**TERMS OF REFERENCE**

**Terminal Evaluation of the project “Assisting non- LDC developing countries with country-driven processes to advance National Adaptation Plans (NAPs)”**

# Section I: PROJECT BACKGROUND AND OVERVIEW

## Project General Information

Table 1. Project summary

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **GEF Project ID:** | 5683  | **GEF Agency Project ID:** | UNEP: 01247UNDP: 5347 |
| **Implementing Agencies:** | UNEP and UNDP | **Executing Agency:** | UN environment Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific (ROAP) |
| **Sub-programme:** | Climate Change | **Other Executing Partner(s):** | UNDP, IFAD, FAO, WHO, GIZ, UNITAR, bilateral/multilateral organizations, national planning ministries, line ministries. |
| **UN Environment approval date:** | July 2016 | **UNDP approval date:** | March 2015 |
| **GEF approval date:** | March 2015 | **Project type:** | Full Size Project (FSP) |
| **GEF Operational Programme #:** |  | **Focal Area(s):** | Climate Change (Adaptation) |
| **Trust Fund** | Special climate change Fund (SCCF) | **Executing Agency/ Implementing Partner:** | UN Environment /ROAP, UNDP |
| ***Expected* start date:** | January 2015 | **Actual start date:** | February 2016 |
| ***Planned* completion date:** | December 2017 | **Actual completion date:** | Q2. 2019 (operational completion) |
| ***Planned* project budget at approval:** | USD 46,300,000 | **Actual total expenditures reported as of June 2019:** | USD 2,169,667 |
| **Cost to the SCCF:** | USD 4,500,000 | **SCCF expenditures reported as of June 2019:** | USD 2,250,000  |
| ***Expected* Full-Size Project co-financing:** | USD 41,800,000 | **Secured Full-Size Project co-financing as of June 2019:** | ? |
| **Project Preparation Grant:** | USD 150,000 | **Project Preparation Grant - co-financing:** | N/A |
| **First disbursement:** | UNDP: April 2014UNEP: February 2016 | **Date of financial closure:** | N/A |
| **No. of revisions:** | 1 | **Date of last revision:** | August 2017 |
| **No. of Project Board Meetings:** | 4 | **Date of last Project Board meeting:** | February 2019 |
| **Mid-term Review/ Evaluation *(planned date):*** | Q1. 2016 | **Mid-term Review/ Evaluation (actual date):** | Q2. 2018 |
| **Terminal Evaluation *(planned date):***  | September 2019 | **Terminal Evaluation (actual date):**  | Q3. 2019 |
| **Coverage:** | Non-LDC Developing Countries | **Coverage - Region(s):** | Global  |

## Project rationale

1. Climate change and associated climate variability pose a serious challenge to poverty reduction efforts and sustainable development in developing countries. Increasing temperatures, changing rainfall patterns, rising sea levels and an increasing frequency and intensity of extreme weather events adversely affect *inter alia* ecosystem functioning, water resources, food security, infrastructure and human health. In developing countries, these impacts are projected to slow down economic growth, and the capacity of these countries to manage the impacts of climate change will continue to be overwhelmed, likely reversing years of progress and achievements made on Millennium Development Goals (MDGs).
2. In non-Least Developed Countries (non-LDC)[[1]](#footnote-1), national and sectoral planning processes - a central means by which public policy responses are formulated, budgeted and implemented, have not systematically incorporated climate change risks and opportunities. As a result, non-LDC developing countries need to consider medium- to long-term planning for low emissions and climate resilient development within their national priorities. The primary problem, however, is that these countries have not had adequate institutional structures, knowledge and the technical capacity required for a functional, cross-sectoral and iterative process that sufficiently incorporates climate change into national planning.
3. At the 16th session of the Conference of the Parties (COP-16) of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) held in Cancun, Mexico (2010), the National Adaptation Plan process was established under the Cancun Adaptation Framework (CAF) to enable developing countries to formulate and implement National Adaptation Plans (NAPs). Under the UNFCCC, all signatories to the Convention are required to produce periodic National Communications (NCs) which report national greenhouse gas inventories and describe national activities to implement the Convention. This is one of several processes that have created both the political and financial space for countries to make systematic efforts to mainstream climate change into national development planning processes.
4. The main barriers that have been known to constrain developing countries from initiating and sustaining their NAP processes are summarised below:
	* Planning ministries in developing countries seldom have access to well-organized and robust scientific data or evidence-based technical guidelines on managing climate change risks;
	* The mandate for addressing climate change often lies within ministries of environment/natural resources rather than ministries of development planning;
	* Planning officials are often not sensitised on the complex nature of climate change and its associated effects, consequently planning ministries have not been adequately capacitated to include climate change risks within development planning processes;
	* There is often a disconnect between political cycles, planning cycles and the long-term nature of climate change concerns;
	* Climate-resilient development has not always been considered a national priority, and budgetary support to advance adaptation planning and implementation is also not prioritised; and
	* There have been relatively few collaborative partnerships that exist between developing country governments and global/regional institutions, networks and platforms, to address adaptation needs.
5. The funding required for climate change adaptation is also quite considerable and overcoming financial barriers to support adaptation is therefore of paramount interest. In developing countries, it has been estimated that over the period 2010 - 2050 the necessary adaptation investments could average US$ 30-100 Billion per year. This funding gap is especially pronounced in non-LDCs due to their limited options to access financial support for adaptation initiatives.
6. At the UNFCCC COP-18 held in Doha, Qatar (2012), Parties requested the Global Environmental Facility (GEF) to consider how to support non-LDC developing countries advance their NAP processes through the Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF). Through the GEF Global Support Programme (GSP), SCCF resources have been set up to finance a support mechanism that is focused on three main pillars, namely: (i) institutional support; (ii) technical capacity building; and (iii) knowledge brokerage in developing countries.
7. **Institutional Coordination Mechanisms**: The multi-faceted and complex nature of climate change requires its integration across multiple sectors and levels of government in a coordinated manner. While most non-LDCs developed their adaptation plans during National Communications and Technology Needs Assessments, most of these plans were limited to a single ministry domain, and climate change was not fully integrated across all economic sectors’ planning. Climate change was therefore being considered in a cursory manner during planning as well as budgeting processes.
8. **Technical Capacity for Adaptation Planning:** Planning ministries in developing countries often lack well-organized, user-friendly and robust scientific data, and evidence-based technical guidelines on managing climate change risks. In some cases, they have not commanded the requisite national ownership when developing climate policies and strategies. As a result, appropriate measures for medium- to long-term climate change adaptation are seldom included in national, sectoral and local policies and plans.
9. **Access to Information and Knowledge:** For countries that share borders, regional cooperation is extremely important as climate change does not respect political boundaries. However, there have been limited partnerships, communication and outreach strategies between developing country governments and regional/global institutions, networks and platforms for addressing adaptation needs in a collaborative manner. Efforts to share knowledge, best practices and lessons learned through South-south exchange have accordingly been limited.
10. This project (“*Assisting non- LDC developing countries with country-driven processes to advance National Adaptation Plans*”) focuses on developing countries, which are not least developed countries (LDCs) under the list of Non-Annex 1 parties to the UNFCCC. This includes middle income countries which are not only challenged by the impacts of climate change but are themselves contributors to global greenhouse gas emissions. Through a Global Support Programme, SCCF resources have been used to establish a support mechanism for assisting developing countries to adapt to the impacts of climate change by providing these countries with an enhanced capacity to plan, finance, and implement adaptation interventions through integration of climate change into medium- to long-term development frameworks.
11. The support provided by UNDP and UNEP includes experience and technical expertise that exists within the two organisations, in assisting countries to pursue climate-resilient development and making sure that adaptation measures are environmentally sound and sustainable. UNDP and UNEP recognize that the SCCF-funded programme will operate in a time where, regardless of this programme, countries are likely to escalate and improve their ongoing efforts towards low-emission and climate resilient development plans, policies and programmes at national and sub-national levels. The project therefore builds upon current initiatives and platforms that were established for National Communications and Technology Needs Assessments, to enhance the coordination of climate change efforts in a manner that is country-driven, iterative and participatory.
12. This evaluation will assess project performance against the approved results framework in the Project Document, for the period leading to operational closure (Q3. 2019), and based on the evaluation criteria detailed in section B.4 of this TOR.

## Project objectives and components

1. The overall objective of adaptation is to reduce vulnerability to the impacts of climate change and associated climate variability by minimizing, reducing or avoiding risks. The problem is that many non-LDC developing countries have not had the requisite coordination mechanisms, knowledge and technical capacity for initiating a functional, cross-sectoral and iterative process for mainstreaming climate change into national development planning.
2. The **objective** of the project is **to** **strengthen institutional and technical capacities for iterative development of comprehensive NAPs in non-LDCs.** The SCCF-financed project supports targeted countries to advance their NAP processes by strengthening institutional and technical capacities as well as increasing access to the sharing of knowledge and lessons learned on adaptation planning through improved North-South and South-South collaboration. The project intended to address this objective using the three approaches (components) described below:

Component 1. Institutional support to develop national-level roadmaps (Overseen by UNDP)

1. This component was overseen by UNDP and focused on in-country support. Under this component, assistance was provided to countries based on demand, taking into consideration the country priorities representing different stages of the NAP process. This tailored approach would address the concern expressed by countries about a one-size-fits-all approach to traditional technical assistance programmes. The project sought to support countries through: (i) taking stock of information and processes of relevance to the NAP and identifying gaps: (ii) providing technical training to address those gaps; and (iii) providing support towards developing country-specific NAP roadmaps. The lessons learned from delivering one-on-one support would then feed into the training package to be developed under Component 2, and further disseminated under Component 3 in order to ensure that lessons learned from NAP preparation and implementation, including from baseline projects, would be captured.

Component 2. Training on relevant tools, methods and guidelines to support effective climate planning (overseen by UNEP)

1. The baseline was that planning ministries within non-LDCs seldom had access to evidence-based technical tools, methods, guidelines and supplementary material (referred to as ‘toolkits’) for integration of adaptation priorities into medium- to long-term development planning, despite the existence of a number of toolkits applicable to the NAP process. Under Component 2, support was provided to non-LDCs to access an improved package of toolkits to cover topics such as: (i) development and application of climate scenarios; (ii) vulnerability and risk assessments; (iii) cost-benefit analyses of adaptation interventions; (iv) Climate Public Expenditure and Institutional Reviews (CPEIRs); and (v) financial costing of adaptation interventions. This would enhance the capacity of non-LDCs to undertake the NAP process through improving the availability and awareness of the toolkits, as well as increasing national stakeholders’ technical skills to apply the toolkit to inform medium- to long-term adaptation planning.

Component 3. Knowledge dissemination to enhance international and regional cooperation (overseen jointly by UNDP and UNEP)

1. While various platforms exist for sharing information they are not necessarily tailored enough so that information a) is specific or applicable to the country’s own NAP process: b) demonstrates the value of NAP to reduce vulnerability; or c) showcases how challenges such as sustainability and access to finance can be addressed. Under this Outcome, the SCCF-financed project focused on making existing knowledge widely available. The project would build upon existing communities of practice to promote South-South and North-South cooperation. Sustained access to knowledge and lessons learned generated/collated by the project is expected to help to maintain the technical and institutional capacities required by countries to undertake the NAP process. Responding to the concern related to access to finance, this component would also pilot a public-private platform in a small number of countries, to facilitate private sector investment in adaptation. Best practices and lessons learned were to be disseminated to inform potential replication in other countries.
2. Table 2 below presents a summary of the results framework of this project:

Table 2. Results framework (abridged version)

| **Component** | **Programmed Outputs** | **Expected Outcomes** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Component 1:** Institutional support to develop national-level roadmaps **(Overseen by UNDP).** | **Output 1.1** Information and processes that are of relevance to the NAP process in the country are taken stock and key gaps to integrate climate change into medium to long-term planning processes are identified.**Output 1.2** Institutional coordination and financial arrangements are strengthened/established to support NAP process**Output 1.3** NAP roadmaps are developed to advance the NAP process, including elements for monitoring the progress of their implementation | **Outcome 1:** Non-LDC developing countries are capacitated to advance medium to long-term adaptation planning processes in the context of their national development strategies and budgets. |
| **Component 2:** Training on relevant tools and methods to support effective climate planning **(Overseen by UNEP).** | **Output 2.1** Tools, methods and guidelines to advance the NAP process are developed and/or adapted for non-LDCs in partnership with other agencies and organisations.**Output 2.2** National technicians trained through sub-regional or thematic workshops in the use of tools and methods to advance the NAP process including budgeting for medium- to long-term adaptation.**Output 2.3** Web-based training materials developed on the application of tools, methods and guidelines as non-LDCs commence their respective NAP processes. | **Outcome 2:** Technical capacity to support key steps of the National Adaptation Plan process is developed and relevant tools and methods are accessible to all non- LDC developing countries. |
| **Component 3:** Knowledge Dissemination to Enhance International and Regional Cooperation **(Overseen by UNEP and UNDP).** | **Output 3.1** Systems established/further developed for information and knowledge on advancing NAP processes to mainstream adaptation into medium-to long term development planning (Overseen by UNEP).**Output 3.2** South-South and North-South transfer of technical and process-oriented information on experiences and lessons relevant to medium to long-term national, sectoral and local plans and planning and budgeting processes are captured, synthesized and made available to all non-LDC developing countries (Overseen by UNDP).  | **Outcome 3:** Lessonsand knowledge sharing through South-South and North-South cooperation to enhance international and regional cooperation to formulate and advance NAP process. |

## Executing Arrangements

1. At a global level, the project was overseen by both UNDP and UNEP as GEF **Implementing Agencies** (IAs). However, there were two distinct project documents that outlined what each agency would be responsible for within the framework of a common logical framework. Close collaboration between UNDP and UNEP ensured linkages to other related projects, which were either under development or commencing activities during the implementation of this SCCF-financed project.
2. Outcome 1 and Outcome 3/Output 3.2 were implemented following UNDP’s Direct Implementation Modality (DIM)[[2]](#footnote-2) and the UNDP Bangkok Regional Hub (BRH) functioned as the responsible party. The UNDP-led project components were overseen by the UNDP-GEF Task Manager. A **Lead Technical Specialist** from the UNDP global adaptation team was responsible for overseeing the overall UNDP NAP portfolio.
3. Outcome 2 and Outcome 3/Output 3.1 were implemented by UNEP under the responsibility of the Policy Division. The UNEP-led project components were overseen by a UNEP GEF Task Manager whereas the day-to-day execution of the project was led by a **Technical Specialist** based in UN Environment Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific (ROAP). Teamwork with the global UNDP adaptation team who were executing the project in Bangkok was envisaged through this arrangement.
4. UNDP-GEF provided financial and technical oversight services for the UNDP-implemented outcomes and outputs of the project. UNDP was expected to ensure that project monitoring and evaluation ran according to the agreed schedule, and in line with UNDP and GEF requirements. Similarly, UNEP was expected to provide technical oversight services for the UNEP-implemented outcomes and outputs of the project, including management of its financial resources and tracking of indicators.
5. A **Project Board** was established as the strategic decision-making body of the project, and was comprised of consisting of representatives from UNDP (co-chair), UN Environment (co-chair) and the GEF Secretariat. This board was expected to provide overall guidance and direction to the project, and also be responsible for making decisions on a consensus basis when high-level strategic guidance was required, including the approval of major revisions in project strategy or implementation approach. The board would review progress towards project implementation at regular intervals, or at the request of the Lead Technical Specialist. The board was also required to approve annual work plans prepared by the Lead Technical Specialist, with the assistance of the Project Management Unit.
6. The **Technical Advisory Group** was established to provide technical guidance to project activities, including review of the annual work plan with recommendations, for endorsement by the Project Board. The Technical Advisory Group was expected to comprise of representatives from the Adaptation Committee, the UNFCCC Secretariat and development partners engaged in activities to support the NAP process in countries (e.g. UNITAR, GIZ, FAO, IFAD, WHO, etc). These partners would assume responsibility for the delivery of project Outputs based on agreed Terms of Reference.
7. A **Technical Support Unit was** set up to provide technical support in the delivery of the project’s objective and outcomes. The unit comprised of: Lead Technical Specialist (UNDP), Technical Specialists (UNEP), and a part-time Portfolio Analyst (UNDP). Additional technical expertise, communication and logistical support was contracted on a consultancy basis.
8. **National partners** included relevant planning ministries (e.g. Finance and Planning/Development), as well as key line ministries (e.g. Agriculture, Water, Public Works, Energy, Environment, Health, Women’s Affairs and Forestry).
9. Project monitoring was to be conducted in accordance with established UNDP, UNEP and GEF procedures, and undertaken by the project team under the oversight of the UNDP-GEF unit based in Bangkok and UNEP Division for Programme Implementation (DEPI). The Annual Project Review/Project Implementation Reports (APR/PIR) would combine UNDP, UNEP and GEF reporting requirements and was to be completed by the project following a prescribed report format. The UNEP Evaluation Office in Nairobi is responsible for conducting the terminal evaluation. Figure 1 below illustrates the project’s operational structure.

Figure 1: Project operational structure
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## Project Cost and Financing

1. This is a Full-Size Project (FSP) with funding from the GEF Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF). The SCCF complements the Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF) – a fund established by GEF to support the world’s most vulnerable countries in their efforts to adapt to the effects of climate change. Unlike the LDCF, the SCCF is open to all vulnerable developing countries, and it funds a wider range of activities related to climate change, although Adaptation is the top priority. LDCF/SCCF funds provide financing only for **additional costs** (i.e. new activities/changes to planned activities that are necessary to adapt to climate change) as opposed to *incremental costs* of a project.
2. SCCF resources were used to establish a Global Support Programme (GSP) to promote medium- to long-term planning for climate change adaptation in non-LDC developing countries. This project received direct funding from the SCCF totaling **USD US$ 4,500,000** in total – US$2,250,000 for administration by UNEP and US$2,250,000 for administration by UNDP. Table 4 below shows the breakdown of the project’s cost across the expected outcomes (based on the data in the Project Document of March 2015).

Table 3. Project estimated budget by Outcome

| **SCCF funding** | **UNDP** | **UNEP** | **Total** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Component 1: Institutional support to develop national-level roadmaps (Overseen by UNDP)Outcome 1: Non-LDC developing countries are capacitated to advance medium to long-term adaptation planning processes in the context of their national development strategies and budgets | 1,388,889 |  | 1,388,889 |
| Component 2: Training on relevant tools and methods to support effective climate planning (Overseen UNEP).Outcome 2: Technical capacity to support key steps of the National Adaptation Plan process is developed and relevant tools and methods are accessible to all non- LDC developing countries. |  | 1,856,992 | 1,896,992 |
| Component 3: Knowledge Dissemination to Enhance International and Regional Cooperation (Overseen by UNEP and UNDP).Outcome 3: Lessons and knowledge sharing through South-South and North-South cooperation to enhance international and regional cooperation to formulate and advance NAP process. | 674,444 | 186,342 | 880,786 |
| Project management costs | 186,667 | 146,666 | 333,333 |
| M&E |  | 60,000 |  |
| **Total (US$)** | **2,250,000** | **2,250,000** | **4,500,000** |

1. In addition, in-kind contribution estimated at **US$ 41,800,000** was to be provided through various grants (see Table 4), bringing the overall project budget to **US$ 46,300,000** for a planned duration of 36 months.

Table 4. Project co-financing initiatives

| **Co-financing Initiative** | **Type of Co-financing** | **Amount ($)** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| UNDP – Low-Emission Capacity-Building (LECB) Programme  | Grant | 15,000,000 |
| UNDP – Supporting developing countries to integrate the agricultural sectors into National Adaptation Plans (NAPs) | Grant | 8,000,000 |
| UNDP – Japan-Caribbean Climate Change Partnership | Grant  | 15,000,000 |
| UNITAR – One UN Climate Change Learning Partnership (UN CC-Learn) | Grant | 3,000,000 |
| UNEP – Global Adaptation Network, Asia-Pacific Adaptation Network, REGATTA, WARN-CC | Grant | 800,000 |
| **Total (US$)** |  | **41,800,000** |

## Implementation Issues

1. There were no significant implementation issues identified in the Progress Implementation Report (PIR) or during the pre-evaluation briefing with the project management at UNEP and UNDP. The performance assessment of most of the criteria in the in the latest Progress Implementation Report (PIR) are rated “Satisfactory”. The Mid-Term Review Report (July 2018) also gave the impression that the project was on track to achieving its set targets, with no major red flags noted. One of the risks identified in the UNEP GEF PIR Fiscal Year 2018 however, refers to sub-optimal co-financing actualized by the project partners, as compared to the initial co-finance commitments made at the project’s inception. The evaluation will help to determine the extent to which this funding shortfall might have affected effectiveness in project implementation.

# Section II. OBJECTIVE AND SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION

## Key Evaluation principles

1. Evaluation findings and judgements should be based on **sound evidence and analysis**, clearly documented in the evaluation report. Information will be triangulated (i.e. verified from different sources) as far as possible, and when verification is not possible, the single source will be mentioned (whilst anonymity is still protected). Analysis leading to evaluative judgements should always be clearly spelled out.
2. **The “Why?” Question.** As this is a terminal evaluation and a follow-up project is likely [or similar interventions are envisaged for the future], particular attention should be given to learning from the experience. Therefore, the “*Why?*” question should be at the front of the consultants’ minds all through the evaluation exercise and is supported by the use of a theory of change approach. This means that the consultants need to go beyond the assessment of “*what*” the project performance was, and make a serious effort to provide a deeper understanding of “*why*” the performance was as it was. This should provide the basis for the lessons that can be drawn from the project.
3. **Baselines and counterfactuals**. In attempting to attribute any outcomes and impacts to the project intervention, the evaluators should consider the difference between *what has happened with, and what would have happened without, the project*. This implies that there should be consideration of the baseline conditions, trends and counterfactuals in relation to the intended project outcomes and impacts. It also means that there should be plausible evidence to attribute such outcomes and impacts to the actions of the project. Sometimes, adequate information on baseline conditions, trends or counterfactuals is lacking. In such cases this should be clearly highlighted by the evaluators, along with any simplifying assumptions that were taken to enable the evaluator to make informed judgements about project performance.
4. **Communicating evaluation results.** A key aim of the evaluation is to encourage reflection and learning by UN Environment staff and key project stakeholders. The consultant should consider how reflection and learning can be promoted, both through the evaluation process and in the communication of evaluation findings and key lessons. Clear and concise writing is required on all evaluation deliverables. Draft and final versions of the main evaluation report will be shared with key stakeholders by the Evaluation Manager. There may, however, be several intended audiences, each with different interests and needs regarding the report. The Evaluation Manager will plan with the consultants which audiences to target and the easiest and clearest way to communicate the key evaluation findings and lessons to them. This may include some or all of the following; a webinar, conference calls with relevant stakeholders, the preparation of an evaluation brief or interactive presentation.

## Objective of the Evaluation

1. Although the project has been jointly implemented by UNEP and UNDP, the Evaluation Office of UNEP shall take the lead in overseeing the evaluation process, while maintaining ongoing consultations with the UNDP counterpart through a collaborative approach.
2. In line with the UN Environment Evaluation Policy[[3]](#footnote-3), the Terminal Evaluation (TE) is undertaken at completion of the project to assess project performance (in terms of relevance, effectiveness and efficiency), and determine outcomes and impacts (actual and potential) stemming from the project, including their sustainability.
3. The evaluation has two primary purposes: (i) to provide evidence of results to meet accountability requirements, and (ii) to promote operational improvement, learning and knowledge sharing through results and lessons learned among: UN Environment, UNDP, GEF and the main project partners (Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO), World Health Organization (WHO), International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD), German Corporation for International Cooperation (GIZ), United Nations Institute for Training and Research (UNITAR), United Nations Office for Disaster Risk Reduction (UNISDR), Global Water Partnership (GWP), UN Habitat, Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environment Programme (SPREP), Global Adaptation Network (GAN), West Asia Regional Network on Climate Change (WARN-CC), Asia Pacific Adaptation Network (APAN), Regional Gateway for Technology Transfer and Climate Change Action (REGATTA), and UNFCCC national focal points. Therefore, the evaluation will identify lessons of operational relevance for future project formulation and implementation.
4. Evaluations for LDCF/SCCF projects should also incorporate the results-based management (RBM) framework that has specifically been developed for monitoring and evaluating adaptation projects i.e. use of the GEF-devised Adaptation Monitoring and Assessment Tool (AMAT) for LDCF/SCCF adaptation activities.

## Key Strategic Questions

1. In addition to the evaluation criteria outlined in Section 10 below, the evaluation will address the **strategic questions** listed below. These are questions of interest to UNEP and UNDP, to which the project is believed to be able to make a substantive contribution:
	1. From the perspective of the project beneficiaries, what were the most significant gains achieved from having the project jointly implemented by UNEP and UNDP?
	2. Access to finance to facilitate moving from adaptation planning to implementation is a major concern raised by most non-LDCs. To what extent has the project succeeded in leveraging (domestic and/or external) funding sources to support the countries in sustaining project Outcomes post closure?
	3. Another key challenge related to adaptation initiatives is the monitoring framework necessary for informing an iterative planning and implementation process. To what degree of success has the project put in place methods that can assist non-LDCs with monitoring, reporting, and verifying impacts of adaptation interventions?
	4. At COP-17 Parties agreed that adaptation planning should follow a gender-sensitive, participatory approach, taking into consideration vulnerable groups, communities and ecosystems. To what extent did the project succeed in mainstreaming Gender, Environmental and Social Safeguards considerations into the NAP process during implementation?

## Evaluation Criteria

1. All evaluation criteria will be rated on a six-point scale. Sections A-I below, outline the scope of the criteria and a link to a table for recording the ratings is provided in Annex 1). A weightings table will be provided in excel format (link provided in Annex 1) to support the determination of an overall project rating. The set of evaluation criteria are grouped in **nine categories**: (A) Strategic Relevance; (B) Quality of Project Design; (C) Nature of External Context; (D) Effectiveness, which comprises assessments of the delivery of outputs, achievement of outcomes and likelihood of impact; (E) Financial Management; (F) Efficiency; (G) Monitoring and Reporting; (H) Sustainability; and (I) Factors Affecting Project Performance. Evaluation of LDCF/SCCF require, at a minimum, the following criteria: Relevance, Effectiveness, Efficiency, Results (direct project outputs, short- to medium-term outcomes, progress toward longer term impacts, replication, and local effects) and Sustainability; these are all duly captured in the criteria/sub-criteria outlined in this section.

### Strategic Relevance

1. The evaluation will assess, in line with the OECD/DAC definition of relevance, *‘the extent to which the activity is suited to the priorities and policies of the target group, recipient and donor’.* The evaluation will include an assessment of the project’s relevance in relation to the mandates of UNEP and UNDP, and its alignment with these agencies' policies and strategies at the time of project approval. Under strategic relevance an assessment of the complementarity of the project with other interventions addressing the needs of the same target groups will be made. This criterion comprises four elements:

*Alignment to the UNEP Medium Term Strategy[[4]](#footnote-4) (MTS) and UNDP Strategic Plan[[5]](#footnote-5)*

1. The evaluation should assess the project’s alignment with the UNEP MTS and UNDP Strategic Plan for the period under which the project was approved and include reflections on the scale and scope of any contributions made to the planned results reflected in the relevant strategic priorities and programmes of work.

*Relevance to Regional, Sub-regional and National Environmental Priorities*

1. The evaluation will assess the extent to which the intervention is suited/responding to the stated environmental concerns and needs of the countries, sub-regions or regions where it is being implemented.

*Complementarity with Existing Interventions*

1. An assessment will be made of how well the project, either at design stage or during the project mobilization, took account of ongoing and planned initiatives that address similar needs of the same target group. The evaluation will consider if the project made efforts to ensure their own intervention was complementary to other interventions, optimized any synergies, and avoided duplication of efforts. Linkages with other interventions should be described, and instances where UNEP and UNDP comparative advantage has been particularly well applied should be highlighted.

*Alignment with the UNFCCC COP Priorities*

1. The Evaluation will assess the extent to which the project was aligned to the evolving UNFCCC COP decisions throughout the implementation of its activities.

*Factors affecting this criterion may include:*

* Stakeholders’ participation and cooperation
* Responsiveness to human rights and gender equity
* Country ownership and driven-ness

### Quality of Project Design

1. The quality of project design is assessed using a template during the evaluation inception phase, ratings are attributed to identified criteria and an overall Project Design Quality rating is established. In the Main Evaluation Report a summary of the project’s strengths and weaknesses at design stage is included, while the complete Project Design Quality template is annexed in the Inception Report.

*Factors affecting this criterion may include (at the design stage):*

* Stakeholders participation and cooperation
* Responsiveness to human rights and gender equity

### Nature of External Context

1. At evaluation inception stage a rating is established for the project’s external operating context (considering the prevalence of conflict, natural disasters and political upheaval). Where a project has been rated as facing either an Unfavourable or Highly Unfavourable external operating context, and/or a negative external event has occurred during project implementation, the ratings for Effectiveness, Efficiency and/or Sustainability may be increased at the discretion of the Evaluation Consultant and Evaluation Manager together. A justification for such an increase must be given.

### Effectiveness

#### Delivery of Outputs

1. The evaluation will assess the project’s success in achieving milestones and producing programmed outputs (availability of products and services, gains in knowledge/abilities, among intended beneficiaries which result from the completion of activities) as per the project design document (ProDoc). Any formal modifications/revisions made during project implementation will be considered part of the project design. Where the project outputs are inappropriately or inaccurately stated in the ProDoc, reformulations may be necessary in the reconstruction of the Theory of Change (TOC). In such cases a table should be provided to show the comparison between the original and the reformulation of the outputs, for transparency. The delivery of outputs will be assessed in terms of both quantity and quality, and the assessment will consider their ownership by, and usefulness to, intended beneficiaries and the timeliness of their delivery. The evaluation will briefly explain the reasons behind the success or shortcomings of the project in delivering its programmed outputs and meeting expected quality standards.

*Factors affecting this criterion may include:*

* Preparation and readiness
* Quality of project management and supervision[[6]](#footnote-6)

#### Achievement of Direct Outcomes

1. The achievement of direct outcomes (the use/uptake/adoption/application of an output by intended beneficiaries, observed as changes in institutions or behaviour, attitude or condition) is assessed as performance against the direct outcomes as defined in the reconstructed[[7]](#footnote-7) Theory of Change. These are the first-level outcomes expected to be achieved as an immediate result of project outputs. As in (a), above, a table can be used where substantive amendments to the formulation of direct outcomes is necessary. The evaluation should report evidence of attribution between the intervention and the direct outcomes. In cases of normative work or where several actors are collaborating to achieve common outcomes, evidence of the nature and magnitude of UNEP/UNDP ‘substantive contribution’ should be included and/or ‘credible association’ established between project efforts and the direct outcomes realised.

*Factors affecting this criterion may include:*

* Quality of project management and supervision
* Stakeholders’ participation and co-operation
* Responsiveness to human rights and gender equity
* Communication and public awareness

#### Likelihood of Impact

1. Based on the articulation of longer-term effects in the reconstructed TOC *(i.e. from direct outcomes, via intermediate states, to impact),* the evaluation will assess the likelihood of the intended, positive impacts becoming a reality. Project objectives or goals should be incorporated in the TOC, possibly as intermediate states or long-term impacts. The UNEP Evaluation Office’s approach to the use of TOC in project evaluations is outlined in a guidance note available on the Evaluation Office website, (<https://www.unenvironment.org/about-un-environment/evaluation/our-evaluation-approach/theory-change>) and is supported by an excel-based flow chart, ‘Likelihood of Impact Assessment Decision Tree’. Essentially the approach follows a ‘likelihood tree’ from direct outcomes to impacts, taking account of whether the assumptions and drivers identified in the reconstructed TOC have held.
2. Whereas the GEF M&E Policy emphasizes a project’s or program’s global environmental benefits, the LDCF/SCCF requires analysis of a project’s adaptation benefits. With regard to Impact, the evaluation will focus on the project’s contributions to increasing adaptive capacities and reducing vulnerabilities to climate change effects among the participating countries.
3. Any unintended positive effects should be identified and their causal linkages to the intended impact described. The evaluation will also consider the likelihood that the intervention may have led, or contributed, to unintended negative effects. Some of these potential negative effects may have been identified in the project design as risks or as part of the analysis of Environmental, Social and Economic Safeguards.
4. The evaluation will consider the extent to which the project has played a catalytic role or has promoted scaling up and/or replication[[8]](#footnote-8) as part of its Theory of Change, and the factors that are likely to contribute to longer term impact.
5. Ultimately UNEP, UNDP and their partners aim to bring about benefits to the environment and human well-being. Few projects are likely to have impact statements that reflect such long-term or broad-based changes. However, the evaluation will assess the likelihood of the project to make a substantive contribution to the high-level changes represented by the Sustainable Development Goals[[9]](#footnote-9) and/or the high-level results prioritised by the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), Hyogo Framework for Action (HFA), GEF Global Support Programme, Green Climate Fund (GCF), etc.

*Factors affecting this criterion may include:*

* Quality of Project Management and Supervision (including adaptive management)
* Stakeholders participation and co-operation
* Responsiveness to human rights and gender equity
* Country ownership and driven-ness
* Communication and public awareness

### Financial Management

1. Financial management will be assessed under two themes: **completeness** of financial information and **communication** between financial and project management staff. The evaluation will establish the actual spend across the life of the project of funds secured from all donors. This expenditure will be reported, where possible, at output level and will be compared with the approved budget. The evaluation will assess the level of communication between the Project/Task Manager and the Fund Management Officer as it relates to the effective delivery of the planned project and the needs of a responsive, adaptive management approach. The evaluation will verify the application of proper financial management standards and adherence to UNEP and UNDP financial management policies. Any financial management issues that have affected the timely delivery of the project or the quality of its performance will be highlighted.

*Factors affecting this criterion may include:*

* Preparation and readiness
* Quality of project management and supervision

### Efficiency

1. In keeping with the OECD/DAC definition of efficiency the evaluation will assess the extent to which the project delivered maximum results from the given resources. This will include an assessment of the **cost-effectiveness** and **timeliness** of project execution. Focussing on the translation of inputs into outputs, cost-effectiveness is the extent to which an intervention has achieved, or is expected to achieve, its results at the lowest possible cost. Timeliness refers to whether planned activities were delivered according to expected timeframes as well as whether events were sequenced efficiently. The evaluation will also assess to what extent any project extension could have been avoided through stronger project management and identify any negative impacts caused by project delays or extensions. The evaluation will describe any cost or time-saving measures put in place to maximise results within the secured budget and agreed project timeframe and consider whether the project was implemented in the most efficient way compared to alternative interventions or approaches.
2. The evaluation will give special attention to efforts by the project teams to make use of/build upon pre-existing institutions, agreements and partnerships, data sources, synergies and complementarities with other initiatives, programmes and projects etc. to increase project efficiency. The evaluation will also consider the extent to which the management of the project minimised UNEP and UNDP environmental footprint.
3. The factors underpinning the need for any project extensions will also be explored and discussed. As management or project support costs cannot be increased in cases of ‘no cost extensions’, such extensions represent an increase in unstated costs to the implementing parties.

*Factors affecting this criterion may include:*

* Preparation and readiness (e.g. timeliness)
* Quality of project management and supervision
* Stakeholders participation and cooperation

### Monitoring and Reporting

1. The evaluation will assess monitoring and reporting across three sub-categories: monitoring design and budgeting, monitoring implementation and project reporting.

#### Monitoring Design and Budgeting

1. Each project should be supported by a sound monitoring plan that is designed to track progress against SMART[[10]](#footnote-10) indicators towards the delivery of the project’s outputs and achievement of direct outcomes, including at a level disaggregated by gender, vulnerability or marginalisation. The evaluation will assess the quality of the design of the monitoring plan as well as the funds allocated for its implementation. The adequacy of resources for mid-term and terminal evaluation/review should be discussed if applicable.

#### Monitoring of Project Implementation

1. The evaluation will assess whether the monitoring system was operational and facilitated the timely tracking of results and progress towards projects objectives throughout the project implementation period. This should include monitoring the representation and participation of disaggregated groups (including gendered, vulnerable and marginalised groups) in project activities. It will also consider how information generated by the monitoring system during project implementation was used to adapt and improve project execution, achievement of outcomes and ensure sustainability. The evaluation should confirm that funds allocated for monitoring were used to support this activity.

#### Project Reporting

1. For the UNDP-led components, quarterly progress was monitored using the UNDP Enhanced Results Based Management Platform. Based on the initial risk analysis submitted, the risk log should be regularly updated in ATLAS, from which Project Progress Reports (PPR) can be generated. Annual progress should be reported in the Annual Project Review/Project Implementation Reports (APR/PIR), which combines both UNDP and GEF reporting requirements. UNEP has a centralised Project Information Management System (PIMS) in which project managers are required to upload six-monthly status reports against agreed project milestones. For the UNEP-led components, this information should be provided to the Evaluation Consultants by the Evaluation Manager. Consideration will be given as to whether reporting has been carried out with respect to the effects on disaggregated groups.
2. In addition to UNEP and UNDP reporting requirements, the evaluation will assess the extent to which SCCF reporting commitments have been fulfilled. LDCF/SCCF M&E policy requires that the established RBM Framework is observed for adaptation activities; in this regard, the evaluation will assess the quality of reporting against the Adaptation Monitoring and Assessment Tool (AMAT) as a basis for enhanced results-based management (RBM) of climate change adaptation under the SCCF.

*Factors affecting this criterion may include:*

* Quality of project management and supervision
* Responsiveness to human rights and gender equity (e.g. disaggregated data and indicators)

### Sustainability

1. Sustainability is understood as the probability of direct outcomes being maintained and developed after the close of the intervention. The evaluation will identify and assess the key conditions or factors that are likely to undermine or contribute to the persistence of achieved direct outcomes (i.e. ‘assumptions’ and ‘drivers’). Some factors of sustainability may be embedded in the project design and implementation approaches while others may be contextual circumstances or conditions that evolve over the life of the intervention.

#### Socio-political Sustainability

1. The evaluation will assess the extent to which social or political factors support the continuation and further development of project direct outcomes. It will consider the level of ownership, interest and commitment among government and other stakeholders to take the project achievements forwards. In particular the evaluation will consider whether individual capacity development efforts are likely to be sustained.

#### Financial Sustainability

1. The evaluation will assess the extent to which project outcomes are dependent on future funding for the benefits they bring to be sustained. Secured future funding is only relevant to financial sustainability where the direct outcomes of a project have been extended into a future project phase. Even where future funding has been secured, the question still remains as to whether the project outcomes are financially sustainable.

#### Institutional Sustainability

1. The evaluation will assess the extent to which the sustainability of project outcomes (especially those relating to policies and laws) is dependent on issues relating to institutional frameworks and governance. It will consider whether institutional achievements such as governance structures and processes, policies, sub-regional agreements, legal and accountability frameworks etc. are robust enough to continue delivering the benefits associated with the project outcomes after project closure. In particular, the evaluation will consider whether institutional capacity development efforts are likely to be sustained.

*Factors affecting this criterion may include:*

* Stakeholders participation and cooperation
* Responsiveness to human rights and gender equity (e.g. where interventions are not inclusive, their sustainability may be undermined)
* Communication and public awareness
* Country ownership and driven-ness

#### Environmental Sustainability

1. The evaluation will assess whether any ongoing activities that may pose an environmental threat to the sustainability of project outcomes and/or any environmental risks are present that can undermine the future flow of the project benefits.

## Factors and Processes Affecting Project Performance

*(These factors are rated in the ratings table, but are discussed within the Main Evaluation Report as cross-cutting themes under the other evaluation criteria, above)*

### Preparation and Readiness

1. This criterion focuses on the inception or mobilisation stage of the project (i.e. the time between project approval and first disbursement). The evaluation will assess whether appropriate measures were taken to either address weaknesses in the project design or respond to changes that took place between project approval, the securing of funds and project mobilisation. In particular the evaluation will consider the nature and quality of engagement with stakeholder groups by the project team, the confirmation of partner capacity and development of partnership agreements as well as initial staffing and financing arrangements. *(Project preparation is included in the template for the assessment of Project Design Quality).*

### Quality of Project Management and Supervision

1. In this case, UNDP and UNEP serve as both Implementing and Executing agencies for the project. For this evaluation, ‘project management and supervision’ will refer to the management performance by UNEP and UNDP, including the technical backstopping and supervision provided to the project’s partners and the national focal points. The evaluation will assess the effectiveness of project management with regard to: providing leadership towards achieving the planned outcomes; managing team structures; maintaining productive partner relationships (including advisory groups, etc.); communication and collaboration with UNEP and UNDP colleagues; risk management; problem-solving; and overall project execution. Evidence of adaptive management should be highlighted.

### Stakeholder Participation and Cooperation

1. Here the term ‘stakeholder’ should be considered in a broad sense, encompassing all project partners, duty-bearers with a role in delivering project outputs, national focal points, target users of project outputs, and any other collaborating agents external to UNEP and UNDP. The assessment will consider the quality and effectiveness of all forms of communication and consultation with stakeholders throughout the project life and the support given to maximise collaboration and coherence between various stakeholders, including sharing plans, pooling resources and exchanging learning. The inclusion and participation of all **differentiated groups**, including gender groups should be considered.

### Responsiveness to Human Rights and Gender Equity

1. The evaluation will ascertain to what extent the project has applied the UN Common Understanding on the human rights-based approach (HRBA) and the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous People. In particular the evaluation will consider to what extent project design, implementation and monitoring have taken into consideration: (i) possible gender inequalities in access to, and the control over, natural resources; (ii) specific vulnerabilities of women and children to environmental degradation or disasters; and (iii) the role of women in mitigating or adapting to environmental changes and engaging in environmental protection and rehabilitation.

### Country Ownership and Driven-ness

1. This factor is concerned with the level of ownership generated by the project over outputs and outcomes and that is necessary for long term impact to be realised. This ownership should adequately represent the needs of interest of all gendered and marginalised groups. The evaluation will assess the quality and degree of engagement of government / public sector agencies in the project. The evaluation will consider the involvement not only of those directly involved in project execution and those participating in technical or leadership groups, but also those official representatives whose cooperation is needed for change to be embedded in their respective institutions and offices.

### Communication and Public Awareness

1. The evaluation will assess the effectiveness of: a) communication of learning and experience-sharing between project partners and interested groups arising from the project during its life and b) public awareness activities that were undertaken during the implementation of the project to influence attitudes or shape behaviour among wider communities and civil society at large. The evaluation should consider whether existing communication channels and networks were used effectively, including meeting the differentiated needs of gendered or marginalised groups, and whether any feedback channels were established. Where knowledge sharing platforms have been established under a project the evaluation will comment on the sustainability of the communication channel under either socio-political, institutional or financial sustainability, as appropriate.

# Section 3. EVALUATION APPROACH, METHODS AND DELIVERABLES

1. The Terminal Evaluation will be an **in-depth evaluation** using a participatory approach whereby key stakeholders are kept informed and consulted throughout the evaluation process. Both quantitative and qualitative evaluation methods will be used as appropriate to determine project achievements against the expected outputs, outcomes and impacts. It is highly recommended that the consultants maintain close communication with the project team and promote information exchange throughout the evaluation implementation phase in order to increase their (and other stakeholder) ownership of the evaluation findings. The findings of the evaluation will be based on the following:
	1. A **desk review** of:
	* Relevant background documentation, inter alia UNEP MTS; UNDP Strategic Plan; UNFCCC decision 7/CP.7; GEF Programming Strategy on Adaptation to Climate Change for the LDCF and the SCCF; GEF Guidance on Monitoring and Evaluation in the LDCF/SCCF; etc.
	* Project design documents (including minutes of the project design review meeting at approval); Annual Work Plans and Budgets or equivalent, revisions to the project, approved logical framework and budget;
	* Project reports such as six-monthly progress and financial reports, progress reports from collaborating partners, and including the Project Implementation Reviews and the Adaptation Monitoring and Assessment Tool (AMAT);
	* Mid-Term Review report;
	* Studies, training/workshop reports, publications, meeting minutes, formal presentations, relevant correspondence, etc.
	1. **Interviews** (individual or in group) with:
	* Project management teams at UNEP and UNDP, and other relevant staff;
	* Technical Specialists and Technical Support Unit (UNDP and UNEP);
	* Representatives from the Technical Advisory Group and Project Board
	* Fund Management Officers;
	* Project partners, including FAO, WHO, IFAD, GIZ, UNITAR, UNISDR, GWP, UN Habitat, SPREP, GAN, WARN-CC, APAN, REGATTA,
	* Other Relevant resource persons.
	1. **Surveys:** an end-of-the project survey was completed, and the results were collected and analysed. The evaluation will consider the findings of this survey as secondary data.
	2. **Other data collection tools** as will be deemed necessary and within available funds

## Evaluation Deliverables and Review Procedures

1. The evaluation team will prepare and submit the following deliverables:
2. **Inception Report:** containing an assessment of project design quality, a draft reconstructed Theory of Change of the project, project stakeholder analysis, evaluation framework and a tentative evaluation schedule (see Annex 1 for links to all templates, tables and guidance notes).
3. **Preliminary Findings Note:** typically in the form of a PowerPoint presentation, the sharing of preliminary findings is intended to support the participation of the project team, act as a means to ensure all information sources have been accessed and provide an opportunity to verify emerging findings. In the case of highly strategic project/portfolio evaluations, the preliminary findings may be presented as a Word document for review and comment.
4. **Draft and Final Evaluation Report:** containing an executive summary that can act as a stand-alone document; detailed analysis of the evaluation findings organised by evaluation criteria and supported with evidence; lessons learned and recommendations and an annotated ratings table (see links in Annex 1).
5. **Evaluation Brief:** a 2-page summary of key evaluation findings for wider dissemination through the Evaluation Office website.
6. **Review of the draft evaluation report**. The evaluation team will submit a draft report to the Evaluation Manager and revise the draft in response to their comments and suggestions. Once a draft of adequate quality has been peer-reviewed and accepted, the Evaluation Manager will share the cleared draft report with the Project Manager, who will alert the Evaluation Manager in case the report contains any blatant factual errors. The Evaluation Manager will then forward revised draft report (corrected by the evaluation team where necessary) to other project stakeholders, for their review and comments. Stakeholders may provide feedback on any errors of fact and may highlight the significance of such errors in any conclusions as well as providing feedback on the proposed recommendations and lessons. Any comments or responses to draft reports will be sent to the Evaluation Manager for consolidation. The Evaluation Manager will provide all comments to the evaluation team for consideration in preparing the final report, along with guidance on areas of contradiction or issues requiring an institutional response.
7. Based on a careful review of the evidence collated by the evaluation consultants and the internal consistency of the report, the Evaluation Manager will provide an assessment of the ratings in the final evaluation report. Where there are differences of opinion between the evaluator and the Evaluation Manager on project ratings, both viewpoints will be clearly presented in the final report. The Evaluation Office ratings will be considered the final ratings for the project.
8. The Evaluation Manager will prepare a **quality assessment** of the first and final drafts of the main evaluation report, which acts as a tool for providing structured feedback to the evaluation consultants. The quality of the report will be assessed and rated against the criteria specified in template listed in Annex 1 and this assessment will be appended to the Final Evaluation Report.
9. At the end of the evaluation process, the Evaluation Office will prepare a **Recommendations Implementation Plan** in the format of a table, to be completed and updated at regular intervals by the Task Manager. The Evaluation Office will track compliance against this plan on a six-monthly basis.

## The Evaluation Team

1. For this evaluation, the evaluation team will consist of a Team Leader and one Supporting Consultant who will work under the overall responsibility of the Evaluation Office represented by an Evaluation Manager, Pauline Marima (Evaluation Office of UNEP), in consultation with the Task Managers (Tunnie Srisakulchairak - UNEP, Rohini Kohli - UNDP), the Oversight Officers (Yusuke Taishi - UNDP, and Jessica Tronni - UNEP), Fund Management Officer (Bwiza Wameyo-Odemba – UNEP), the Climate Change Sub-programme Coordinator for UNEP (Niklas Hagelberg), and the CCA Principal Technical Advisor for UNDP (Srilata Kammila).
2. The consultants will liaise with the Evaluation Manager on any procedural and methodological matters related to the evaluation. It is, however, the consultants’ individual responsibility to arrange for their visas and immunizations as well as to plan meetings with stakeholders, organize online surveys, obtain documentary evidence and any other logistical matters related to the assignment. The UNEP and UNDP Task Managers and project team will, where possible, provide logistical support (introductions, meetings etc.) allowing the consultants to conduct the evaluation as efficiently and independently as possible.
3. The Team Leader will be hired over the period mid-August 2019 to mid-February 2020. S/he should have: an advanced university degree in environmental sciences, or other relevant sciences area; a minimum of 10 years of experience in work related to climate change (adaptation); familiarity with the UN Framework Convention on Climate change (UNFCCC), Kyoto Protocol and/or the National Adaptation Plan (NAP) process; experience conducting project evaluation, including use of Theory of Change approach; excellent writing skills in English, knowledge of additional UN languages is desirable; team leadership experience and, where possible, knowledge of the UN system, specifically of the work of UNEP and/or UNDP.
4. The Supporting Consultant will be hired will be hired over the period mid-August 2019 to mid-February 2020. S/he should have: an undergraduate university degree in environmental sciences, or other relevant sciences area; a minimum of 5 years of experience in work related to climate change (adaptation); excellent writing skills in English, knowledge of additional UN languages is desirable; where possible, knowledge of the UN system, specifically of the work of UNEP and/or UNDP. Experience in managing partnerships, knowledge management and communication is desirable for all evaluation consultants.
5. The Team Leader will be responsible, in close consultation with the Evaluation Office of UN Environment, for overall management of the evaluation and timely delivery of its outputs, described above in Section 12 Evaluation Deliverables, above. The Supporting Consultant will make substantive and high quality contributions to the evaluation process and outputs. Both consultants will ensure together that all evaluation criteria and questions are adequately covered.
6. Specifically, the the **Team Leader** will ensure the following steps are followed as appropriate:

Inception phase of the evaluation, including:

* + - * preliminary desk review and introductory interviews with project staff;
			* draft the reconstructed Theory of Change of the project;
			* prepare the evaluation framework;
			* develop the desk review and interview protocols;
			* draft the survey protocols (if relevant);
			* develop and present criteria for country and/or site selection for the evaluation mission;
			* plan the evaluation schedule;
			* prepare the Inception Report, incorporating comments until approved by the Evaluation Manager

Data collection and analysis phase of the evaluation, including:

* + - * conduct further desk review and in-depth interviews with project implementing and executing agencies, project partners and project stakeholders;
			* (where appropriate and agreed) conduct an evaluation mission(s) to interview the executing/implementing teams from UNEP and UNDP;
			* conduct surveys and interviews (online or by telephone) with various national focal points
			* ensure independence of the evaluation and confidentiality of evaluation interviews;
			* regularly report back to the Evaluation Manager on progress and inform of any possible problems or issues encountered and;
			* keep the Project/Task Managers informed of the evaluation progress and engage them in discussions on emerging findings throughout the evaluation process.

Reporting phase, including:

* + - * draft the Main Evaluation Report, ensuring that the evaluation report is complete, coherent and consistent with the Evaluation Manager guidelines both in substance and style;
			* liaise with the Evaluation Manager on comments received and finalize the Main Evaluation Report, ensuring that comments are taken into account until approved by the Evaluation Manager and;
			* prepare a Response to Comments annex for the main report, listing those comments not accepted by the Evaluation Consultant and indicating the reason for the rejection.

Managing relations, including:

* + - * maintain a positive relationship with evaluation stakeholders, ensuring that the evaluation process is as participatory as possible but at the same time maintains its independence;
			* communicate in a timely manner with the Evaluation Manager on any issues requiring attention and intervention.
1. The **Supporting Consultant** will make substantive and high-quality contributions to the evaluation process and outputs. The contributions to the evaluation by the supporting consultant are detailed in Document 2 of Annex 1.

## Schedule of the evaluation

1. Table 5 below presents the tentative schedule for the evaluation.

Table 5. Tentative schedule for the evaluation

| **Milestone** | **Tentative schedule\*** |
| --- | --- |
| Consultant recruitment process | July-August 2019 |
| Kick-off meeting (via Skype) | August 2019 |
| Data collection and analysis, desk-based interviews and surveys  | August-October 2019 |
| Inception Report | September 2019 |
| Field Mission (based on meeting arrangements with UNEP and UNDP) | October 2019 |
| Draft report to UN Environment (Evaluation Manager and Peer Reviewer) | November 2019 |
| Draft Report shared with UN Environment Task Manager and Project Team | December 2019 |
| Draft Report shared with wider group of stakeholders | January 2020 |
| Final Report | February 2020 |

\*Allowances have been provided for incidental and/or unanticipated delays

## Contractual Arrangements

1. Evaluation Consultants will be selected and recruited by the Evaluation Office of UN Environment under an individual Special Service Agreement (SSA) on a “fees only” basis (see below). By signing the service contract with UN Environment/UNON, the consultants certify that they have not been associated with the design and implementation of the project in any way which may jeopardize their independence and impartiality towards project achievements and project partner performance. In addition, they will not have any future interests (within six months after completion of the contract) with the project’s executing or implementing units. All consultants are required to sigh the Code of Conduct Agreement Form.
2. Fees will be paid on an instalment basis, paid on acceptance by the Evaluation Manager of expected key deliverables. The schedule of payment is as follows:

Schedule of Payment for the Team Leader:

| Deliverable | Percentage Payment |
| --- | --- |
| Approved Inception Report (as per Annex 1 document 9) | 30% |
| Approved Draft Main Evaluation Report (as per Annex 1 document 16) | 40% |
| Approved Final Main Evaluation Report | 30% |

Schedule of Payment for the Support Consultant:

| Deliverable | Percentage Payment |
| --- | --- |
| Approved Inception Report (as per Annex 1 document 9) | 30% |
| Approved Draft Main Evaluation Report (as per Annex 1 document 16) | 40% |
| Approved Final Main Evaluation Report | 30% |

1. Fees only contracts: Air tickets will be purchased by UNEP and 75% of the Daily Subsistence Allowance for each authorised travel mission will be paid up front. Local in-country travel will only be reimbursed where agreed in advance with the Evaluation Manager and on the production of acceptable receipts. Terminal expenses and residual DSA entitlements (25%) will be paid after mission completion.
2. The consultants will be provided with access to UNEP and UNDP documents, the consultants agree not to disclose information to third parties beyond information required for, and included in, the evaluation report.
3. In case the consultants are not able to provide the deliverables in accordance with these guidelines, and in line with the expected quality standards by the Evaluation Office of UNEP, payment may be withheld at the discretion of the Director of the Evaluation Office until the consultants have improved the deliverables to meet required quality standards.
4. If the consultants fail to submit a satisfactory final product to UNEP in a timely manner, i.e. before the end date of their contract, the Evaluation Office reserves the right to employ additional human resources to finalize the report, and to reduce the consultants’ fees by an amount equal to the additional costs borne by the Evaluation Office to bring the report to completion and up to standard.

## Annex 1: Tools, Templates and Guidance Notes for use in the Evaluation

The tools, templates and guidance notes listed in the table below, and available on the Evaluation Office website (https://www.unenvironment.org/about-un-environment/evaluation/our-evaluation-approach), are intended to help Evaluation Managers and Evaluation Consultants to produce evaluation products that are consistent with each other and which can be compiled into a biennial Evaluation Synthesis Report. The biennial summary is used to provide an overview of progress to UN Environment and the UN Environmental Assembly.

This suite of documents is also intended to make the evaluation process as transparent as possible so that all those involved in the process can participate on an informed basis. It is recognised that the evaluation needs of projects and portfolio vary and adjustments may be necessary so that the purpose of the evaluation process (broadly, accountability and lesson learning), can be met. Such adjustments should be decided between the Evaluation Manager and the Evaluation Consultants in order to produce evaluation reports that are both useful to project implementers and that produce credible findings.

ADVICE TO CONSULTANTS: As our tools, templates and guidance notes are updated on a continuous basis, kindly download documents from these links during the Inception Phase and use those versions throughout the evaluation.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Document** | **Name**  | **URL link**  |
| 1 | Evaluation Process Guidelines for Consultants | [Link](https://wedocs.unep.org/bitstream/handle/20.500.11822/7109/18_Evaluation_Process_Guidelines_for_Consultants_17.04.18.pdf?sequence=11&isAllowed=y)  |
| 2 | Evaluation Consultants Team Roles *(Team Leader and Supporting Consultant)* | [Link](https://wedocs.unep.org/bitstream/handle/20.500.11822/7109/19_Evaluation_Consultants_Team_Roles_17.04.18.pdf?sequence=12&isAllowed=y)  |
| 3 | List of documents required in the evaluation process | [Link](https://wedocs.unep.org/bitstream/handle/20.500.11822/25542/01_List_of_project_documents_needed_for_evaluation.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y) |
| 4 | Evaluation Criteria *(summary of descriptions, as in these terms of reference)* | [Link](https://wedocs.unep.org/bitstream/id/c6598799-b95b-4c0a-aae5-74b603e0a22c/2_Evaluation_Criteria_17.04.18.doc)  |
| 5 | Evaluation Ratings Table (only) | [Link](https://wedocs.unep.org/bitstream/handle/20.500.11822/25543/3_Evalaution_Ratings_Table_Only_17.04.18.docx?sequence=1&isAllowed=y) |
| 6 | Matrix Describing Ratings by Criteria | [Link](https://wedocs.unep.org/bitstream/handle/20.500.11822/25544/1_Criterion_rating_descriptions_matrix_22.01.19.pdf?sequence=3&isAllowed=y) |
| 7 | Weighting of Ratings (excel) | [Link](https://wedocs.unep.org/bitstream/handle/20.500.11822/25545/4_Weightings_for_Ratings_06.05.18.xlsx?sequence=1&isAllowed=y) |
| 8 | Project Identification Tables | [Link](https://wedocs.unep.org/bitstream/handle/20.500.11822/7121/5_Project_Identification_Table_26.10.17.docx?sequence=1&isAllowed=y) |
| 9 | Structure and Contents of the Inception Report | [Link](https://wedocs.unep.org/bitstream/handle/20.500.11822/27353/6_Inception_Report_Structure_and_Contents_17.04.18.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y) |
| 10a | Template for the Assessment of the Quality of Project Design (Word template) | [Link](https://wedocs.unep.org/bitstream/id/00a41116-b940-44d4-9d3e-84ee406ef949/8_Quality_of_Project_Design_Assessment_Template_17.04.18.doc) |
| 10b | Template for the Assessment of the Quality of Project Design (Excel tool) | [Link](https://wedocs.unep.org/bitstream/id/ac39897b-8c2b-40dd-8e9c-d304d4f498ef/8_Quality_of_Project_Design_Assessment_Template_17.04.18.xlsx) |
| 11 | Guidance on Stakeholder Analysis  | [Link](https://wedocs.unep.org/bitstream/handle/20.500.11822/27354/10_Stakeholder_Analysis_Guidance_Note_26.10.17.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y) |
| 12 | Gender Note for Evaluation Consultants | [Link](https://wedocs.unep.org/bitstream/handle/20.500.11822/25546/9_Gender_Methods_Note_for_Consultants_17.04.18.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y) |
| 13 | Use of Theory of Change in Project Evaluations | [Link](https://wedocs.unep.org/bitstream/id/8b45f5ff-c37b-4aac-b386-6b6b8e29aaed/11_Use_of_Theory_of_Change_in_Project_Evaluation_26.10.17.pdf) |
| 14 | Assessment of the Likelihood of Impact Decision Tree (Excel) | [Link](https://wedocs.unep.org/bitstream/id/74a99e70-063a-46a5-a0a0-b7e7b67d1a94/12_Likelihood_of_Impact_Decision_Tree_17.04.18.xlsm) |
| 15 | Possible Evaluation Questions | [Link](https://wedocs.unep.org/bitstream/handle/20.500.11822/27348/20_Possible_Evaluation_Questions.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y) |
| 16 | Structure and Contents of the Main Evaluation Report | [Link](https://wedocs.unep.org/bitstream/handle/20.500.11822/27349/7_Main_Evaluation_Report_Structure_and_Contents_17.04.18.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y) |
| 17 | Cover Page, Prelims and Style Sheet for Main Evaluation Report  | [Link](https://wedocs.unep.org/bitstream/handle/20.500.11822/22306/15_Cover_Pages_Prelims_and_Style_Sheet_for_the_Main_Evaluation_Report_26.10.17.docx?sequence=1&isAllowed=y) |
| 18 | Financial Tables | [Link](https://wedocs.unep.org/bitstream/id/694da3d8-2cd8-408d-9046-d875461e2fc0/13_Financial_Tables_26.10.17.doc) |
| 19 | Template for the Assessment of the Quality of the Evaluation Report | [Link](https://wedocs.unep.org/bitstream/handle/20.500.11822/27356/14_Quality_of_Evaluation_Report_Assessment_Template_17.04.18.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y) |

## Annex 2: Evaluation Consultant Code of Conduct Agreement Form



## Annex 3: Audit trail template for received comments on draft TE Report

Note: 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 included as an annex in the final TE Report.

To the comments received on (date) from the Terminal Evaluation of (project name) (Project ID)

The following comments were provided in track changes to the draft Terminal 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 TE report** | **TE team response and actions taken** |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

1. In the context of this project, the term ‘non-LDCs’ is used to refer to developing countries which are not least developed countries (LDCs) under the list of Non-Annex 1 parties to the UNFCCC. These countries are not a specific grouping under the UNFCCC parties, rather they are eligible for SCCF resources hence eligible to receive support from this project. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. For more information on the UNDP DIM modality, please visit: <https://info.undp.org/global/popp/frm/pages/direct-implementation-dim-modality.aspx> [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. http://www.unep.org/eou/StandardsPolicyandPractices/UNEPEvaluationPolicy/tabid/3050/language/en-US/Default.aspx [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. UN Environment’s Medium-Term Strategy (MTS) is a document that guides UN Environment’s programme planning over a four-year period. It identifies UN Environment’s thematic priorities, known as Sub-programmes (SP), and sets out the desired outcomes, known as Expected Accomplishments (EAs), of the Sub-programmes. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. The Strategic Plan sets out the direction for UNDP, optimized to help countries achieve the eradication of poverty and significant reduction of inequalities and exclusion [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. In some cases ‘project management and supervision’ will refer to the supervision and guidance provided by UN Environment to implementing partners and national governments while in others, specifically for GEF funded projects, it will refer to the project management performance of the executing agency and the technical backstopping provided by UN Environment. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. The level of ‘reconstruction’ needed during an evaluation will depend on the quality of this initial TOC, the time that has lapsed between project design and implementation (which may be related to securing and disbursing funds) and the level of any changes made to the project design. In the case of [UNEP] projects pre-dating 2013 the intervention logic is often represented in a logical framework and a TOC will need to be constructed in the inception stage of the evaluation. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. *Scaling up* refers to approaches being adopted on a much larger scale, but in a very similar context. Scaling up is often the longer-term objective of pilot initiatives. *Replication* refers to approaches being repeated, or lessons being explicitly applied in new/different contexts e.g. other geographic areas, different target group etc. Effective replication typically requires some form of revision or adaptation to the new context. It is possible to replicate at either the same or a different scale. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. A list of relevant SDGs is available here <https://www.unenvironment.org/about-un-environment/evaluation/our-evaluation-approach/sustainable-development-goals> [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. SMART refers to indicators that are specific, measurable, assignable, realistic and time-specific. [↑](#footnote-ref-10)