Terms of Reference
Terminal Evaluation: LBR National Adaptation Plan

1. Background

The project document for the UNDP-supported GCF-financed project "To Advance the National Adaptation Plans (NAP) process for medium-term investment planning in climate-sensitive sectors" was signed on 16 October 2017 by the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and the Government of Liberia. The project Inception Meeting kicked off in March 2018 and is currently in its last year of implementation.

The project has suffered additional delay due to COVID-19. Liberia recorded its first COVID-19 patient on 16 March 2020. One week later, the Ministry of Health declared a public health emergency. This was followed by the declaration of a state of emergency beginning April 10 to curb the spread of the coronavirus, including a partial lockdown and restriction on public gathering, travel and curfew across the country. Thus far, the country has recorded as at 30th July 2020, 1,179 confirmed cases, 72 deaths and 664 recovered. On July 23, the government lifted the state of emergency with further enforcement of the Public Health Law, which amongst other things requires mandatory wearing of masks in public places and social distancing.

The project is being implemented by UNDP in partnership with the Environmental Protection Agency of Liberia. The main objective of the project is to support Liberia to put in place its National Adaptation Planning process which is gender-responsive taking into consideration the needs of both women and men and interests contributing to and building upon existing development planning strategies and processes and to implement relevant, efficient and inclusive priority adaptation actions.

The activities in this project focus on four components:

1. Strengthening institutional frameworks and coordination for implementation of the NAPs process
2. Expansion of the knowledge base for scaling up gender-responsive adaptation processes
3. Building capacity for gender mainstreaming climate change adaptation into planning, and budgeting processes and systems
4. Formulation of financing mechanisms for scaling up adaptation in Liberia.

The direct beneficiaries of the project are the Environment Protection Agency and the National Climate Change Secretariat. Key government partners are Ministry of Finance and Development Planning, Ministry of Agriculture, National Disaster Management Agency, Liberia Maritime Authority, National Fisheries & Aquaculture Authority, Ministry of Mines & Energy, Liberia National Department of Meteorology, Liberia Institute of Statistics and Geo-Information Services and University of Liberia.

Overall, the project will contribute to GCF Fund level impact towards output A.5 -- "Strengthened institutional and regulatory systems for climate responsive planning and development." The expected outputs are derived from the Government of Liberia's NAP formulation and implementation note issued in 2016, following national stakeholder consultations held during the launch of the NAP process in April 2015. A stock-taking exercise was prepared by UNDP in 2015 upon request of the government. The stock-taking exercise identified six climate sensitive sectors for Liberia's NAP intervention-agriculture, forestry, energy, waste management, fisheries and transportation.

2. Evaluation Purpose

UNDP commissions programme evaluations to capture and demonstrate evaluative evidence of its contributions to development results at the country level as articulated in UNDP's Country Programme Document (CPD). These are evaluations carried out within the overall provisions contained in the UNDP Evaluation Policy. In line with the Evaluation Plan of UNDP Liberia, project evaluation is planned to be commissioned at during the last year of the project implementation.

The UNDP Office in Liberia is commissioning this independent evaluation on the NAP project to capture evaluative evidence of its relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and incorporation of gender and other cross-cutting issues in an effort to assess the achievement of projects results against what was expected to be achieved. The evaluation will ascertain how beneficiaries have benefited from the project interventions and what lessons could be learned that can both improve the sustainability of benefits from this project, and aid in the overall enhancement of UNDP programming. The evaluation serves an important accountability function, providing national stakeholders and partners in Liberia with an impartial assessment of the results of NAP's intervention.

3. Evaluation Scope

The evaluation will assess project performance against expectations set out in the project results framework (\Documents\UNDP-NAP\NAP 2019\TERMINAL EVALUATION\Final TOR-TE\NAP Project Results Framework.docx). The TE will assess results according to the criteria outlined in the UNDP Evaluation Guidelines[1].

The evaluation will consider the pertinent outcomes and outputs as stated in the project document focused towards advancing medium to long term planning in climate sensitive sectors in relations to Country Programme Outcome #3: Inclusive Growth-UNDP will support the Government to meet its obligations under the Paris Agreement by strengthening policy and legislative capacities, building partnerships for climate action, particularly with the private sector, and mobilizing national and global finance. Mainstreaming environmental considerations into national policy and planning to ensure climate justice for women and marginalized groups will remain a priority.

---

[1] UNDP Evaluation Guidelines: http://web.undp.org/evaluation/guidance.shtml#handbook

As described in the background, the NAP programme has implemented 4 outcomes. An analysis of achievements across all 4 outcomes is expected:

NAP PROGRAMME OUTCOME 1	**Strengthening institutional frameworks and coordination for implementation of the NAPs process**
NAP PROGRAMME OUTCOME 2	**Expansion of the knowledge base for scaling up adaptation**
NAP PROGRAMME OUTCOME 3	**Building capacity for mainstreaming CCA into planning, and budgeting processes and systems**
NAP PROGRAMME OUTCOME 4	**Formulation of mechanisms for scaling up of prioritised adaptation investments and addressing financial gaps**

4. Evaluation Questions

The evaluation seeks to answer the following questions, focused around the evaluation criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability:

Relevance:
- How well has the programme aligned with government and agency priorities?
- To what extent has NAP's selected method of delivery been appropriate to the development context?
- Has NAP programme been influential in influencing national policies on climate change adaptation?
- To what extent was the theory of change presented in the outcome model a relevant and appropriate vision on which to base the initiatives?
- To what extent was the project in line with the UNDP Strategic Plan, CPD, UNDAF, United Nations Sustainable Development Cooperation Framework (UNSDCF), SDGs, and GCF strategic programming

Effectiveness
- What evidence is there that the programme has contributed towards an improvement in national government capacity, including institutional strengthening?
- Has the NAP programme been effective in helping improve climate change adaptation planning in Liberia?
- To what extent have outcomes been achieved or has progress been made towards their achievement.
- What has been the contribution of partners and other organizations to the outcome, and how effective have the programme partnerships been in contributing to achieving the outcome?
- What were the positive or negative, intended or unintended, changes brought about by NAP's work?
- What contributing factors and impediments enhance or impede NAP performance?
- To what extent did the project contribute to gender equality, the empowerment of women, and/or a human-rights based approach?

Efficiency
- Are NAP's approaches, resources, models, conceptual framework relevant to achieve the planned outcomes?
- To what extent were quality outputs delivered on time?
- Has there been an economical use of financial and human resources and strategic allocation of resources (funds, human resources, time, expertise, etc.)?
- Did the monitoring and evaluation systems that NAP has in place help to ensure that activities and outputs were managed efficiently and effectively?
- Were alternative approaches considered in designing the programme?

Sustainability
- What is the likelihood that the NAP programme interventions are sustainable?
- What mechanisms have been set in place by NAP to support the government of Liberia to sustain improvements made through these interventions?
- To what extent has a sustainability strategy, including capacity development of key national stakeholders, been developed or implemented?
- To what extent have partners committed to providing continuing support?
- What indications are there that the outcomes will be sustained, e.g., through requisite capacities (systems, structures, staff, etc.)?
- What opportunities for financial sustainability exist?
- How has the project developed appropriate institutional capacity (systems, structures, staff, expertise, etc.) that will be self-sufficient after the project closure date?

Impact
- What has happened as a result of the programme or project?
- What real difference has the activity made to the beneficiaries?
- How many people have been affected?
- Were there contributions to changes in policy/legal/regulatory frameworks, including observed changes in capacities (awareness, knowledge, skills, infrastructure, monitoring systems, etc.) and governance architecture, including access to and use of information (laws, administrative bodies, trust-building and conflict resolution processes, information-sharing systems, etc.)?
- Were there contributions to changes in socio-economic status (income, health, well-being, etc.)?
- Discuss any unintended impacts of the project (both positive and negative) and assess their overall scope and implications.
- Identify barriers and risks that may prevent further progress towards long-term impact;
- Assess any real change in gender equality, e.g. access to and control of resources, decision-making power, division of labor, etc.

The evaluation must also include an assessment of the extent to which programme design, implementation and monitoring have taken the following cross cutting issues into consideration:

4

Human rights
- To what extent have poor, indigenous and tribal peoples, women and other disadvantaged and marginalized groups benefitted from NAP's interventions?

Gender Equality
- To what extent has gender been addressed in the design, implementation and monitoring of the NAP programme?
- To what extent has NAP programme promoted positive changes in gender equality? Were there any unintended effects?
- How did the programme promote gender equality, human rights and human development in the delivery of outputs?

The evaluation team will include a summary of the main findings of the evaluation report. Findings should be presented as statements of fact that are based on analysis of the data.

A 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 evaluation 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 GCF, 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 evaluation report should also include lessons that can be taken from the evaluation, including best and worst 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 GCF and UNDP interventions. When possible, the evaluation 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 include results related to gender equality and empowerment of women.

5. Methodology
The mission anticipates 7 days for field mission. In the event where field mission is not possible due to COVID, then remote interviews may be conducted through telephone or online (skype, zoom etc). Under such situation, site visits will be led out by the National Consultants.

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

The evaluation will be carried out by an external team of independent evaluators and will follow a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with a wide array of stakeholders and beneficiaries, including national and local

government officials and staff, donors, beneficiaries from the interventions, and community members.

Evidence obtained and used to assess the results of NAP's interventions must be triangulated from a variety of sources, including verifiable data on indicator achievement, existing reports, evaluations and technical papers, stakeholder interviews, focus groups, surveys and site visits. In the event where field mission is not possible due to COVID, then remote interviews may be conducted through telephone or online (skype, zoom etc). Under such situation, site visits will be carried out by the National Consultants. These formalities will be agreed upon during contract discussions and finalized in the inception meeting. The specific design and methodology for the evaluation should emerge from consultations between the evaluation team and the above-mentioned parties regarding what is appropriate and feasible for meeting the evaluation purpose and objectives and answering the evaluation questions, given limitations of budget, time and data. The evaluation 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 evaluation report.

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

The final report must 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 evaluation.

The following steps in data collection are anticipated:

5.1 Desk Review

A desk review should be carried out of the key strategies and documents underpinning the project's scope of work. This includes reviewing the project document, different reports, country programme document, the as well as any monitoring and other documents, to be provided by the project and Commissioning Unit.

5.2 Field Data Collection

Following the desk review, the national evaluator will build on the documented evidence through an agreed set of field and interview methodologies, including:

- Interviews with key partners and stakeholders
- Field visits to project sites and partner institutions
- Survey questionnaires where appropriate
- Participatory observation, focus groups, and rapid appraisal techniques

6. Deliverables
The following reports and deliverables are required for the evaluation:

- Inception report
- Draft Evaluation Report

- Presentation at the validation workshop with key stakeholders, (partners and beneficiaries)
- Final Evaluation report

One week after contract signing, the evaluation team will produce an **inception report** clarifying the objectives, methodology and timing of the evaluation. The inception report must include an evaluation matrix presenting the evaluation questions, data sources, data collection, analysis tools and methods to be used. Annex 3 provides a simple matrix template. The inception report should detail the specific timing for evaluation activities and deliverables and propose specific site visits and stakeholders to be interviewed. Protocols for different stakeholders should be developed. The inception report will be discussed and agreed with the UNDP Country Office before the national evaluator proceed with site visits.

The **draft evaluation report** will be shared by the evaluation team to the UNDP Country Office, who will circulate the draft to stakeholders. The evaluation tea will present the draft report in a validation workshop that the UNDP country office will organise. Feedback received from these sessions should be considered when preparing the final report. The evaluators will produce an 'audit trail' (Annex Z) indicating whether and how each comment received was addressed in revisions to the **final report**.

The suggested table of contents of the evaluation report is found in ANNEX 2.

7. Evaluation Team Composition and Required Competencies

The evaluation will be undertaken by a team of 2 external evaluators, a Team Lead (international consultant) and an Associate Evaluator (national consultant). The Team Lead will oversee the entire evaluation process, ensure its successful execution and be responsible for the final product. As the Team Lead, s/he will manage the national consultant. In addition to his/her direct reporting line to the international consultant, the National Consultant will rely on the project staff and stakeholders to prepare the ground for effective and efficient implementation of the evaluation.

The evaluators cannot have participated in the project preparation, formulation and/or implementation (including the writing of the project document) and should not have a conflict of interest with the project's related activities.

Required Competencies and Qualifications of the Team Lead

- Minimum Master's degree in natural resource management/ environmental management/ business/ public administration other related disciplines;
- Minimum 7-10 years of relevant professional experience.

- Knowledge of UNDP and GCF/GCF monitoring and evaluation policies and guidelines
- Strong working knowledge of the UN and more specifically the work of UNDP in support of government;
- Sound knowledge of results-based management systems, and monitoring and evaluation methodologies; including experience in applying SMART (S Specific; M Measurable; A Achievable; R Relevant; T Time-bound) indicators;
- Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender and climate change adaptation

- Excellent reporting and communication skills

The **Team Lead** will have overall responsibility for the quality and timely submission of the draft and final evaluation report. Specifically, the Team Lead will perform the following tasks:

- Lead and manage the evaluation mission;
- Develop the inception report, detailing the evaluation scope, methodology and approach;
- Conduct the project evaluation in accordance with the proposed objective and scope of the evaluation and UNDP evaluation guidelines;
- Manage the team during the evaluation mission, and liaise with UNDP on travel and interview schedules'
- Draft and present the draft and final evaluation reports;
- Lead the presentation of draft findings in the stakeholder workshop;
- Finalize the evaluation report and submit it to UNDP.

Required qualification of the Associate Evaluator

- Liberian citizen or persons with extensive experience working in Liberia during the last 5 years;
- Minimum master's degree in the social sciences;
- Minimum 5 years' experience carrying out development evaluations for government and civil society;
- Experience working in or closely with UN agencies, especially UNDP, is preferred;
- A deep understanding of the development context in Liberia and preferably an understanding of climate change/natural resource management issues within the Liberia context;
- Strong communication skills;
- Excellent reading and writing skills in English, and preferably also Shona.

The Associate Evaluator will, *inter alia*, perform the following tasks:

- Review documents;
- Participate in the design of the evaluation methodology;
- Assist in carrying out the evaluation in accordance with the proposed objectives and scope of the evaluation;
- Draft related parts of the evaluation report as agreed with the Evaluation Manager;
- Assist the Evaluation Manager to finalize the draft and final evaluation report.

8. Evaluation Ethics

The evaluation must be carried out in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation' and sign the Ethical Code of Conduct for UNDP Evaluations. In particular, evaluators must be free and clear of perceived conflicts of interest. To this end, interested consultants will not be considered if they were directly and substantively involved, as an employee or consultant, in the formulation of UNDP strategies and programming relating to the outcomes and programmes under review. The code of conduct and an agreement form to be signed by each consultant are included in Annex 4.

9. Implementation Arrangements

The UNDP CO will select the evaluation team through standard UNDP procurement processes and will be responsible for the management of the evaluators. The Head of Unit/Deputy Resident Representative Programme (DRR/P) will designate a focal point for the evaluation that will work with the M&E Specialist and Programme Manager to assist in facilitating the process (e.g., providing relevant documentation, arranging visits/interviews with key informants, etc.). The CO Management will take responsibility for the approval of the final evaluation report. The M&E Specialist or designate will arrange introductory meetings within the CO and the DRR/P or her designate will establish initial contacts with partners and project staff. The consultants will take responsibility for setting up meetings and conducting the evaluation, subject to advanced approval of the methodology submitted in the inception report. The CO management will develop a management response to the evaluation within two weeks of report finalization.

The Task Manager of the Project will convene an Advisory Panel comprising of technical experts to enhance the quality of the evaluation. This Panel will review the inception report and the draft evaluation report to provide detail comments related to the quality of methodology, evidence collected, analysis and reporting. The Panel will also advise on the conformity of evaluation processes to the UNEG standards. The evaluation team is required to address all comments of the Panel completely and comprehensively. The Evaluation Team Leader will provide a detail rationale to the advisory panel for any comment that remain unaddressed.

The evaluation will use a system of ratings standardising assessments proposed by the evaluators in the inception report. The evaluation acknowledges that rating cannot be a standalone assessment, and it will not be feasible to entirely quantify judgements. Performance rating will be carried out for the four evaluation criteria: relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability.

While the Country Office will provide some logistical support during the evaluation, for instance assisting in setting interviews with senior government officials, it will be the responsibility of the evaluators to logistically and financially arrange their travel to and from relevant project sites and to arrange most interviews. Planned travels and associated costs will be included in the Inception Report, and agreed with the Country Office.

10.   Time-Frame for the Evaluation Process

The evaluation is expected to take 22 working days for each of the two consultants, over a period of six weeks starting 1 September 2020. The final draft evaluation report is due the 1st of October 2020. The following table provides an indicative breakout for activities and delivery:

Activity	Deliverable	Work day allocation		Time period (days) for task completion
		Team Lead	Associate Evaluator	

Review materials and develop work plan	Inception report and evaluation matrix	4	3	7
Participate in an Inception Meeting with UNDP Liberia country office				
Draft inception report				
Review Documents and stakeholder consultations	Draft evaluation report Stakeholder workshop presentation	13	16	30
Interview stakeholders				
Conduct field visits				
Analyse data				
Develop draft evaluation and lessons report to Country Office				
Present draft Evaluation Report and lessons at Validation Workshop	Final evaluation report	5	3	7
Finalize and submit evaluation and lessons learned report incorporating additions and comments provided by stakeholders				
	totals	22	22	6 weeks

11.   Fees and payments

Interested consultants should provide their requested fee rates when they submit their expressions of interest, in USD. The UNDP Country Office will then negotiate and finalise contracts. Travel costs and daily allowances will be paid against invoice, and subject to the UN payment schedules for Liberia. Fee payments will be made upon acceptance and approval by the UNDP Country Office of planned deliverables, based on the following payment schedule:

Inception report	20%
Draft Evaluation Report	40%
Final Evaluation Report + completed Audit Trail	40%

12.   TOR ANNEXES

- ToR Annex 1: Project Information Package to be reviewed by TE team
- ToR Annex 2: Content of the TE report
- ToR Annex 3: Evaluation Criteria Matrix template
- ToR Annex 4: Ethical Code of Conduct for Evaluators
- ToR Annex 5: TE Rating Scales
- ToR Annex 6: TE Report Clearance Form
- ToR Annex 7: TE Audit Trail

ToR Annex 1: 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 NAP 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 MTR 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)
14	Financial data, including actual expenditures by project outcome, including management costs, and including documentation of any significant budget revisions
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 GCF 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

ToR Annex 2: Content of the TE report

i. Title page
  - Tile of UNDP-supported GCF-financed project
  - UNDP PIMS ID and GCF ID
  - TE timeframe and date of final TE report
  - Region and countries included in the project
  - GCF Focal Area/Strategic Program
  - Executing Agency, Implementing partner and other project partners
  - TE Team members
ii. Acknowledgements
iii. Table of Contents
iv. Acronyms and Abbreviations
1. 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
2. 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
3. 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
4. Findings
   (in addition to a descriptive assessment, all criteria marked with (*) must be given a rating2)
   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
   4.1 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

4.2 Project Results
- Progress towards objective and expected outcomes (*)
- Relevance (*)
- Effectiveness (*)
- Efficiency (*)
- Overall Outcome (*)
- Country ownership
- Gender
- Other Cross-cutting Issues
- Social and Environmental Standards
- Sustainability: financial (*), socio-economic (*), institutional framework and governance (*), environmental (*), and overall likelihood (*)
- Country Ownership
- Gender equality and women's empowerment
- Cross-cutting Issues
- GCF Additionality
- Catalytic Role / Replication Effect
- Progress to Impact

5. Main Findings, Conclusions, Recommendations & Lessons
- Main Findings
- Conclusions
- Recommendations
- Lessons Learned

6. Annexes
- TE ToR (excluding ToR annexes)
- TE Mission itinerary
- List of persons interviewed
- List of documents reviewed
- Summary of field visits
- 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 GCF/LDCF/SCCF Core Indicators or Tracking Tools, as applicable

ToR Annex 3: Evaluation Criteria Matrix template

Evaluative Criteria Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
Relevance: How does the project relate to the main objectives of the GCF 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?			
To what extent have the project been impacted by COVID			

ToR Annex 4: Ethical Code of Conduct for UNDP Evaluations

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 limitations, 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.

Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form[3]
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 ____ on _____

Signature: _____

---

[3] www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct

ToR Annex 5: 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	4 = Likely (L): negligible risks to sustainability
5 = Satisfactory (S): meets expectations and/or no or minor shortcomings	3 = Moderately Likely (ML): moderate risks to sustainability
4 = Moderately Satisfactory (MS): more or less meets expectations and/or some shortcomings	2 = Moderately Unlikely (MU): significant risks to sustainability
3 = Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): somewhat below expectations and/or significant shortcomings	1 = Unlikely (U): severe risks to sustainability
2 = Unsatisfactory (U): substantially below expectations and/or major shortcomings	Unable to Assess (U/A): Unable to assess the expected incidence and magnitude of risks to sustainability
1 = Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): severe shortcomings	
Unable to Assess (U/A): available information does not allow an assessment	

ToR Annex 6: 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 7: 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

Reviewed and cleared   : _____
                     Dorsla D. Farcathy-Team Leader, IGSD

Approved   : _____
                     Rowland Cole-Deputy Resident Representative/Programme a.i