 3 Grants |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**Indicator Assessment Key**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Green= Achieved | Yellow= On target to be achieved | Red= Not on target to be achieved |

In addition to the progress towards outcomes analysis:* Compare and analyse the GEF Tracking Tool at the Baseline with the one completed right after the Terminal Review.
* Identify remaining barriers to achieving the project objective in the remainder of the project.
* By reviewing the aspects of the project that have already been successful, identify ways in which the project can further expand these benefits.

**iii. Project Implementation and Adaptive Management**Management Arrangements:* Review overall effectiveness of project management as outlined in the Project Document. Have changes been made and are they effective? Are responsibilities and reporting lines clear? Is decision-making transparent and undertaken in a timely manner? Recommend areas for improvement.
* Review the quality of execution of the Executing Agency/Implementing Partner(s) and recommend areas for improvement.
* Review the quality of support provided by the GEF Partner Agency (UNDP) and recommend areas for improvement.

Work Planning:* Review any delays in project start-up and implementation, identify the causes and examine if they have been resolved.
* Are work-planning processes results-based? If not, suggest ways to re-orientate work planning to focus on results?
* Examine the use of the project’s results framework/ log frame as a management tool and review any changes made to it since project start.

Finance and co-finance:* Consider the financial management of the project, with specific reference to the cost-effectiveness of interventions.
* Review the changes to fund allocations as a result of budget revisions and assess the appropriateness and relevance of such revisions.
* Does the project have the appropriate financial controls, including reporting and planning, that allow management to make informed decisions regarding the budget and allow for timely flow of funds?
* Informed by the co-financing monitoring table to be filled out, provide commentary on co-financing: is co-financing being used strategically to help the objectives of the project? Is the Project Team meeting with all co-financing partners regularly in order to align financing priorities and annual work plans?

Project-level Monitoring and Evaluation Systems:* Review the monitoring tools currently being used: Do they provide the necessary information? Do they involve key partners? Are they aligned or mainstreamed with national systems? Do they use existing information? Are they efficient? Are they cost-effective? Are additional tools required? How could they be made more participatory and inclusive?
* Examine the financial management of the project monitoring and evaluation budget. Are sufficient resources being allocated to monitoring and evaluation? Are these resources being allocated effectively?

Stakeholder Engagement:* Project management: Has the project developed and leveraged the necessary and appropriate partnerships with direct and tangential stakeholders?
* Participation and country-driven processes: Do local and national government stakeholders support the objectives of the project? Do they continue to have an active role in project decision-making that supports efficient and effective project implementation?
* Participation and public awareness: To what extent has stakeholder involvement and public awareness contributed to the progress towards achievement of project objectives?

Reporting:* Assess how adaptive management changes have been reported by the project management and shared with the Project Board.
* Assess how well the Project Team and partners undertake and fulfil GEF reporting requirements (i.e. how have they addressed poorly-rated PIRs, if applicable?)
* Assess how lessons derived from the adaptive management process have been documented, shared with key partners and internalized by partners.

Communications:* Review internal project communication with stakeholders: Is communication regular and effective? Are there key stakeholders left out of communication? Are there feedback mechanisms when communication is received? Does this communication with stakeholders contribute to their awareness of project outcomes and activities and investment in the sustainability of project results?
* Review external project communication: Are proper means of communication established or being established to express the project progress and intended impact to the public (is there a web presence, for example? Or did the project implement appropriate outreach and public awareness campaigns?)
* For reporting purposes, write one half-page paragraph that summarizes the project’s progress towards results in terms of contribution to sustainable development benefits, as well as global environmental benefits.

**iv. Sustainability*** Validate whether the risks identified in the Project Document, Annual Project Review/PIRs and the ATLAS Risk Management Module are the most important and whether the risk ratings applied are appropriate and up to date. If not, explain why.
* In addition, assess the following risks to sustainability:

Financial risks to sustainability: * What is the likelihood of financial and economic resources not being available once the GEF assistance ends (consider potential resources can be from multiple sources, such as the public and private sectors, income generating activities, and other funding that will be adequate financial resources for sustaining project’s outcomes)?

Socio-economic risks to sustainability: * Are there any social or political risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project outcomes? What is the risk that the level of stakeholder ownership (including ownership by governments and other key stakeholders) will be insufficient to allow for the project outcomes/benefits to be sustained? Do the various key stakeholders see that it is in their interest that the project benefits continue to flow? Is there sufficient public / stakeholder awareness in support of the long term objectives of the project? Are lessons learned being documented by the Project Team on a continual basis and shared/ transferred to appropriate parties who could learn from the project and potentially replicate and/or scale it in the future?

Institutional Framework and Governance risks to sustainability: * Do the legal frameworks, policies, governance structures and processes pose risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project benefits? While assessing this parameter, also consider if the required systems/ mechanisms for accountability, transparency, and technical knowledge transfer are in place.

Environmental risks to sustainability: * Are there any environmental risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project outcomes?

**Conclusions & Recommendations**The TE team will include a section of the report setting out the TE’s evidence-based conclusions, in light of the findings.[[19]](#footnote-19)Recommendations should be succinct suggestions for critical intervention that are specific, measurable, achievable, and relevant. A recommendation table should be put in the report’s executive summary. See the *Guidance For Conducting Final Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects* for guidance on a recommendation table.The TE team should make no more than 15 recommendations total. **Ratings**The TE team will include its ratings of the project’s results and brief descriptions of the associated achievements in a *TE Ratings & Achievement Summary Table* in the Executive Summary of the TE report. See Annex E for ratings scales. No rating on Project Strategy and no overall project rating is required.Table. TE Ratings & Achievement Summary Table

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Measure** | **TE Rating** | **Achievement Description** |
| **Project Strategy** | N/A |  |
| **Progress Towards Results** | Objective Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale) |  |
| Outcome 1 Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale) |  |
| Outcome 2 Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale) |  |
| Outcome 3 Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale) |  |
| Etc.  |  |
| **Project Implementation & Adaptive Management** | (rate 6 pt. scale) |  |
| **Sustainability** | (rate 4 pt. scale) |  |

 |

**ToR Annex B: Project Information Package to be reviewed by TE team**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| # | Item (electronic versions preferred if available) |
| 1 | Project Identification Form (PIF) |
| 2 | UNDP Initiation Plan |
| 3 | Final UNDP-GEF Project Document with all annexes |
| 4 | CEO Endorsement Request |
| 5 | UNDP Social and Environmental Screening Procedure (SESP) and associated management plans (if any) |
| 6 | Inception Workshop Report |
| 7 | Mid-Term Review report and management response to TE recommendations |
| 8 | All Project Implementation Reports (PIRs) |
| 9 | Progress reports (quarterly, semi-annual or annual, with associated workplans and financial reports) |
| 10 | Oversight mission reports |
| 11 | Minutes of Project Board Meetings and of other meetings (i.e. Project Appraisal Committee meetings) |
| 12 | GEF Tracking Tools (from CEO Endorsement, midterm and terminal stages) |
| 13 | GEF/LDCF/SCCF Core Indicators (from PIF, CEO Endorsement, midterm and terminal stages); for GEF-6 and GEF-7 projects only |
| 14 | Financial data, including actual expenditures by project outcome, including management costs, and including documentation of any significant budget revisions |
| 15 | Co-financing data with expected and actual contributions broken down by type of co-financing, source, and whether the contribution is considered as investment mobilized or recurring expenditures |
| 16 | Audit reports |
| 17 | Electronic copies of project outputs (booklets, manuals, technical reports, articles, etc.) |
| 18 | Sample of project communications materials |
| 19 | Summary list of formal meetings, workshops, etc. held, with date, location, topic, and number of participants |
| 20 | Any relevant socio-economic monitoring data, such as average incomes / employment levels of stakeholders in the target area, change in revenue related to project activities |
| 21 | List of contracts and procurement items over ~US$5,000 (i.e. organizations or companies contracted for project outputs, etc., except in cases of confidential information) |
| 22 | List of related projects/initiatives contributing to project objectives approved/started after GEF project approval (i.e. any leveraged or “catalytic” results) |
| 23 | Data on relevant project website activity – e.g. number of unique visitors per month, number of page views, etc. over relevant time period, if available |
| 24 | UNDP Country Programme Document (CPD) |
| 25 | List/map of project sites, highlighting suggested visits |
| 26 | List and contact details for project staff, key project stakeholders, including Project Board members, RTA, Project Team members, and other partners to be consulted |
| 27 | Project deliverables that provide documentary evidence of achievement towards project outcomes |
|  | *Additional documents, as required* |

**ToR Annex C: Content of the TE report**

1. Title page
* Title of UNDP-supported GEF-financed project
* UNDP PIMS ID and GEF ID
* TE timeframe and date of final TE report
* Region and countries included in the project
* GEF Focal Area/Strategic Program
* Executing Agency, Implementing partner and other project partners
* TE Team members
1. Acknowledgements
2. Table of Contents
3. Acronyms and Abbreviations
4. Executive Summary (3-4 pages)
* Project Information Table
* Project Description (brief)
* Evaluation Ratings Table
* Concise summary of findings, conclusions and lessons learned
* Recommendations summary table
1. Introduction (2-3 pages)
* Purpose and objective of the TE
* Scope
* Methodology
* Data Collection & Analysis
* Ethics
* Limitations to the evaluation
* Structure of the TE report
1. Project Description (3-5 pages)
* Project start and duration, including milestones
* Development context: environmental, socio-economic, institutional, and policy factors relevant to the project objective and scope
* Problems that the project sought to address, threats and barriers targeted
* Immediate and development objectives of the project
* Expected results
* Main stakeholders: summary list
* Theory of Change
1. Findings

(in addition to a descriptive assessment, all criteria marked with (\*) must be given a rating[[20]](#footnote-20))

4.1 Project Design/Formulation

* Analysis of Results Framework: project logic and strategy, indicators
* Assumptions and Risks
* Lessons from other relevant projects (e.g. same focal area) incorporated into project design
* Planned stakeholder participation
* Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector
	1. Project Implementation
* Adaptive management (changes to the project design and project outputs during implementation)
* Actual stakeholder participation and partnership arrangements
* Project Finance and Co-finance
* Monitoring & Evaluation: design at entry (\*), implementation (\*), and overall assessment of M&E (\*)
* UNDP implementation/oversight (\*) and Implementing Partner execution (\*), overall project implementation/execution (\*), coordination, and operational issues
* Risk Management, including Social and Environmental Standards (Safeguards)
	1. Project Results and Impacts
* Progress towards objective and expected outcomes (\*)
* Relevance (\*)
* Effectiveness (\*)
* Efficiency (\*)
* Overall Outcome (\*)
* Sustainability: financial (\*), socio-economic (\*), institutional framework and governance (\*), environmental (\*), and overall likelihood (\*)
* Country ownership
* Gender equality and women’s empowerment
* Cross-cutting Issues
* GEF Additionality
* Catalytic/Replication Effect
* Progress to Impact
1. Main Findings, Conclusions, Recommendations & Lessons
* Main Findings
* Conclusions
* Recommendations
* Lessons Learned
1. Annexes
* TE ToR (excluding ToR annexes)
* TE Mission itinerary, including summary of field visits
* List of persons interviewed
* List of documents reviewed
* Evaluation Question Matrix (evaluation criteria with key questions, indicators, sources of data, and methodology)
* Questionnaire used and summary of results
* Co-financing tables (if not include in body of report)
* TE Rating scales
* Signed Evaluation Consultant Agreement form
* Signed UNEG Code of Conduct form
* Signed TE Report Clearance form
* *Annexed in a separate file*: TE Audit Trail
* *Annexed in a separate file:* relevant terminal GEF/LDCF/SCCF Core Indicators or Tracking Tools, as applicable

**ToR Annex D: Evaluation Criteria Matrix template**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **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 a the local, regional and national level? |
| *(include evaluative questions)* | *(i.e. relationships established, level of coherence between project design and implementation approach, specific activities conducted, quality of risk mitigation strategies, etc.)* | *(i.e. project documentation, national policies or strategies, websites, project staff, project partners, data collected throughout the TE mission, etc.)* | *(i.e. document analysis, data analysis, interviews with project staff, interviews with stakeholders, etc.)* |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| 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, socio-political, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results? |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Gender equality and women’s empowerment: How did the project contribute to gender equality and women’s empowerment?  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status? |
|  |  |  |  |
| *(Expand the table to include questions for all criteria being assessed: Monitoring & Evaluation, UNDP oversight/implementation, Implementing Partner Execution, cross-cutting issues, etc.)* |

**ToR Annex E: UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluators**

Independence entails the ability to evaluate without undue influence or pressure by any party (including the hiring unit) and providing evaluators with free access to information on the evaluation subject. Independence provides legitimacy to and ensures an objective perspective on evaluations. An independent evaluation reduces the potential for conflicts of interest which might arise with self-reported ratings by those involved in the management of the project being evaluated. Independence is one of ten general principles for evaluations (together with internationally agreed principles, goals and targets: utility, credibility, impartiality, ethics, transparency, human rights and gender equality, national evaluation capacities, and professionalism).

**Evaluators/Consultants:**

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.
8. Must ensure that independence of judgement is maintained, and that evaluation findings and recommendations are independently presented.
9. Must confirm that they have not been involved in designing, executing or advising on the project being evaluated and did not carry out the project’s Mid-Term Review.

**Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form**

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

Name of Evaluator: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

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: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**ToR Annex F: TE Rating Scales**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Ratings for Outcomes, Effectiveness, Efficiency, M&E, Implementation/Oversight, Execution, Relevance | Sustainability ratings:  |
| 6 = Highly Satisfactory (HS): exceeds expectations and/or no shortcomings 5 = Satisfactory (S): meets expectations and/or no or minor shortcomings4 = Moderately Satisfactory (MS): more or less meets expectations and/or some shortcomings3 = Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): somewhat below expectations and/or significant shortcomings2 = Unsatisfactory (U): substantially below expectations and/or major shortcomings1 = Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): severe shortcomingsUnable to Assess (U/A): available information does not allow an assessment | 4 = Likely (L): negligible risks to sustainability3 = Moderately Likely (ML): moderate risks to sustainability2 = Moderately Unlikely (MU): significant risks to sustainability1 = Unlikely (U): severe risks to sustainabilityUnable to Assess (U/A): Unable to assess the expected incidence and magnitude of risks to sustainability |

**ToR Annex G: TE Report Clearance Form**

|  |
| --- |
| **Terminal Evaluation Report for** *(Project Title & UNDP PIMS ID*) **Reviewed and Cleared By:****Commissioning Unit (M&E Focal Point)**Name: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_Signature: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**Regional Technical Advisor (Nature, Climate and Energy)**Name: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_Signature: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ |

**ToR Annex H: TE Audit Trail**

*The following is a template for the TE Team 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 listed as an annex in the final TE report but not attached to the report file.*

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

The following comments were provided to the draft TE report; they are referenced by institution/organization (do not include the commentator’s name) and track change comment number (“#” column):

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

1. Annex 9. Checklist for Gender Sensitive Final Review Analysis, ([Guidance for Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-supported GEF-financed Projects](https://eur03.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=http%3A%2F%2Fweb.undp.org%2Fevaluation%2Fguideline%2Fdocuments%2FGEF%2FTE_GuidanceforUNDP-supportedGEF-financedProjects.pdf&data=02%7C01%7Cmohammad.saleem%40undp.org%7C45f089e7684e40370ec608d82e1203a5%7Cb3e5db5e2944483799f57488ace54319%7C0%7C0%7C637310002190012148&sdata=OSKOAKnEhnP95Ieo6tqz74PnpEkcoFk79ad13OgWKOE%3D&reserved=0) [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Populate with data from the Log frame and scorecards [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Populate with data from the Project Document [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. If available [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. Colour code this column only [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. Use the 6 point Progress Towards Results Rating Scale: HS, S, MS, MU, U, HU [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. Outcomes, Effectiveness, Efficiency, M&E, Implementation/Oversight & Execution, Relevance are rated on a 6-point scale: 6=Highly Satisfactory (HS), 5=Satisfactory (S), 4=Moderately Satisfactory (MS), 3=Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU), 2=Unsatisfactory (U), 1=Highly Unsatisfactory (HU). Sustainability is rated on a 4-point scale: 4=Likely (L), 3=Moderately Likely (ML), 2=Moderately Unlikely (MU), 1=Unlikely (U) [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. Access at: <http://web.undp.org/evaluation/guideline/section-6.shtml> [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. The Commissioning Unit is obligated to issue payments to the TE team as soon as the terms under the ToR are fulfilled. If there is an ongoing discussion regarding the quality and completeness of the final deliverables that cannot be resolved between the Commissioning Unit and the TE team, the Regional M&E Advisor and Vertical Fund Directorate will be consulted. If needed, the Commissioning Unit’s senior management, Procurement Services Unit and Legal Support Office will be notified as well so that a decision can be made about whether or not to withhold payment of any amounts that may be due to the evaluator(s), suspend or terminate the contract and/or remove the individual contractor from any applicable rosters. See the UNDP Individual Contract Policy for further details:

<https://popp.undp.org/_layouts/15/WopiFrame.aspx?sourcedoc=/UNDP_POPP_DOCUMENT_LIBRARY/Public/PSU_Individual%20Contract_Individual%20Contract%20Policy.docx&action=default> [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. Engagement of evaluators should be done in line with guidelines for hiring consultants in the POPP <https://popp.undp.org/SitePages/POPPRoot.aspx> [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
11. <https://intranet.undp.org/unit/bom/pso/Support%20documents%20on%20IC%20Guidelines/Template%20for%20Confirmation%20of%20Interest%20and%20Submission%20of%20Financial%20Proposal.docx> [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
12. <http://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/corporate/Careers/P11_Personal_history_form.doc> [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
13. Annex 9. Checklist for Gender Sensitive Final Review Analysis, [Guidance for Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-supported GEF-financed Projects](https://eur03.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=http%3A%2F%2Fweb.undp.org%2Fevaluation%2Fguideline%2Fdocuments%2FGEF%2FTE_GuidanceforUNDP-supportedGEF-financedProjects.pdf&data=02%7C01%7Cmohammad.saleem%40undp.org%7C45f089e7684e40370ec608d82e1203a5%7Cb3e5db5e2944483799f57488ace54319%7C0%7C0%7C637310002190012148&sdata=OSKOAKnEhnP95Ieo6tqz74PnpEkcoFk79ad13OgWKOE%3D&reserved=0)). [↑](#footnote-ref-13)
14. Populate with data from the Log frame and scorecards [↑](#footnote-ref-14)
15. Populate with data from the Project Document [↑](#footnote-ref-15)
16. If available [↑](#footnote-ref-16)
17. Colour code this column only [↑](#footnote-ref-17)
18. Use the 6 point Progress Towards Results Rating Scale: HS, S, MS, MU, U, HU [↑](#footnote-ref-18)
19. Alternatively, TE conclusions may be integrated into the body of the report. [↑](#footnote-ref-19)
20. See ToR Annex F for rating scales. [↑](#footnote-ref-20)