**Terms of Reference**

**International Consultant for the Interim Evaluation of the UNDP-supported GCF-financed project ‘Scaling-up Glacial Lake Outburst Flood (GLOF) risk reduction in Northern Pakistan’**

**Location:** home-based

**Type of Contract:** Individual Contract

**Post Level:** International Consultant

**Languages Required:** English

**Starting Date:** 10 June 2020

**Duration of Contract:** 24 working days (must complete assignment by 22 July 2020)

1. **INTRODUCTION**

This is the Terms of Reference (ToR) for the Interim Evaluation of the UNDP-supported GCF-financed project titled ‘Scaling-up Glacial Lake Outburst Flood (GLOF) risk reduction in Northern Pakistan’ (PIMS 5660) implemented through the Ministry of Climate Change, which is to be undertaken in 2020. The project started on the *12 July 2017* and is in its 3rd year of implementation. This ToR sets out the expectations for this Interim Evaluation.

**2. PROJECT BACKGROUND INFORMATION**

The melting of the Hindu Kush, Karakoram, and Himalayan glaciers in Northern Pakistan due to rising temperatures has created 3,044 glacial lakes in the federally-administered territory of Gilgit-Baltistan (GB) and the province of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa (KP). It is estimated that 33 of these glacial lakes are hazardous and likely to result in glacial lake outburst floods (GLOFs). Such outbursts have occurred in the past and when they do, millions of cubic metres of water and debris is released in a few hours, resulting in the loss of lives, destruction of property and infrastructure, and severe damage to livelihoods in some of the most remote areas of Pakistan. Currently 7,101,000 people remain at risk in GB and KP. In July 2015, over 280,000 people in GB and KP were affected by a combination of heavy rains and GLOFs.

At present, the country faces a critical gap in technical and technological capacity to monitor the status of glaciers through hydrological monitoring and forecasting. Current early warning systems (EWS) do not have the capacity to support the management of risks posed by rising water levels in the lakes or the ability to issue early warnings to communities. The design and implementation of medium- and long-term disaster management policies as well as risk reduction and preparedness plans are also not fully geared to deal with the specifics of GLOF threats.

The Government of Pakistan has recognized the threat from GLOFs in its National Climate Change Policy and in its Nationally Determined Contributions (NDCs) to monitor changes in glacier volumes and related GLOFs To be able to strengthen capacities of vulnerable communities to address the GLOF issue urgently in the scale that is needed, the Government of Pakistan needs financial support from international donors. Flood hazards are already greater than what national public finance can manage. As a result, it has secured GCF resources to upscale ongoing initiatives on early warning systems and small, locally-sourced infrastructure to protect communities from GLOF risks. The interventions proposed for scale-up by this project will be based on activities implemented in two districts that have demonstrated success. In these districts engineering structures like gabion walls have been constructed and automatic weather stations, rain gauges and discharge equipment were installed. Rural communities receiving this support were able to avoid human and material losses from GLOF events. The proposed GCF project will expand coverage of interventions to twelve districts in the Khyber Pakhtunkhwa and Gilgit-Baltistan provinces. It will strengthen the technical capacity of sub-national decision makers to integrate climate change and disaster risk management into medium- and long-term development planning processes.

The GCF project grant totals US$ 36.96 million with planned co-financing of US$ 0.5 million from the Government of Gilgit-Baltistan).

**3. OBJECTIVES OF THE INTERIM EVALUATION**

The Interim Evaluation will assess implementation of the project and its alignment with FAA obligations and progress towards the achievement of the project objectives and outcomes as specified in the Project Document, and assess early signs of project success or failure with the goal of identifying the necessary changes to be made in order to set the project on-track to achieve its intended results. The Interim Evaluation will also review the project’s strategy and its risks to sustainability, as well as the following:

* Implementation and adaptive management
* Risks to sustainability
* Relevance, effectiveness and efficiency of projects and programmes;
* Coherence in climate finance delivery with other multilateral entities;
* Gender equity;
* Country ownership of projects and programmes;
* Innovativeness in results areas (extent to which interventions may lead to paradigm shift towards low-emission and climate resilient development pathways);
* Replication and scalability – the extent to which the activities can be scaled up in other locations within the country or replicated in other countries (this criterion, which is considered in document GCF/B.05/03 in the context of measuring performance could also be incorporate d in independent evaluations); and
* Unexpected results, both positive and negative.

**4. INTERIM EVALUATION APPROACH & METHODOLOGY**

The Interim Evaluation team (international consultant + national consultant) must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful.

The Interim Evaluation team will conduct a thorough review of all relevant sources of information including documents prepared during the preparation phase (i.e. baseline Funding proposal submitted to the GCF, the Project Document, project reports including Annual Performance Reports, Quarterly Progress Reports, UNDP Environmental & Social Safeguard Policy, project budget revisions, records of surveys conducted, national strategic and legal documents, remote sensing data, GIS data, stakeholder maps, and any other materials that the team considers useful for this evidence-based review).

The Interim Evaluation team is expected to follow a collaborative and participatory approach[[1]](#footnote-1) ensuring close engagement with the Project Team, Implementing Partner, NDA focal point, government counterparts, the UNDP Country Office, Regional Technical Advisers, and other principal stakeholders and beneficiaries, to the extent possible, using virtual tools such as online meetings, online interviews telephone calls and rapid surveys.

Engagement of stakeholders is vital to a successful Interim 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 Interim 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 Interim 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.

**5. DETAILED SCOPE OF THE INTERIM EVALUATION**

The Interim Evaluation team will assess the following four categories of project progress.

**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 of *Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects* for further guidelines.
* If there are major areas of concern, recommend areas for improvement.

Results Framework/Logframe:

* Undertake a critical analysis of the project’s logframe indicators and targets, assess how “SMART” the midterm 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. Relevance, Effectiveness and Efficiency**

* Were the context, problem, needs and priorities well analysed and reviewed during project initiation?
* Are the planned project objectives and outcomes relevant and realistic to the situation on the ground?
* Is the project Theory of Change (ToC) and intervention logic coherent and realistic? Does the ToC and intervention logic hold or does it need to be adjusted?
* Do outputs link to intended outcomes which link to broader paradigm shift objectives of the project?
* Are the planned inputs and strategies identified realistic, appropriate and adequate to achieve the results? Were they sequenced sufficiently to efficiently deliver the expected results?
* Are the outputs being achieved in a timely manner? Is this achievement supportive of the ToC and pathways identified?
* What and how much progress has been made towards achieving the overall outputs and outcomes of the project (including contributing factors and constraints)?
* To what extent is the project able to demonstrate changes against the baseline (assessment in approved Funding Proposal) for the GCF investment criteria (including contributing factors and constraints)?
* How realistic are the risks and assumptions of the project?
* How did the project deal with issues and risks in implementation?
* To what extent did the project’s M&E data and mechanism(s) contribute to achieving project results?
* Have project resources been utilized in the most economical, effective and equitable ways possible (considering value for money; absorption rate; commitments versus disbursements and projected commitments; co-financing; etc.)?
* Are the project’s governance mechanisms functioning efficiently?
* To what extent did the design of the project help or hinder achieving its own goals?
* Were there clear objectives, ToC and strategy? How were these used in performance management and progress reporting?
* Were there clear baselines indicators and/or benchmark for performance measurements? How were these used in project management? To what extent and how the project apply adaptive management?
* What, if any, alternative strategies would have been more effective in achieving the project objectives?

**iii. Progress Towards Results**

Progress Towards Outcomes and Outputs Analysis:

* Review the logframe indicators against progress made towards the end-of-project targets using the Progress Towards Results Matrix and 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:** | Indicator: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Outcome 1:** | Indicator: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Indicator: |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Output** | 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 and outputs analysis:

* 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.

**iv. 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 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/ logframe 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?
* Assess factors that contributed to low/high expenditure rate

Coherence in climate finance delivery with other multilateral entities

* Who are the partners of the project and how strategic are they in terms of capacities and commitment?
* Is there coherence and complementarity by the project with other actors for local other climate change interventions?
* To what extent has the project complimented other on-going local level initiatives (by stakeholders, donors, governments) on climate change adaptation or mitigation efforts?
* How has the project contributed to achieving stronger and more coherent integration of shift to low emission sustainable development pathways and/or increased climate resilient sustainable development (GCF RMF/PMF Paradigm Shift objectives)? Please provide concrete examples and make specific suggestions on how to enhance these roles going forward.

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 GCF reporting requirements (i.e. how have they addressed poorly-rated APRs, if applicable?)
* Assess how lessons derived from the adaptive management process have been documented, shared with key partners and internalized by partners.
* Assess the efficiency, timeliness, and adequacy of reporting requirements

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.

**v. Sustainability**

* Validate whether the risks identified in the Project Document, APRs 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 GCF 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?

**vi. Country Ownership**

* To what extent is the project aligned with national development plans, national plans of action on climate change, or sub-national policy as well as projects and priorities of the national partners?
* How well is country ownership reflected in the project governance, coordination and consultation mechanisms or other consultations?
* To what extent are country level systems for project management or M&E utilized in the project?
* What level and types of involvement for all Is the project as implemented responsive to local challenges and relevant/appropriate/strategic in relation to SDG indicators, National indicators, GCF RMF/PMF indicators, AE indicators, or other goals?
* Were the modes of deliveries of the outputs appropriate to build essential/necessary capacities, promote national ownership and ensure sustainability of the result achieved?

**vii. Gender equity**

* Does the project only rely on sex-disaggregated data per population statistics?
* Are financial resources/project activities explicitly allocated to enable women to benefit from project interventions?
* Does the project account in activities and planning for local gender dynamics and how project interventions affect women as beneficiaries?
* Do women as beneficiaries know their rights and/or benefits from project activities/interventions?
* How do the results for women compare to those for men?
* Is the decision-making process transparent and inclusive of both women and men?
* To what extent are female stakeholders or beneficiaries satisfied with the project gender equality results?
* Did the project sufficiently address cross cutting issues including gender?
* How does the project incorporate gender in its governance or staffing?

**viii. Innovativeness in results areas**

* What role has the project played in the provision of "thought leadership,” “innovation,” or “unlocked additional climate finance” for climate change adaptation/mitigation in the project and country context? Please provide concrete examples and make specific suggestions on how to enhance these roles going forward.

**ix. Unexpected results, both positive and negative**

* What has been the project’s ability to adapt and evolve based on continuous lessons learned and the changing development landscape? Please account for factors both within the AE/EE and external.
* Can any unintended or unexpected positive or negative effects be observed as a consequence of the project's interventions?
* What factors have contributed to the unintended outcomes, outputs, activities, results?

**x. Replication and Scalability**

* What are project lessons learned, failures/lost opportunities to date? What might have been done better or differently?
* How effective were the exit strategies and approaches to phase out assistance provided by the project including contributing factors and constraints
* What factors of the project achievements are contingent on specific local context or enabling environment factors?
* Are the actions and results from project interventions likely to be sustained, ideally through ownership by the local partners and stakeholders?
* What are the key factors that will require attention in order to improve prospects of sustainability, scalability or replication of project outcomes/outputs/results?

**Conclusions & Recommendations**

The Interim Evaluation team will include a section of the report setting out the evaluation’s evidence-based conclusions, in light of the findings. Explain whether the project will be able to achieve planned development objective and outcomes by the end of implementation.

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.

The Interim Evaluation team should make no more than 15 recommendations total.

**Ratings**

The Interim Evaluation team will include its ratings of the project’s results and brief descriptions of the associated achievements in an *Interim Evaluation Ratings & Achievement Summary Table* in the Executive Summary of the Interim Evaluation report. See Annex E for ratings scales. No rating on Project Strategy and no overall project rating is required.

Table. Interim Evaluation Ratings & Achievement Summary Table for ‘Scaling-up Glacial Lake Outburst Flood (GLOF) risk reduction in Northern Pakistan’ (PIMS 5660)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Measure** | **Interim Evaluation 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) |  |

1. **TIMEFRAME**

The total duration of the Interim Evaluation will be *24* working daysover a time period of *6* of weeks. The tentative Interim Evaluation timeframe is as follows:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **ACTIVITY** | **NUMBER OF WORKING DAYS** | **COMPLETION DATE** |
| Document review and preparing Interim Evaluation Inception Report | *2 days* | *By 15 June, 2020* |
| Virtual stakeholder meetings, interviews, | *12 days* | *By 29 June, 2020* |
| Presentation of initial findings | *1 day* | *30 June, 2020* |
| Preparing draft report (due within 1 week of concluding virtual interviews) | *5 days* | *By 8 July, 2020*  *(Comments from UNDP on the draft report by 15 July)* |
| Submission of final Interim Evaluation report plus Audit Trail from feedback on draft report (due within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on the draft) *(note: accommodate time delay in dates for circulation and review of the draft report)* | *4 days (recommended: 3-4 days)* | *By 22 July, 2020* |

1. **MIDTERM REVIEW DELIVERABLES**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **#** | **Deliverable** | **Description** | **Timing** | **Responsibilities** |
| **1** | **Interim Evaluation Inception Report** | Interim Evaluation team clarifies objectives and methods of the evaluation | By 15 June, 2020  ] | Interim Evaluation team submits to the Commissioning Unit and project management |
| **2** | **Presentation** | Initial Findings | 30 June, 2020 | Interim Evaluation Team presents to project management and the Commissioning Unit |
| **3** | **Draft Interim Evaluation Report** | Full report (using guidelines on content outlined in Annex B) with annexes | Within 1 weeks of concluding virtual interviews | Sent to the Commissioning Unit, reviewed by RTA, Project Coordinating Unit, NDA focal point |
| **4** | **Final Interim Evaluation Report\*** | Revised report with audit trail detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final report | Within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft | Sent to the Commissioning Unit |

\*The final Interim Evaluation report must be in English. If applicable, the Commissioning Unit may choose to arrange for a translation of the report into a language more widely shared by national stakeholders.

1. **INTERIM EVALUATION ARRANGEMENTS**

The principal responsibility for managing this Interim Evaluation resides with the Commissioning Unit. The Commissioning Unit for this project’s Interim Evaluation is the Vertical Fund Directorate within the Nature, Climate and Energy team at UNDP HQ.

The Project Team will be responsible for liaising with the Interim Evaluation team to provide all relevant documents, set up stakeholder interviews, etc.

1. **TEAM COMPOSITION**

A team of two independent consultants, will conduct the Interim Evaluation - one team leader (with experience and exposure to projects and evaluations in other regions globally) and one team expert, usually from the country of the project. The consultants 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 project’s related activities.

The selection of consultants will be aimed at maximizing the overall “team” qualities in the following areas: The required qualifications of the team leader are as follows:

* Recent experience with result-based management evaluation methodologies (10%);
* Experience applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios (10%);
* Competence in adaptive management, as applied to climate change adaptation (10%);
* Experience working in South Asia *(5%)*;
* Work experience in relevant technical areas for at least 10 years (15%);
* Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender and climate change adaptation ; experience in gender sensitive evaluation and analysis (10%);
* Excellent communication skills (10%);
* Demonstrable analytical skills (10%);
* Project evaluation/review experiences within United Nations system will be considered an asset (10%);

A Master’s degree in natural resource management, environmental sciences, development studies, international development , or other closely related field. (10%)

The team expert (national consultant) will be recruited under a separate Terms of Reference.

1. **PAYMENT MODALITIES AND SPECIFICATIONS**

20% upon submission and approval by the Commissioning Unit of the final Interim Evaluation Inception Report

50% upon submission and approval by the Commissioning Unit of the draft Interim Evaluation report

30% upon submission and approval by the Commissioning Unit, Regional Technical Advisor and Principal Technical Advisor of the final Interim Evaluation report and submission of completed Audit Trail (approval signatures are required on the Report Clearance form)

1. **EVALUATOR ETHICS**

This evaluation will be conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG ‘Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation’. The Interim Evaluation team 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 Interim Evaluation Team 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 with the express authorization of UNDP and partners.

1. **APPLICATION PROCESS**

The team leader for this Interim Evaluation will be selected from the GPN/ExpRes roster of vetted consultants. The selection process will follow standard UNDP procurement processes.

**ToR ANNEX A: List of Documents to be reviewed by the Interim Evaluation Team**

1. Funding Proposal
2. UNDP Project Document
3. UNDP Environmental and Social Screening results
4. Project Inception Report
5. All Annual Performance Reports (APRs)
6. Progress reports and work plans of the various implementation task teams
7. Audit reports
8. Mission reports
9. All monitoring reports prepared by the project
10. Financial and Administration guidelines used by Project Team

The following documents will also be available:

1. Project operational guidelines, manuals and systems
2. UNDP country/countries programme document(s)
3. Minutes of the Project Board Meetings and other meetings (i.e. Project Appraisal Committee meetings)
4. Project site location maps
5. *additional documents, as needed*

**ToR ANNEX B: Guidelines on Contents for the Interim Evaluation Report**[[7]](#footnote-7)

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **i.** | Basic Report Information *(for opening page or title page)*   * Title of UNDP-supported GCF-financed project * UNDP PIMS# and GCF project ID# * Interim Evaluation time frame and date of report * Region and countries included in the project * Executing Agency/Implementing Partner and other project partners * Interim Evaluation team members * Acknowledgements | | |
| **ii.** | Table of Contents | | |
| **iii.** | Acronyms and Abbreviations | | |
| **1.** | Executive Summary *(3-5 pages)*   * Project Information Table * Project Description (brief) * Project Progress Summary (between 200-500 words) * Interim Evaluation Ratings & Achievement Summary Table * Concise summary of conclusions * Recommendation Summary Table | | |
| **2.** | Introduction *(2-3 pages)*   * Purpose of the Interim Evaluation and objectives * Scope & Methodology: principles of design and execution of the Interim Evaluation, Interim Evaluation approach and data collection methods, limitations * Structure of the Interim Evaluation report | | |
| **3.** | Project Description and Background Context *(3-5 pages)*   * 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 * Project Description and Strategy: objective, outcomes and expected results, description of field sites (if any) * Project Implementation Arrangements: short description of the Project Board, key implementing partner arrangements, etc. * Project timing and milestones * Main stakeholders: summary list | | |
| **4.** | Findings *(12-14 pages)* | | |
| **4.1** | Project Strategy   * Project Design * Results Framework/Logframe | |
| **4.2** | Relevance | |
| **4.3** | Effectiveness and Efficiency | |
| **4.4** | Progress Towards Results   * Progress towards outcomes analysis * Remaining barriers to achieving the project objective | |
| **4.5** | Project Implementation and Adaptive Management   * Management Arrangements * Work planning * Finance and co-finance * Coherence in climate finance delivery with other multilateral entities * Project-level monitoring and evaluation systems * Stakeholder engagement * Reporting * Communications | |
| **4.6** | Sustainability   * Financial risks to sustainability * Socio-economic to sustainability * Institutional framework and governance risks to sustainability * Environmental risks to sustainability | |
| **4.7** | Country Ownership | |
| **4.8** | Innovativeness in results areas | |
| **4.9** | Unexpected results, both positive and negative | |
| **4.10** | Replication and Scalability | |
| **4.11** | Gender Equity | |
| **5.** | Conclusions and Recommendations *(4-6 pages)* | | |
|  | **5.1** | | Conclusions   * Comprehensive and balanced statements (that are evidence-based and connected to the Interim Evaluation’s findings) which highlight the strengths, weaknesses and results of the project |
| **5.2** | | Recommendations   * Corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project * Actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the project * Proposals for future directions underlining main objectives |
| **6.** | Annexes   * Interim Evaluation ToR (excluding ToR annexes) * Interim Evaluation evaluative matrix (evaluation criteria with key questions, indicators, sources of data, and methodology) * Example Questionnaire or Interview Guide used for data collection * Ratings Scales * List of persons interviewed & interview schedule * List of documents reviewed * Co-financing table (if not previously included in the body of the report) * Signed UNEG Code of Conduct form * Signed Interim Evaluation final report clearance form * *Annexed in a separate file:* Audit trail from received comments on draft Interim Evaluation report | | |

**ToR ANNEX C: Interim Evaluation Evaluative Matrix Template**

This Interim Evaluation Evaluative Matrix must be fully completed/amended by the consultant and included in the Inception Report and as an Annex to the Interim Evaluation report.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Evaluative Questions** | **Indicators** | **Sources** | **Methodology** |
| **Project Strategy: To what extent is the project strategy relevant to country priorities, country ownership, and the best route towards expected results?** | | | |
| (include evaluative question(s)) | (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 documents, national policies or strategies, websites, project staff, project partners, data collected throughout the evaluation mission, etc.) | (i.e. document analysis, data analysis, interviews with project staff, interviews with stakeholders, etc.) |
| Is the project log frame and theory of change still relevant and appropriately designed given the project experience to date? | Technical design studies confirm feasibility | project documents, project staff, project partners, data collected | document analysis, data analysis, interviews, |
| Are the project assumptions still valid and have any been missed? | Changes occurred in underlying conditions that affect design assumptions | project documents, project staff, project partners, data collected | document analysis, data analysis, interviews, |
| Are the project indicators and targets realistic? | Stakeholder views of the project design | project documents, project staff, project partners, data collected | document analysis, data analysis, interviews, |
| Is the project promoting stakeholder engagement? | Stakeholder response to expected community voluntary contributions | project documents, project staff, project partners, data collected | document analysis, data analysis, interviews, |
| Is the project in line with national development priorities (SDGs, National Climate Change Policy, Climate Change Act, etc.)? | Flood warning and management measures proven in flood events or tested in exercises | project documents, project staff, project partners, data collected | document analysis, data analysis, interviews, |
| Are broader development and gender/social inclusion aspects addressed in the project design? | Extent of targeting of vulnerable beneficiaries | project documents, project staff, project partners, data collected | document analysis, data analysis, interviews, |
| Does the project address DRR-CCA linkages? | Inter-ministry coordination activities | project documents, project staff, project partners, data collected | document analysis, data analysis, interviews, |
| **Progress Towards Results: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved thus far?** | | | |
| What quantitative and qualitative achievements have occurred in terms of output/outcome targets? | Changes from baseline conditions; water depth/ sediment monitoring data | project documents, monitoring reports, training reports, meeting minutes, project staff, project partners, data collected | document analysis, data analysis, interviews |
| How is progress rated relative to baseline status? | Lake lowering design and construction progress | project documents, monitoring reports, training reports, meeting minutes, project staff, project partners, data collected | document analysis, data analysis, interviews |
| What are the circumstances and issues affecting project achievements and components not on target? | Training participants and assessment data | project documents, monitoring reports, training reports, meeting minutes, project staff, project partners, data collected | document analysis, data analysis, interviews |
| What are the main causes and remedies for delays, appropriate for the operating context in Pakistan? | Extent of flood risk reduction measures adopted to date | project documents, monitoring reports, training reports, meeting minutes, project staff, project partners, data collected | document analysis, data analysis, interviews |
| Is there an enabling environment for project implementation at national and local levels? | Participant satisfaction with quantity and quality of outputs to date | project documents, monitoring reports, training reports, meeting minutes, project staff, project partners, data collected | document analysis, data analysis, interviews |
| What actions are needed, if any, to ensure, accelerate or expand project achievements? | Responses to delays in project schedule | project documents, monitoring reports, training reports, meeting minutes, project staff, project partners, data collected | document analysis, data analysis, interviews |
| How well is the project contributing to national policy and practice on flood risk management (National Flood Protection Plan, National DRM Plan, etc.)? | Evidence of policy uptake of project methods and results | National policies, data collected, project staff, project partners | document analysis, data analysis, interviews |
| **Project Implementation and Adaptive Management: Has the project been implemented efficiently, cost-effectively, and been able to adapt to any changing conditions thus far? To what extent are project-level monitoring and evaluation systems, reporting, and project communications supporting the project’s implementation?** | | | |
| Are the management structure, the distribution of responsibilities, and the coordination mechanisms operating effectively? | Perceived clarity of roles and responsibilities in project implementation | Project staff, project partners, monitoring reports, training reports, data collected | document analysis, data analysis, interviews, |
| How effective are the working relationships and communications between the implementing partners? | Status of MoUs between implementing partners | Project staff, project partners, monitoring reports, | document analysis, interviews |
| Is the Implementing Partner providing sufficient management direction and how could it be improved? | Pro-active actions of management bodies (adaptive management) | Project staff, project partners, monitoring reports, | document analysis, interviews |
| Is UNDP providing effective support and quality assurance and how could it be improved? | Pro-active actions of management bodies (adaptive management) | Project staff, project partners, monitoring reports, | document analysis, interviews |
| Is the Project Board/Project Steering Committee providing effective oversight and guidance and how could it be improved? | Number of meetings and decisions taken by project committees | Project staff, project partners, monitoring reports, | document analysis, interviews |
| Are the project stakeholders and beneficiaries substantially engaged in implementation? | Participant satisfaction with decision making and communication processes | Project staff, project partners, monitoring reports, training reports | document analysis, interviews |
| What constraints have been encountered and how have they been addressed? If not, what needs to be put in place to address them? | Self-assessment by implementing partners | Project documents, project staff, project partners, monitoring reports | document analysis, interviews |
| Does the project have the appropriate financial controls, including reporting and planning, for budgeting and for timely flow of funds? | Efficiency of disbursements and financial management  Annual expenditures in relation to annual budgets | Project staff, project partners, financial reports | document analysis, interviews |
| What is the status of expected and actual co-financing? | Tracking of co-financing contributions (table) | Financial reports | Document analysis |
| How effective are the monitoring and oversight functions and usefulness of the monitoring data? | Use of project indicators in progress reports | Project documents, monitoring reports, project staff, project partners, data collected | Document analysis, interviews, data collected |
| Is the monitoring and reporting based on the project’s indicators? | Perceptions of effectiveness of the M&E systems | Project documents, monitoring reports, project staff, project partners | Document analysis, interviews |
| Are monitoring reports submitted in timely manner? | Reporting quality and completeness | Project documents, monitoring reports, project staff, project partners | Document analysis, interviews |
| Are sufficient resources being allocated to M&E and are they used effectively and efficiently? | Resources committed to M&E and data availability | Project documents, monitoring reports, project staff, project partners, data collected | Document analysis, data analysis, interviews |
| Have implementation issues been fully reported and discussed with the Board? |  | Project documents, monitoring reports, project staff, project partners, Project Board meeting minutes | Document analysis, interviews |
| Does the project have a communication strategy and adequate public outreach | Communication strategy documented  Outreach activities completed and media products disseminated | Communication and KM products, media products, project staff, project partners | Document analysis, interviews |
| Have the critical risks affecting achievements and potential sustainability been sufficiently addressed? | Risks identified in the Pro Doc/ ATLAS Risk Management Module  Risks noted in technical reports and Audit | Project documents, ATLAS risk assessment, project staff, project partners | Document analysis, interviews |
| Have the critical risks affecting achievements and potential sustainability been sufficiently addressed? | Risks identified in the Pro Doc/ ATLAS Risk Management Module  Risks noted in technical reports and Audit | Project documents, monitoring reports, project staff, project partners | Document analysis, interviews |
| **Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, socio-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?** | | | |
| To what extent is the project contributing to capacity development to sustain results? | Sustainability strategies in the project design | Project documents, project staff, project partners | Document analysis, interviews; training and capacity development reports |
| What policy or institutional measures are required to sustain the outputs of the project – O&M funding, , etc? | Changes in policy or regulation to sustain project results | Project documents, national strategies/policies, project staff, project partners | Document analysis, interviews; training and capacity development reports |
| Are there adverse social, environmental or other effects that need consideration? | Socio-economic or political factors observed | Project documents, national strategies/policies, project staff, project partners | Document analysis, interviews; training and capacity development reports |
| Will local stakeholders continue to stay engaged in the flood warning and risk management measures during and after project implementation? Why or why not? | Socio-economic or political factors observed | Project documents, project staff, project partners | Document analysis, interviews; training and capacity development reports |

**ToR ANNEX D: UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluators/Interim Evaluation Consultants[[8]](#footnote-8)**

**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 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.

**Interim Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form**

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

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

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

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

Signed at *\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ (Place)* on *\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ (Date)*

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

**ToR ANNEX E: Interim Evaluation Ratings**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Ratings for Progress Towards Results:** (one rating for each outcome and for the objective) | | |
| 6 | Highly Satisfactory (HS) | The objective/outcome is expected to achieve or exceed all its end-of-project targets, without major shortcomings. The progress towards the objective/outcome can be presented as “good practice”. |
| 5 | Satisfactory (S) | The objective/outcome is expected to achieve most of its end-of-project targets, with only minor shortcomings. |
| 4 | Moderately Satisfactory (MS) | The objective/outcome is expected to achieve most of its end-of-project targets but with significant shortcomings. |
| 3 | Moderately Unsatisfactory (HU) | The objective/outcome is expected to achieve its end-of-project targets with major shortcomings. |
| 2 | Unsatisfactory (U) | The objective/outcome is expected not to achieve most of its end-of-project targets. |
| 1 | Highly Unsatisfactory (HU) | The objective/outcome has failed to achieve its midterm targets, and is not expected to achieve any of its end-of-project targets. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Ratings for Project Implementation & Adaptive Management:** (one overall rating) | | |
| 6 | Highly Satisfactory (HS) | Implementation of all seven components – management arrangements, work planning, finance and co-finance, project-level monitoring and evaluation systems, stakeholder engagement, reporting, and communications – is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management. The project can be presented as “good practice”. |
| 5 | Satisfactory (S) | Implementation of most of the seven components is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management except for only few that are subject to remedial action. |
| 4 | Moderately Satisfactory (MS) | Implementation of some of the seven components is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management, with some components requiring remedial action. |
| 3 | Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU) | Implementation of some of the seven components is not leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive, with most components requiring remedial action. |
| 2 | Unsatisfactory (U) | Implementation of most of the seven components is not leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management. |
| 1 | Highly Unsatisfactory (HU) | Implementation of none of the seven components is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Ratings for Sustainability:** (one overall rating) | | |
| 4 | Likely (L) | Negligible risks to sustainability, with key outcomes on track to be achieved by the project’s closure and expected to continue into the foreseeable future |
| 3 | Moderately Likely (ML) | Moderate risks, but expectations that at least some outcomes will be sustained due to the progress towards results on outcomes at the Midterm Review |
| 2 | Moderately Unlikely (MU) | Significant risk that key outcomes will not carry on after project closure, although some outputs and activities should carry on |
| 1 | Unlikely (U) | Severe risks that project outcomes as well as key outputs will not be sustained |

**ToR ANNEX F: Interim Evaluation Report Clearance Form**

*(to be completed and signed by the Commissioning Unit, RTA and PTA included in the final report)*

**Interim Evaluation Report Reviewed and Cleared By:**

**Commissioning Unit**

Name: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

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

**Regional Technical Advisor (Nature, Climate and Energy)**

Name: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

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

**Principal Technical Advisor, Climate Change Adaptation (Nature, Climate and Energy)**

Name: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

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

**ToR ANNEX G: Audit Trail Template**

*Note:* The following is a template for the Interim Evaluation Team to show how the received comments on the draft Interim Evaluation report have (or have not) been incorporated into the final report. This audit trail should be listed as an annex in the final report but not attached to the report file.

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

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

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

1. For ideas on innovative and participatory Monitoring and Evaluation strategies and techniques, see [UNDP Discussion Paper: Innovations in Monitoring & Evaluating Results](http://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/librarypage/capacity-building/discussion-paper--innovations-in-monitoring---evaluating-results/), 05 Nov 2013. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Populate with data from the Logframe 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. The Report length should not exceed *40* pages in total (not including annexes). [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. <http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/100> [↑](#footnote-ref-8)