

Terms of Reference**Ref: PN/FJI/002/20**

Consultancy Title: Terminal Evaluation (TE) for the Capacity Building for Mainstreaming Multi-lateral Environmental Agreements Objectives into the Inter-Ministerial Structures and Mechanisms of the Fiji Government – Fiji Cross-Cutting Capacity Development Project (PIMS #: 4727)

Project Name: Capacity Building for Mainstreaming Multi-lateral Environmental Agreements (MEA) Objectives into the Inter-Ministerial Structures and Mechanisms of the Fiji Government – Fiji Cross-Cutting Capacity Development Project (PIMS #: 4727)

Duty Station: Home based with mission travel (pending on the current restrictions) to the Ministry of Waterways and Environment in Suva, Fiji

BACKGROUND**Introduction**

In accordance with UNDP and GEF M&E policies and procedures, all full- and medium-sized UNDP-supported GEF-financed projects are required to undergo a Terminal Evaluation (TE) at the end of the project. This Terms of Reference (ToR) sets out the expectations for the TE of the medium-sized project titled Terminal Evaluation (TE) for the “**Capacity Building for Mainstreaming Multi-lateral Environmental Agreements Objectives into the Inter-Ministerial Structures and Mechanisms of the Fiji Government – Fiji Cross-Cutting Capacity Development Project**” (PIMS #: 4727) implemented through the UNDP/Department of Environment, Ministry of Waterways and Environment. The project started on the 26th of March 2015 and was in its 4th year of implementation when it reached its operational closure date on September 2019. The TE process must follow the guidance outlined in the document ‘Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects’ ([E-link](#)).

Project Description

The project was designed with the objective of integrating and institutionalizing inter-ministerial decision-making to ensure MEA implementation. This objective was designed to be achieved through two components:

1. The institutional framework is strengthened and more coordinated, and more able to address global environmental concerns: This first component will focus on assessing and structuring an improved consultative and decision-making process that effectively integrates global environmental objectives into existing national environmental legislation. The project will support the development of capacities of decision-makers to interpret and agree on how best to govern the environment in Fiji that not only meets national priorities, but also global environmental obligations. This component will also include strengthening the process to engage, coordinate and collaborate with non-governmental stakeholders, such as NGOs, civil society, private sector and academia.
2. Global environmental objectives are reconciled and integrated into national legislation, policy, strategies and planning frameworks: This component will focus on reconciling and strengthening the set of legislative instruments - inclusive of key national policies and programmes – that are used to govern environmental management and ensure that these instruments are aligned with Fiji’s MEA obligations. This will help Fiji to improve its compliance with various related MEA, particularly the three Rio Conventions. This outcome will be achieved through a set of three outputs: the revision of the legislation instruments in place to manage the environment; the strengthening of the monitoring of the environment to be fully in line with Rio Convention reporting obligations; and, the identification of sustainable financing mechanisms for environmental protection and conservation. Activities supported by the project in this area will also build and collaborate with existing initiatives undertaken by the government, the non-government sector and also through the support of donors’ activities.

Concerning Fiji’s COVID-19 context, there were 18 cases initially of which the Fiji Government through its quarantine and travel restriction were able to reduce to a zero count. In the beginning of July 2020, there were 2 border quarantine cases, returnees from a medical trip to India. The number then increased to 8 cases. They are all well contained and isolated at the border quarantine facility. Despite the excellent control on the COVID-19 cases, Fiji’s economy has been critically impacted. Basic estimation has it that about 25,000 people have lost their jobs, with the tourism industry hit the hardest. Apart from the damaging blow to the tourism industry, global supply chains have been hampered and small enterprises have also lost significant business. Overall, Fiji’s COVID-19 induced economic picture is bleak with a 5 percent contraction for the 2020-2021 financial year.

Project Summary Table

Project Title:	Capacity Building for Mainstreaming MEA Objectives Into the Inter-Ministerial Structures And Mechanisms of the Fiji Government – Fiji CCCD Project			
GEF Project ID:	5166		<i>at endorsement (Million US\$)</i>	<i>at completion (Million US\$)</i>
UNDP Project IDs:	Atlas Award: 00083221 Atlas Output: 00091812 PIMS # 4727	GEF financing:	0.611	0.254
Country:	Republic of Fiji	IA/EA own:	0.11 cash	0.10
Region:	Asia & Pacific	Government:	0.965 cash 0.10 in kind	TBD @ TE
Focal Area:	Multi-Focal Areas	Other:	Not applicable	Not applicable
FA Objectives, (OP/SP):	CD2 To generate, access and use information and knowledge CD3 To strengthen capacities to develop policy and legislative frameworks	Total co-financing:	1.175	TBD @ TE
Executing Agency:	Department of Environment (DoE) at the Ministry of Waterways and Environment (MoWE)	Total Project Cost:	1.786	TBD @ TE
Other Partners involved:	1. Ministry of Economy; and 2. Ministry of Agriculture	ProDoc Signature (date project began):		26 th March 2015
		(Operational) Closing Date:	Proposed: 25 th March 2018	Actual: 25 th September 2019

Kindly note that TBD @ TE simply means 'To be determined during the terminal evaluation'

Terminal Evaluation Purpose

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

- assess the effectiveness of the project in structuring consultative and decision-making process that effectively integrates global environmental objectives into existing national environmental legislation and;
- assess the project's contribution to reconciling and strengthening the set of legislative instruments that govern environmental management ensuring that the Government of Fiji is aligned to its multi-lateral environmental agreement (MEA) obligations.

The TE report promotes accountability and transparency and assesses the extent of project accomplishments.

Terminal Evaluation Objectives and Scope

The objectives of the evaluation are to

- assess the achievement of project results supported by evidence (i.e. progress of project's outcome targets)
- assess the contribution and alignment of the project to relevant national development plan or environmental policies;
- assess the contribution of the project results towards the relevant outcome and output of the Sub Regional Programme Document (SRPD) & United Nation Pacific Strategy (UNPS/UNDAF)
- assess any cross cutting and gender issues
- examination on the use of funds and value for money and;
- draw lessons that can both improve the sustainability of benefits from this project, and aid in the overall enhancement of UNDP programming.

Terminal Evaluation Approach and Method

The evaluator is expected to frame the evaluation effort using the criteria of **relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and impact**, as defined and explained in the UNDP Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-supported, GEF-financed Projects.

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

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

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

Engagement of stakeholders is vital to a successful TE. Stakeholder involvement should include interviews with stakeholders who have project responsibilities, including but not limited to (list); executing agencies, senior officials and task team/component leaders, key experts and consultants in the subject area, Project Board, project beneficiaries, academia, local government and CSOs, etc. Additionally, the TE team is expected to conduct field missions to (locations), including the following project sites (list). (Adjust text if a mission will not take place. Describe the virtual tools that will be used. See additional text suggestions below.)

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

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

An overall approach and method for conducting project terminal evaluations of UNDP supported GEF financed projects has developed over time. The evaluator is expected to frame the evaluation effort using the criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and impact, as defined and explained in the UNDP Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-supported, GEF-financed Projects

1. Interviews using standard questionnaire

A set of questions covering each of these criteria have been drafted and are included with this TOR ([Annex C](#)) The evaluator is expected to amend, complete and submit this matrix as part of an evaluation inception report, and shall include it as an annex to the final report. In cases of remote engagement due to COVID-19, the questionnaire will be shared in advance with interviewees.

The evaluation must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The evaluator is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with government counterparts, in particular the GEF operational focal point, UNDP Country Office, project team, UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based in the region and key stakeholders.

2 In country field missions or Remote engagement and validation

As of 11 March 2020, the World Health Organization (WHO) declared COVID-19 a global pandemic as the new coronavirus rapidly spread to all regions of the world. Travel restrictions to Fiji has been since 20th of March. Therefore, the evaluator should develop a methodology that takes into account the remote conduction of the TE. This should include the use of remote interview methods and extended desk reviews, data analysis, surveys and evaluation questionnaires. This should be detailed in the TE Inception Report and agreed with the Commissioning Unit.

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

The evaluator is expected to remotely engage with the implementing stakeholders within the Government of Fiji, these are:

- i) the Department of Environment, Ministry of Waterways and Environment (the main implementing partner), 19 McGregor Road, Suva;
- ii) Ministry of Economy, Ro Lalabalavu House, Victoria Parade, Suva; and
- iii) Ministry of Agriculture, Hugh Robinson Complex, Grantham Road, Suva

Interviews will be held with the following organizations listed above with their focal points/liaison individuals at a minimum.

Equally, qualified and independent national consultants can be hired to undertake the TE and interviews in country as long as it is safe to do so.

3. Remote engagement with stakeholders

The evaluator will consult with interviewee or key stakeholders on which virtual tool the interviewee is more comfortable with (zoom, skype, WhatsApp, telephone etc.). Interviews by telephone, rather than VOIP, may be more acceptable and reliable in some circumstances. Consider developing interviews with smaller groups, 1-2 people to ensure all voices are heard. Consider overcoming time differences and support in country interviews.

The above remote engagements and considerations should be agreed and clearly outlined in the terminal evaluation inception report.

4. Literature/Desktop review

The evaluator will review all relevant sources of information, such as the project document, project reports – including Annual APR, project budget revisions, quarterly progress reports, GEF focal area tracking tools, project files, national strategic and legal documents, and any other materials that the evaluator considers useful for this evidence-based assessment. A list of documents that the project team will provide to the evaluator for review is included in [Annex B](#) of this Terms of Reference. Also, to explore a wider range of documentation for extended desk reviews including internal operational data (BTOR etc.), evaluations reports from UN agencies and donors, as well as information from non-traditional sources, as an example social media.

5. Analysis and reporting

Data collated will be analysed and presented based on the evaluation criteria and ratings. Analysis will be provided in matrices, tables to be best present findings and key recommendations. Reporting to be conducted in RBM (results-based management) approach.

6. Presentation of final draft to country office and stakeholders.

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

Detailed Scope of the Terminal Evaluation

An assessment of project performance will be carried out, based against expectations set out in the Project Logical Framework/Results Framework (see [Annex A](#)), which provides performance and impact indicators for project implementation along with their corresponding means of verification. The evaluation will at a minimum covering the criteria of: **relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact**. Ratings must be provided on the following performance criteria. The completed table must be included in the evaluation executive summary. The obligatory rating scales are included in [Annex D](#).

Evaluation Ratings:

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

The Findings section of the TE report will cover the topics listed below.

A full outline of the TE report's content is provided in ToR Annex C.

The asterisk "*" indicates criteria for which a rating is required.

Findings

i. Project Design/Formulation

- National priorities and country driven-ness
- Theory of Change
- Gender equality and women's empowerment
- Social and Environmental Safeguards
- 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
- Management arrangements

ii. 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 (*)
- Implementing Agency (UNDP) (*) and Executing Agency (*), overall project oversight/implementation and execution (*)
- Risk Management, including Social and Environmental Standards

iii. Project Results

- Assess the achievement of outcomes against indicators by reporting on the level of progress for each objective and outcome indicator at the time of the TE and noting final achievements
- Relevance (*), Effectiveness (*), Efficiency (*) and overall project outcome (*)
- Sustainability: financial (*), socio-political (*), institutional framework and governance (*), environmental (*), overall likelihood of sustainability (*)
- Country ownership
- Gender equality and women's empowerment
- Cross-cutting issues (poverty alleviation, improved governance, climate change mitigation and adaptation, disaster prevention and recovery, human rights, capacity development, South-South cooperation, knowledge management, volunteerism, etc., as relevant)
- GEF Additionality
- Catalytic Role / Replication Effect
- Progress to impact

iv. Main Findings, Conclusions, Recommendations and Lessons Learned

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

- The section on conclusions will be written in light of the findings. Conclusions should be comprehensive and balanced statements that are well substantiated by evidence and logically connected to the TE findings. They should highlight the strengths, weaknesses and results of the project, respond to key evaluation questions and provide insights into the identification of and/or solutions to important problems or issues pertinent to project beneficiaries, UNDP and the GEF, including issues in relation to gender equality and women's empowerment.
- Recommendations should provide concrete, practical, feasible and targeted recommendations directed to the intended users of the evaluation about what actions to take and decisions to make. The recommendations should be specifically supported by the evidence and linked to the findings and conclusions around key questions addressed by the evaluation.
- The TE report should also include lessons that can be taken from the evaluation, including best 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 GEF and UNDP interventions. When possible, the TE team should include examples of good practices in project design and implementation.
- It is important for the conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned of the TE report to include results related to gender equality and empowerment of women.

The TE report will include an Evaluation Ratings Table, as shown in the ToR Annex.

Project finance / co-finance

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

Co-financing (type/source)	UNDP own financing (mill. US\$)		Government (mill. US\$)		Partner Agency (mill. US\$)		Total (mill. US\$)	
	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual
Grants	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Loans/ Concessions	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
• In-kind support	0.03	TBD @ TE	0.5	TBD @ TE	NA	NA	0.53	TBD @ TE
• Other	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Totals	0.03	TBD @ TE	0.5	TBD @ TE	NA	NA	1.03	TBD @ TE

Kindly note that:

- NA simply means 'Not Applicable'
- TBD @ TE simply means 'To be determined during the terminal evaluation'

Mainstreaming

UNDP supported GEF financed projects are key components in UNDP country programming, as well as regional and global programmes. The evaluation will assess the extent to which the project was successfully mainstreamed with other UNDP priorities, including poverty alleviation, improved governance, the prevention and recovery from natural disasters, and gender.

Impact

The evaluators will assess the extent to which the project is achieving impacts or progressing towards the achievement of impacts. Key findings that should be brought out in the evaluations include whether the project has demonstrated: a) verifiable improvements in ecological status, b) verifiable reductions in stress on ecological systems, and/or c) demonstrated progress towards these impact achievements.¹

¹ A useful tool for gauging progress to impact is the Review of Outcomes to Impacts (ROtI) method developed by the GEF Evaluation Office: [ROtI Handbook 2009](#)

Conclusions, recommendations & lessons

The evaluation report must include a chapter providing a set of **conclusions, recommendations and lessons**.

Implementation arrangements

The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation resides with the UNDP CO in Fiji. The UNDP Fiji CO will contract the evaluator and ensure the timely payments as per the satisfactory deliverables submitted by her/him. The Project Team will be responsible for liaising with the evaluator to set up stakeholder interviews, arrange field visits, coordinate with the Government etc.

Terminal Evaluation Timeframe

The total duration of the evaluation will be 25 days according to the following plan:

TE Activity	Timing	Completion Date
Preparation	2 days	18 August 2020
Inception Report	3 days	21 August 2020
Evaluation Mission (Remote Engagement)	10 days	From 26 August to 8 September 2020
Draft Evaluation Report	5 days	15 September 2020
Final Report	5 days	30 September 2020

Evaluation Output and Deliverables

The evaluation team is expected to deliver the following:

Deliverable	Content	Timing	Responsibilities
Inception Report	Evaluator provides clarifications on timing and method	No later than 2 weeks before the evaluation mission. Approximate due date: 21 August 2020	Evaluator submits to UNDP CO
Presentation	Initial Findings	End of evaluation mission. Approximate due date: 10 September 2020	To project management, UNDP CO
Draft Final Report	Full report, (per annexed template) with annexes	One (1) week after the evaluation mission. Approximate due date: 15 September 2020	Sent to CO, reviewed by RTA, PCU, GEF OFPs
Final Report*	Revised report	Within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft. Approximate due date: 30 September 2020	Sent to CO for uploading to UNDP ERC.

*When submitting the final evaluation report, the evaluator is required also to provide an 'audit trail', detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final evaluation report.

Team Composition

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

Evaluator Ethics

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

Resources Provided

- All costs associated with the delivery of this work based on work plans submitted detailing all activities to achieve delivery and timeline.
- Ground transportation to facilitate in-country meetings and consultation will be facilitated only if included in the financial proposal.

- Travel cost to the countries will be facilitated only if included in the financial proposal.
- Visit to stakeholders will be supported by the Project Management Unit (PMU).

Supervision/Reporting

The consultant will be under the direct supervision and will report to the UNDP Fiji Multi-Country Office (MCO).

Duration of the Contract: Up to 25 working days starting on Friday, 17th August and ending on 30th October 2020

Consultancy Proposal (CV & Financial proposal Template) should be uploaded on UNDP Jobshop website (https://jobs.undp.org/cj_view_jobs.cfm?cur_rgn_id_c=RAS) no later than, 31st July 2020 (Fiji Time) clearly stating the title of consultancy applied for. Any proposals received after this date/time will not be accepted. Any request for clarification must be sent in writing, or by standard electronic communication to procurement.fj@undp.org. UNDP will respond in writing or by standard electronic mail and will send written copies of the response, including an explanation of the query without identifying the source of inquiry, to all consultants. Incomplete, late and joint proposals will not be considered and only offers for which there is further interest will be contacted. Failure to submit your application as stated as per the application submission guide (Procurement Notice) on the above link will be considered incomplete and therefore application will not be considered.

NOTE:

Proposals must be sent through UNDP job shop web page. Candidates need to upload their CV and financial proposal -using UNDP template-. This should be scanned as 1 document

If the selected/successful Candidate is over 65 years of age and required to travel outside his home country; He/She will be required provide a full medical report at their expense prior to issuance to contract. Contract will only be issued when Proposed candidate is deemed medically fit to undertake the assignment.

Requirement for Qualifications & ExperienceEducation:

- A Master's degree in M&E, environment, development studies, or other closely related field.

Work Experiences:

- Minimum 7 years of relevant professional experience in the area of Development, Environment and Sustainable Development with required technical knowledge in the targeted GEF focal areas: Multi-Focal Areas and Cross Cutting Capacity Development for MEAs
- Minimum of 5 years of project evaluation and/or implementation experience in the result-based management framework and adaptive management, with proven accomplishments in undertaking evaluation for international organizations, preferably with UNDP-GEF
- Knowledge of UNDP and GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policies
- Excellent English Writing and reporting skills (present at least 3 references of documents prepared).
- Good communication skills and positive interrelation.

Proposal Requirements

Technical Proposal

- CV
- Statement of how applicant meets requirement
- Names/Contacts of 3 referees

Financial Proposal

- Applicants must send a financial proposal based on a Lump Sum Amount. The total amount quoted shall be all-inclusive and include all costs components required to perform the deliverables identified in the TOR, including professional fee for 25 working days, travel costs, living allowance (if travel restrictions are eased then the days of mission to Fiji; the 26th August – 8th September, 2020 should be included) and any other applicable cost to be incurred by the Individual Consultant in completing the assignment. The contract price will be fixed output-based price regardless of extension of the herein specified duration. Payments will be done upon completion of the deliverables/outputs.
- In general, UNDP shall not accept travel costs exceeding those of an economy class ticket. Should the Individual Consultant wish to travel on a higher class he/she should do so using their own resources.

Travel:

- Mission travel pending on the easing of the current international travel restrictions, will be required, which is a maximum of 12 travel days (inclusive of travel). Ten (10) of these are working days spent with the Environment and Conservation Division.
- The [Advanced and Basic Security in the Field II courses](#) must be successfully completed prior to commencement of travel;
- Individual Consultants are responsible for ensuring they have vaccinations/inoculations when travelling to certain countries, as designated by the [UN Medical Director](#);
- Consultants are responsible for obtaining any visas and security clearances needed in connection with travel with the necessary support from UNDP;
- The Consultant is required to comply with the UN security directives set forth under <https://dss.un.org/dssweb/>;
- The consultant will be responsible for making his/her own mission travel arrangements in line with [UNDP travel policies](#);
- All related travel expenses will be supported by UNDP funds and will be reimbursed as per UNDP rules and regulations for consultants. Costs for mission airfares, terminal expenses, insurance, and living allowances should not be included in financial proposal;
- Financial proposal to be submitted separate from Technical proposal.

Payment Schedule (if required):

Payments will be done upon completion of the deliverables in the table below:

%	Milestone
10%	At contract signing
40%	Following submission and approval of the 1 st draft terminal evaluation report
50%	Following submission and approval (UNDP-CO and UNDP RTA) of the final terminal evaluation report

Evaluation

- Cumulative analysis
- The proposals will be evaluated using the cumulative analysis method with a split 70% technical and 30% financial scoring. The proposal with the highest cumulative scoring will be awarded the contract. Applications will be evaluated technically, and points are attributed based on how well the proposal meets the requirements of the Terms of Reference using the guidelines detailed in the table below:
- When using this weighted scoring method, the award of the contract may be made to the individual consultant whose offer has been evaluated and determined as:
 - a) responsive/compliant/acceptable, and
 - b) having received the highest score out of a pre-determined set of weighted technical and financial criteria specific to the solicitation.
- * Technical Criteria weighting; 70%
- * Financial Criteria weighting; 30%
- Only candidates obtaining a minimum of 49 points in the Technical Evaluation would be considered for the Financial Evaluation. Interviews may be conducted as part of technical assessment for shortlisted proposals.

Criteria	Percentage
Qualification	
A Master's degree in M&E, environment, development studies, or other closely related field	15%
Experience	
Minimum 7 years of relevant professional experience in the area of Development, Environment and Sustainable Development with required technical knowledge in the targeted GEF focal areas: Multi-Focal Areas and Cross Cutting Capacity Development for MEAs	20%
Minimum of 5 years of project evaluation and/or implementation experience in the result-based management framework and adaptive management, with proven accomplishments in undertaking evaluation for international organizations, preferably with UNDP-GEF	15%
Knowledge of UNDP and GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policies.	10%
Excellent English Writing and reporting skills (present at least 3 references of documents prepared).	5%

Good communication skills and positive interrelation.	5%
Technical Criteria	70%
**If necessary interviews shall also be conducted as part of the technical evaluation to ascertain best value for money.	
Financial Criteria – Lowest Price	30%
Total	100%

Proposal Submission: Offerors must send the following documents.
Shortlisted candidates may be contacted for an interview.

Offerors must send the following documents.

- i) **CV including names/contacts of at least 3 referees.**
- ii) **A cover letter indicating why the candidate considers himself/herself suitable for the required consultancy**
Completed template for confirmation of Interest and Submission of Financial Proposal.
Individuals applying for this consultancy will be reviewed based on their own individual capacity. The successful individual may sign an Individual Contract with UNDP or request his/her employer to sign a Reimbursable Loan Agreement (RLA) on their behalf by indicating this in the Offerors letter to Confirming Interest and Availability

For any clarification regarding this assignment please write to procurement.fj@undp.org

Women candidates are encouraged to apply.

**The Fiji Office covers Fiji, Kiribati, Marshall Islands, Micronesia, Nauru, Palau, Solomon Islands, Tonga, Tuvalu and Vanuatu*

Annexes to the TE ToR

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

TOR prepared by:



Name: Rusiate Ratuniata

Designation: RSD Analyst

Approved by:



Name: Kevin Petrini

Designation: DRR a.i. and RSD Team Leader, UNDP Pacific Office, Fiji.

Cleared by:



Name: Merewalesi Laveti

Designation: Monitoring and Evaluation Analyst, UNDP Pacific office, Fiji

Annex A: Project Logical Framework

Objectives and Outcomes	Indicator	Baseline	Targets End of Project	Source of Verification	Risks and Assumptions	Status to Date (Ratings will be based on the scales of ANNEX D)	Justifications of Ratings
Objective: To integrate and institutionalize inter-ministerial decision-making for MEA implementation.	1. Alignment of institutional framework with the objectives and obligations of the Rio Conventions.	Fiji is committed to meet its MEAs obligations; however, some critical gaps in its institutional framework exist; including an uneven capacity within key ministries	Conventions obligations are well integrated into institutional framework	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NCSA reports for baseline information • Project progress • Evaluation reports • National reports 	To be determined at inception	To be determined on site when IC is on TE mission in-country	To be determined on site when IC is on TE mission in-country
	2. Alignment of legislative and policy frameworks with the objectives and obligations of the Rio Conventions.	Similar to its institutional framework, some critical gaps in its legal and policy frameworks exist	MEAs obligations are well integrated into legislative and policy frameworks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NCSA reports for baseline information • Project progress • Evaluation reports • National, regional and local plans, strategies and programs 	To be determined at inception	To be determined on site when IC is on TE mission in-country	To be determined on site when IC is on TE mission in-country
	3. Capacity development monitoring scorecard rating	Capacity for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Engagement: 6 of 9 • Generate, access and use information and knowledge: 7 of 15 • Policy and legislation development: 6 of 9 • Management and implementation: 3 of 6 	Capacity for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Engagement: 7 of 9 • Generate, access and use information and knowledge: 10 of 15 • Policy and legislation development: 8 of 9 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mid-term review and final evaluation reports • Annual PIRs • Capacity assessment reports 	To be determined at inception	To be determined on site when IC is on TE mission in-country	To be determined on site when IC is on TE mission in-country

Objectives and Outcomes	Indicator	Baseline	Targets End of Project	Source of Verification	Risks and Assumptions	Status to Date (Ratings will be based on the scales of ANNEX D)	Justifications of Ratings
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Monitor and evaluate: 2 of 6 (total score: 24/45) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Management and implementation : 5 of 6 Monitor and evaluate: 4 of 6 (total targeted score: 34/45) 				
COMPONENT 1.0 - INTEGRATE INTER-MINISTERIAL DECISION-MAKING PROCESS FOR THE GLOBAL ENVIRONMENT							
<p>Outcome 1: The institutional framework is strengthened and more coordinated, and more able to address global environmental concerns.</p> <p>Output 1.1 Institutions with clear mandates and responsibilities to implement MEAs</p> <p>Output 1.2 An operational inter-sectorial coordination mechanism for</p>	<p>4. Strategies implemented that address prioritized institutional gaps and overlaps in respective government MEA convention focal points.</p>	<p>Relevant policies (what are the policies?), national strategies (what are the strategies?), institutional set-ups (#? type?), endorsed by Govt from 2008 to 2013</p>	<p>Re-structure of institutions to fully comply to obligations under MEAs</p>	<p>Reports from MoE, MoAFF, iTaukei Affairs, MoFAIC, MoPUWT</p>	<p>Risks:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Political: changes in government management systems and priorities due to change in political status, and unavailability of focal points to make decisions. Operational: unavailability of dedicated project personnel to follow through with activities <p>Assumption: Government commitment to align institutions to fully comply to obligations under MEAs</p>	<p>To be determined on site when IC is on TE mission in-country</p>	<p>To be determined on site when IC is on TE mission in-country</p>

Objectives and Outcomes	Indicator	Baseline	Targets End of Project	Source of Verification	Risks and Assumptions	Status to Date (Ratings will be based on the scales of ANNEX D)	Justifications of Ratings
<p>implementing MEAs.</p> <p>Output 1.3 Improved contribution from NGO sector, Academia, CBO/Faith based organizations and private sector to implement MEAs.</p>	5. Number of relevant government institutions represented in training that effectively execute these strategies	Insert number of relevant institutions trained in since 2010	All relevant institutions trained, improved quality of national reports produced (e.g. national communications, 5th National Report, etc.)	Training reports, National Reports submitted to all three conventions	<p>Risks:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Political - institutional reforms due to political change, change in priorities due to change in leadership. • Operational - Staff turnover, limited resources to commit to training <p>Assumption: An effective training programme, institutions include awareness and training under respective annual corporate plans</p>	To be determined on site when IC is on TE mission in-country	To be determined on site when IC is on TE mission in-country
	6. Percentage of Environmental Management Units and conservation officers supported in the reporting and monitoring of MEAs	Insert percentage of relevant EMUs and conservation officers trained in since 2010	100% of relevant EMUs and conservation officers trained	Training reports, EMU progress reports to Department of Environment, and DOE annual national reports to NEC	<p>Risk:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unwillingness to participate due to lack of understanding <p>Assumption: Coordinated response to reporting system</p>	To be determined on site when IC is on TE mission in-country	To be determined on site when IC is on TE mission in-country
	7. An operational inter-sectorial coordination mechanism) that build on existing	Three existing mechanisms are operational, however there is very little <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • inter-sectorial coordination. 	Coordinating MEAs including a broader stakeholder involvement	Policy paper approved by NEC and Cabinet, regular updates to NEC and Cabinet	<p>Risks:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Political - delays due to ministerial reforms. • Operational - Irregular frequency 	To be determined on site when IC is on TE mission in-country	To be determined on site when IC is on TE mission in-country

Objectives and Outcomes	Indicator	Baseline	Targets End of Project	Source of Verification	Risks and Assumptions	Status to Date (Ratings will be based on the scales of ANNEX D)	Justifications of Ratings
	instruments such as NEC, NBSAP committee, NCCCC, NLCSC, etc.				<p>of meetings for relevant bodies, unclear approval mechanism for an inter-sectorial coordination body, unwillingness to participate in the inter-sectorial coordination body.</p> <p><i>Assumption:</i> Supporting mechanism is in place</p>		
	8. Policy decisions supported through improved MEA awareness.	Limited awareness of policy-makers	Adoption of policy-papers at various levels (ministries, Cabinet, NEC)	NEC policy and Cabinet papers	<p><i>Risk:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lack of participation from decision-makers, limited understanding of MEAs <p><i>Assumption:</i> Good participation to an effective awareness programme</p>	To be determined on site when IC is on TE mission in-country	To be determined on site when IC is on TE mission in-country
	9. Endorsed annual work plans for MEAs (from government, NGOs, Academia, CBOs/Faith Organizations and private	Validated MOUs/NBSAP/draft NAP/CC Policy	Renewed commitments under annual work plans with specific budgets	MOUs, annual work plans, minutes of inter-sectorial committee meetings	<p><i>Risk:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Limited participation of ministries, unwillingness to declare all externally funded activities <p><i>Assumption:</i> Willingness to coordinate and</p>	To be determined on site when IC is on TE mission in-country	To be determined on site when IC is on TE mission in-country

Objectives and Outcomes	Indicator	Baseline	Targets End of Project	Source of Verification	Risks and Assumptions	Status to Date (Ratings will be based on the scales of ANNEX D)	Justifications of Ratings
	sector) to support government's MEA obligations.				collaborate for effective planning		
COMPONENT 2.0 - STRENGTHEN FIJI'S ENVIRONMENTAL LEGISLATIVE FRAMEWORK							
OUTCOME 2: Global environmental objectives are reconciled and integrated into national legislation, policy, strategies and planning frameworks. Output 2.1 Revised legislation and policies addressing MEAs obligations. Output 2.2 An effective system to monitor implementation of MEAs. Output 2.3	10. An analytical legal framework for the three MEAs emerging issues	Currently, 56 legislations exist that need to be improved to incorporate MEAs and emerging issues	Legal framework / instructions developed for the three MEAs and emerging issues	National reports for the three conventions, policy priorities of the government under national strategic planning and each ministry annual corporate plans	<i>Risk:</i> • Changes in the legal system, lack of support from legislators, lack of national capacity to review and draft legal framework/instructions. <i>Assumption:</i> Clear processes and mechanisms to support deliverables	To be determined on site when IC is on TE mission in-country	To be determined on site when IC is on TE mission in-country
	11. Number of institutions that are actively involved in the formulation of environmental legal framework.	3 (Department of Environment, the Fiji Environment Law Association, and the Solicitor-General's Office)	5 institutions (2 additional - Climate Change Division of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs; and the Land Use Division of the Ministry of Agriculture)	Legal documents from the Solicitor-General's Office, NEC discussion papers and decisions.	<i>Risk:</i> • Lack of national capacity to support the process <i>Assumption:</i> Political will	To be determined on site when IC is on TE mission in-country	To be determined on site when IC is on TE mission in-country
	12. Number of individual MEA monitoring	Each institution has its own database/data sets, which need to be	Indicator-based monitoring systems in all institutions,	Reports from MLGUDHE/MPI/MOFA/MoPU	<i>Risk:</i> • Unwillingness to participate, lack of capacity	To be determined on site when IC is on TE mission in-country	To be determined on site when IC is on TE mission in-country

Objectives and Outcomes	Indicator	Baseline	Targets End of Project	Source of Verification	Risks and Assumptions	Status to Date (Ratings will be based on the scales of ANNEX D)	Justifications of Ratings
Guidelines for Sustainable financing mechanisms developed	systems upgraded and operational (with strong guidelines, data collection methods, data norms and standards, database structures, and data sharing), and a centralized data bank.	upgraded and fed into a centralized data bank.	and a central data bank established.	WT and relevant non-Govt actors	<i>Assumption:</i> Effective monitoring systems		
	13. Comparative analysis of research on Payment for Ecosystem Services (PES) based on national and international practices	Environmental Financing Mechanisms currently in place/ practice and other relevant research materials	Formalized MEAs sustainable financing mechanisms	Guideline for sustainable financing mechanism, Cabinet and NEC endorsements	<i>Risk:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lack of sustainability and ownership, and ineffective accountability and management systems. <i>Assumption:</i> Commitment to sustain sustainable financing mechanisms	To be determined on site when IC is on TE mission in-country	To be determined on site when IC is on TE mission in-country

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

Checklist of Documents Required for the Terminal Evaluation of the Fiji CCCD Project

Particulars	Year	Document	Source	Check
Project Approval	2015	Letter of Approval from the GEF CEO	UNDP	
		Signed Project Document	UNDP	
		Delegation of Authority	UNDP	
Project Start-Up	2015 - 2016	Staff contract for the Project Coordinator	DoE, MoWE	
		Staff contract for the Project Finance Personnel	DoE, MoWE	
		Staff contract for the Project's UNFCCC Liaison Personnel	DoE, MoWE	
		Staff contract for the Project's UNCCD Liaison Personnel	DoE, MoWE	
Project Planning and Implementation	2015	Inception Workshop Report	Fiji CCCD PMU	
		Annual Workplan and Budget	Fiji CCCD PMU	
		1 st Quarter Workplan	Fiji CCCD PMU	
		2 nd Quarter Workplan	Fiji CCCD PMU	
		3 rd Quarter Workplan	Fiji CCCD PMU	
		4 th Quarter Workplan	Fiji CCCD PMU	
	2016	Annual Workplan and Budget	Fiji CCCD PMU	
		1 st Quarter Workplan	Fiji CCCD PMU	
		2 nd Quarter Workplan	Fiji CCCD PMU	
		3 rd Quarter Workplan	Fiji CCCD PMU	
		4 th Quarter Workplan	Fiji CCCD PMU	
		2015 – 2016 Annual Project Report	UNDP	
	2017	Annual Workplan and Budget	Fiji CCCD PMU	
		1 st Quarter Workplan	Fiji CCCD PMU	
		2 nd Quarter Workplan	Fiji CCCD PMU	
		3 rd Quarter Workplan	Fiji CCCD PMU	
		4 th Quarter Workplan	Fiji CCCD PMU	
		2016 – 2017 Annual Project Report	UNDP	
	2018	Annual Workplan and Budget	Fiji CCCD PMU	
		1 st Quarter Workplan	Fiji CCCD PMU	
		2 nd Quarter Workplan	Fiji CCCD PMU	
		3 rd Quarter Workplan	Fiji CCCD PMU	
		4 th Quarter Workplan	Fiji CCCD PMU	
		2017 – 2018 Annual Project Report	UNDP	
	2019	Annual Workplan and Budget	Fiji CCCD PMU	
		1 st Quarter Workplan	Fiji CCCD PMU	
		2 nd Quarter Workplan	Fiji CCCD PMU	
		3 rd Quarter Workplan	Fiji CCCD PMU	
		4 th Quarter Workplan	Fiji CCCD PMU	
		2018 – 2019 Annual Project Report	UNDP	
Project Monitoring	2015	2 nd Quarter Progress Report/FACE form	Fiji CCCD PMU	
		3 rd Quarter Progress Report/FACE form	Fiji CCCD PMU	
		4 th Quarter Progress Report/FACE form	Fiji CCCD PMU	

Particulars	Year	Document	Source	Check
		Signed 2015 CDR	UNDP	
	2016	1 st Quarter Progress Report/FACE form	Fiji CCCD PMU	
		2 nd Quarter Progress Report/FACE form	Fiji CCCD PMU	
		3 rd Quarter Progress Report/FACE form	Fiji CCCD PMU	
		4 th Quarter Progress Report/FACE form	Fiji CCCD PMU	
		Signed 2016 CDR	UNDP	
	2017	1 st Quarter Progress Report/FACE form	Fiji CCCD PMU	
		2 nd Quarter Progress Report/FACE form	Fiji CCCD PMU	
		3 rd Quarter Progress Report/FACE form	Fiji CCCD PMU	
		4 th Quarter Progress Report/FACE form	Fiji CCCD PMU	
		Signed 2017 CDR	UNDP	
	2018	1 st Quarter Progress Report/FACE form	Fiji CCCD PMU	
		2 nd Quarter Progress Report/FACE form	Fiji CCCD PMU	
		3 rd Quarter Progress Report/FACE form	Fiji CCCD PMU	
		4 th Quarter Progress Report/FACE form	Fiji CCCD PMU	
		Signed 2018 CDR	UNDP	
	2019	1 st Quarter Progress Report/FACE form	Fiji CCCD PMU	
		2 nd Quarter Progress Report/FACE form	Fiji CCCD PMU	
		3 rd Quarter Progress Report/FACE form	Fiji CCCD PMU	
		4 th Quarter Progress Report/FACE form	Fiji CCCD PMU	
		Signed 2019 CDR	UNDP	
Project Oversight	2015	Project Board Meeting Agenda	Fiji CCCD PMU	
		Project Board Meeting Minutes	Fiji CCCD PMU	
	2016	Project Board Meeting Agenda	Fiji CCCD PMU	
		Project Board Meeting Minutes	Fiji CCCD PMU	
	2017	Project Board Meeting Agenda	Fiji CCCD PMU	
		Project Board Meeting Minutes	Fiji CCCD PMU	
		Request and Approval Documentations for No-Cost Project Extension	UNDP	
	2018	Project Board Meeting Agenda	Fiji CCCD PMU	
		Project Board Meeting Minutes	Fiji CCCD PMU	
	2019	Project Board Meeting Agenda	Fiji CCCD PMU	
		Project Board Meeting Minutes	Fiji CCCD PMU	
	2016-2019	Back to Office Reports	UNDP	
	2016-2019	Social Media	UNDP/Kiribati CCCD PMU	
Asset Management	Y1 – Y4	Project Assets List/Register	Fiji CCCD PMU	

Annex C

Content of the TE report

- i. Title page
 - Title of UNDP-supported GEF-financed project
 - UNDP PIMS ID and GEF ID
 - TE timeframe and date of final TE report
 - Region and countries included in the project
 - GEF Focal Area/Strategic Program
 - Executing Agency, Implementing partner and other project partners
 - TE Team members
- 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
- GEF Additionality
- Catalytic Role / Replication Effect
- Progress to Impact

² See ToR Annex F for rating scales.

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 GEF/LDCF/SCCF Core Indicators or Tracking Tools, as applicable

Annex D: Evaluation Questions

Evaluative Criteria Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
Relevance: How does the project relate to the main objectives of the GEF focal area, and to the environment and development priorities at the local, regional and national levels?			
• Is the project relevant to Fiji's environmental policies and Fiji national development plan?	•	•	•
• Is the project relevant to United Nation Pacific Strategy for the country?	•	•	•
• Is the project relevant to UNDP Pacific's Sub Regional Programme Document?	•	•	•
• Is the project addressing the needs of the targeted beneficiaries?	•	•	•
• Is the project specifically addressing gender issues and any other	•	•	•

• How is the project complementary to the actions of other stakeholders active in the city/country/region?	•	•	•
• Is the project internally consistent in its design?	•	•	•
Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved?			
• Are the activities and outputs of the project consistent with the project's goals and objectives?	•	•	•
• To what extent has the delivered project outputs contributed to the achievement of its expected outcomes?	•	•	•
• Were the project's expected targets against the outcomes achieved?	•	•	•
• How was risk managed during the project?	▪	•	•
• What are the lessons learnt from the project in terms of effectiveness?	▪	•	•
• Which changes could have been made in project's design to improve its effectiveness?	▪	•	•
• How could the project have been more effective in achieving results?	▪	•	•
Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards?			
• Was adaptive management needed and used to ensure efficient use of resources?	•	•	•
• Were the accounting and financial systems in place adequate?	•	•	•
• Were progress reports produced in a timely manner and in compliance to project reporting requirements?	•	•	•
• Was project implementation as cost-effective as originally envisaged?	•	•	•
• Was the expected co-finance leveraged as initially expected?	•	•	•
• Were the reported lessons learnt shared among project stakeholders for subsequent improvement of project implementation?	•	•	•
• Which partnerships and networking were facilitated among stakeholders? Be specific to mention any legal agreements or memorandum of understanding signed to ascertain partnership	•	•	•
• Was local capacity and know-how adequately mobilized?	•	•	•
Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, social-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?			

• Were sustainability issues adequately addressed at project design?	•	•	•
• Is there evidence that some partners and stakeholders will continue their activities beyond project termination? And if such partners/stakeholders were identified, which ones were they?	•	•	•
• Which are the main risks to the continuation of policies and actions initiated by the projects? (financial, institutional, socioeconomic, environmental)	•	•	•
• Are project actions and results being scaled up or replicated elsewhere in the region?	•	•	•
• Did the project adequately address institutional and financial sustainability issues?	•	•	•
• How is the beneficiary planning to mainstream the lessons learnt to ensure quality reporting to the global platforms?	•	•	•
Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward, reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status?			
• How likely is the project to achieve its long-term goal?	•	•	•
• Are stakeholders more aware about the project's contribution towards informing the related policies? Which ones?	•	•	•
• What is the impact of the project for the citizens of Fiji in terms of awareness about the related environmental policies?	•	•	•
• What are the level of influence and visibility of the project in Nauru in promoting sustainable development?	•	•	•

Annex E: UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluators

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

Evaluators/Consultants:

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

Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form

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

Name of Evaluator: _____

Name of Consultancy Organization (where relevant): _____

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

Signed at _____ (Place) on _____ (Date)

Signature: _____



Empowered Lives.
Resilient Nations.



Empowered Lives.
Resilient Nations.

ToR Annex F: TE Rating Scales & Evaluation Ratings Table

TE Rating Scales	
Ratings for Outcomes, Effectiveness, Efficiency, M&E, Implementation/Oversight, Execution, Relevance	Sustainability ratings:
6 = Highly Satisfactory (HS): exceeds expectations and/or no shortcomings 5 = Satisfactory (S): meets expectations and/or no or minor shortcomings 4 = Moderately Satisfactory (MS): more or less meets expectations and/or some shortcomings 3 = Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): somewhat below expectations and/or significant shortcomings 2 = Unsatisfactory (U): substantially below expectations and/or major shortcomings 1 = Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): severe shortcomings Unable to Assess (U/A): available information does not allow an assessment	4 = Likely (L): negligible risks to sustainability 3 = Moderately Likely (ML): moderate risks to sustainability 2 = Moderately Unlikely (MU): significant risks to sustainability 1 = Unlikely (U): severe risks to sustainability Unable to Assess (U/A): Unable to assess the expected incidence and magnitude of risks to sustainability

Evaluation Ratings Table	
Monitoring & Evaluation (M&E)	Rating ³
M&E design at entry	

³ Outcomes, Effectiveness, Efficiency, M&E, I&E Execution, Relevance are rated on a 6-point rating scale: 6 = Highly Satisfactory (HS), 5 = Satisfactory (S), 4 = Moderately Satisfactory (MS), 3 = Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU), 2 = Unsatisfactory (U), 1 = Highly Unsatisfactory (HU). Sustainability is rated on a 4-point scale: 4 = Likely (L), 3 = Moderately Likely (ML), 2 = Moderately Unlikely (MU), 1 = Unlikely (U)

Annex G: TE Report Clearance Form

Terminal Evaluation Report for (Project Title & UNDP PIMS ID) Reviewed and Cleared By:

Commissioning Unit (M&E Focal Point)

Name: _____

Signature: _____ Date: _____

Regional Technical Advisor (Nature, Climate and Energy)

Name: _____

Signature: _____ Date: _____

Annex H: TE Audit Trail

The following is a template for the TE Team to show how the received comments on the draft TE report have (or have not) been incorporated into the final TE report. This Audit Trail should be listed as an annex in the final TE report but not attached to the report file.

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

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

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