TERMS OF REFERENCE

Terminal Evaluation of UNDP/GEF Project "Strengthening Climate Information and Early Warning System in Cambodia to Support Climate Resilient Development and Adaptation to Climate Change"

BASIC INFORMATON

Assignment Title	Terminal Evaluation of UNDP/GEF Project "Strengthening Climate Information and Early Warning System in Cambodia to Support Climate Resilient Development and Adaptation to Climate Change"
Location:	Home based with mission to Cambodia
Application Deadline:	
Type of Contract:	Individual Contract
Post Level:	International Consultant
Languages Required:	English; proficiency in Khmer would be an advantage
Expected starting Date:	20 February 2020
Expected Duration of Assignment:	30 working days total from 20 February to 15 April 2020, including 10 days mission in Phnom Penh and other two provinces in Cambodia.

Background and Project Description

Cambodia is facing mounting development challenges due to climate change. Damage related to the October 2013 flooding alone, caused by heavy rain and the seasonal swell of the Mekong River, is estimated at $356 million, having affected 20 out of 24 provinces[1] and 1.7 million people; 297,600 hectares of rice paddies were inundated and more than 28,100 hectares of rice were immediately destroyed[2]. Climate change is resulting in longer dry seasons and shorter, more intense rainy seasons. This impacts both the frequency and severity of natural hazards such as floods and droughts, as well as agricultural production which is dependent on seasonal rainfall. Recovery from such events puts strain on the least developed country's (LDC's) limited resources and forces shifts in development priorities - hindering Cambodia's ability to progress and to achieve its development goals.

The Royal Government of Cambodia's (RGC) preferred situation is to implement an effective early warning system (EWS). The purpose of an EWS is to monitor climate and environmental data on a real-time basis, detect adverse trends and make reliable predictions of possible impacts in the form of early warning information. An early warning therefore refers not only to advisories in emergency situations, but also to information related to the changing climatic trends revealed after tracking and analysing climate and weather data over time. An effective EWS would thus enable timely response to natural hazards and extreme weather events, as well as informed planning in light of changing climate trends.

The RGC faces several challenges in realizing its preferred situation. With few working climate and weather observation stations, there is insufficient data to refine predictions and forecasts based on sector, geographic areas, or vulnerability. Further, limited human resources and high staff turnover make it difficult for institutions such as the Ministry of Water Resources and Meteorology (MOWRAM) to develop capacity and maintain qualified forecasters and modelers. Appropriate dissemination of information is also a challenge. MOWRAM is responsible for providing climate and weather information to the planning, line ministries to inform climate resilient planning, and for the communication of natural hazards and extreme weather events for disaster risk reduction. However, the information is often not presented in manner that can be easily understood or applied and standard operating

---

[1] As of 31 December 2013, the total number of provinces in Cambodia changed from 24 to 25.

[2] http://www.undp.org/content/cambodia/en/home/presscenter/articles/2013/10/18/cambodia_s-first-disaster-database-system-unveiled/

procedures (SOPs) defining roles, responsibilities, and accountability are lacking. MOWRAM is also responsible for maintaining the EWS infrastructure such as automated weather stations and water gauge stations. Urgent needs to improve the national EWS infrastructure in light of imminent climate risks has prompted some donors to assist the Government in rehabilitating old or installing new weather stations. However, there is a significant risk of unsustainability of the newly built infrastructure due to limited financial resources to cover all the O&M requirements.

The project "Strengthening climate information and early warning systems in Cambodia to support climate resilient development and adaptation to climate change" (henceforth "the EWS project") has been implemented to help the Government overcome these gaps and challenges. Funding of approximately US$4.9 million was approved by the Least Developed Countries Fund Council in October 2014 and the project was officially launched in May 2015. The project seeks to address the current barriers through three complementary outcomes:

1.   Increased institutional capacity to assimilate and forecast weather, hydrological, climate and environmental information.
2.   Climate and weather information available and utilized for national, sectoral and sub-national planning as well as for transboundary communication in the region.
3.   Strengthened institutional capacity to operate and maintain EWS and climate information infrastructure, both software and hardware, in order to monitor weather and climate change.

To meet the above three outcomes, the approach adopted by the project is to 1) invest in early warning infrastructure – hydro and meteorology stations nationwide; 2) mobilize technical expertise to enhance capacity of national entities (namely MOWRAM, NCDM, and MAFF) in making use of the information; and 3) ensure the smooth flow of information sharing both at national level and between national and provincial level.

With close collaboration with national stakeholders, the project has been in its final implementation stage and made steady progress in line with the agreed project work plan. The project is currently looking for an International Consultant to conduct the Terminal Evaluation for the project.

Objective and Scope

This terminal evaluation will be conducted according to the guidance, rules and procedures established by UNDP and GEF as reflected in the UNDP evaluation guidance for GEF financed projects. The terminal evaluation should start in February 2020 and be carried out until Mid April 2020.

The objectives of the terminal evaluation are to assess the achievement of project results, and to draw lessons that can both improve the sustainability of benefits from this project, and aid in the overall enhancement of UNDP programming. The terminal evaluation will be carried out by an international consultant supported by UNDP Country Office in Cambodia.

In accordance with UNDP and GEF policies and procedures, all full and medium-sized UNDP- GEF projects are required to undergo a terminal evaluation upon completion of implementation. These terms of reference set out the expectations for a terminal evaluation of the project "Strengthening Climate Information and Early Warning System in Cambodia to Support Climate Resilient Development and Adaptation to Climate Change" (PIMS #5235).

Evaluation Approach and Method

An overall approach and method[3] for conducting project terminal evaluations of UNDP supported GEF financed projects has developed over time. The evaluation will be carried out by a lead international consultant and

---

[3] 3 For additional information on methods, see the Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results, Chapter 7, pg. 163

supported by the project team at UNDP Cambodia. The final evaluation should include a mixed methodology of document review, interviews, and observations from project site visits, at minimum, and the evaluators should make an effort to triangulate information. 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. 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 the evaluation inception report, and shall include it as an annex to the final report.

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, the GEF operational focal point, Project Manager, UNDP Project Consultant Team (Monitoring, Evaluation and Reporting as well as Communication Specialist), UNDP Programme Result Team, UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based in Bangkok, Thailand and other key stakeholders.

Field Mission

The international evaluator is expected to conduct a field mission of 8 days (not including travel days) to the project sites and Phnom Penh. The 8 working days mission should include at a minimum 3-4 working days based in Phnom Penh, and 4 working days in the provinces. The international evaluator will be accompanied by the Project Team who arranges all meetings and field mission.

A list of persons and organizations for interviews will be proposed by the project team and should be agreed prior to the mission to Cambodia. The international evaluator can request additional meetings/interviews as required. UNDP should be informed of additional interviews/meetings required by the evaluator, and the dialogue with the evaluated party should be handled in an inclusive and transparent manner.

The international evaluator will review all relevant sources of information, such as project document, project reports – including Annual APR/PIR, project budget revisions, midterm review, progress reports, project files, national documents and any other materials that the evaluator considers useful for this evidence-based assessment. A list of documents will be provided by the project team after signing the contract.

Duties and Responsibilities

Evaluation Criteria and Ratings

An assessment of project performance will be carried out 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 cover the criteria of: **relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact.** Ratings must be provided on the following performance criteria:

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

The completed table must be included in the evaluation executive summary. The obligatory rating scales are included in Annex D.

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 and Project Team to obtain financial data in order to complete the required co-financing table, which will be included in the terminal evaluation report.

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[4].

Conclusions, Recommendations and Lessons

The evaluation report must include a chapter providing a set of conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned. Conclusions should build on findings and be based on evidence. Recommendations should be prioritized, specific, relevant, and targeted, with suggested implementers of the recommendations. Lessons should have wider applicability to other initiatives across the region, the area of intervention, and for the future.

Implementation Arrangements

The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation resides with the UNDP CO in Cambodia The UNDP CO will contract the evaluator(s) and ensure the timely provision of per diems and travel arrangements within the country for the evaluation team. The Project Team will be responsible for liaising with the Evaluators team to set up stakeholder interviews, arrange field visits, coordinate with the Government etc.

Evaluation Timeframe

The total duration of the evaluation will be 30 working days during the calendar period of 20 February – 15 April 2020. The following tentative timetable is recommended for the evaluation; however, the final schedule will be agreed upon in the beginning of the assignment:

- Preparation - 3 days in February 2020;
- Evaluation Mission - 8 w/days in late February– early March 2020;
- Travel Days – 2 working days for travel to and from Cambodia
- Draft Evaluation Report - 10 days, completed by end of March 2020;
- Final Report - 7 days, completed by mid-April 2020.

Deliverables

---

[4] 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

The International Consultant / evaluator is expected to deliver the following:

- Inception Report: Evaluator provides clarifications on timing and method, Evaluator submits to UNDP CO no later than 1 week before the evaluation mission
- Presentation of Initial Findings: Evaluator submits to project management and UNDP CO at the end of evaluation mission
- Draft Final Report: Full report (per template provided in TE Guidance) with annexes, Evaluator submits to CO within 3 weeks of the evaluation mission, reviewed by RTA, PCU, GEF OFPs
- Final Report: Revised report, Evaluator submits to CO within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft

*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.

Payment Modalities and Specifications

The consultant will be paid on a lump sum basis (all-inclusive of expense relate to the above assignment including travels outside and inside the duty station and any tax obligation) under the following instalments.

- *10%- at* submission and approval of inception report: 25th February 2020
- *40%-* Following submission and approval of the 1ST draft terminal evaluation report: 30 March 2020
- *50%-* Following submission and approval (UNDP-CO and UNDP RTA) of the final terminal evaluation report: 20 April 2020

Competencies

Corporate competencies

- Demonstrates integrity by modelling the UN's values and ethical standards;
- Promotes the vision, mission and strategic goals of UN/UNDP;
- Displays cultural, gender, religion, race, nationality and age sensitivity and adaptability;

Functional competencies

- Ability to lead strategic planning, results-based management and reporting;
- Builds strong relationships with clients, focuses on impact and result for the client and responds positively to feedback;
- Consistently approaches work with energy and a positive, constructive attitude;
- Demonstrates good oral and written communication skills;
- Demonstrates ability to manage complexities and work under pressure, as well as conflict resolution skills.
- Capability to work effectively under deadline pressure and to take on a range of responsibilities;
- Ability to work in a team, good decision-making skills, communication and writing skills.

Evaluation consultants will be held to the highest ethical standards and are required to sign a Code of Conduct upon acceptance of the assignment. UNDP evaluations are conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG 'Ethical Guideline for Evaluations.'

Required Skills and Experience

Education:	A Master's degree in natural resource management, agricultural development, climatology/meteorology, water resources management, environmental sciences, disaster management or related field, or other closely related field.
Experience:	- Minimum 7 years of experience in conducting evaluation for development projects and GEF funded project. Experience working in the UN system is a strong asset - Minimum of 7 years of relevant professional experience in relevant technical areas of Early Warning System. - Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender and climate resilient development and adaption to climate change; experience in gender sensitive evaluation and analysis - Experience working for development projects, with multi stakeholders including government agencies, development agencies, and UN agencies - Knowledge of UNDP and GEF monitoring and evaluation policies - Previous experience with results-based monitoring and evaluation methodologies, application of SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios
Language requirement	High proficiency in English, knowledge of Khmer would be an advantage.

Conflict of interest:
To ensure impartiality and objectivity of the evaluation, as well as to avoid the conflict of interest, UNDP will not consider the applications from the candidates that have had prior involvement in the design, formulation, implementation or evaluation of the above-indicated project.

Application process

Qualified candidates are requested to apply online via this website. The application should contain:

a) Completed letter of confirmation of interest and availability. Please paste the letter into the "Resume and Motivation" section of the electronic application;

b) CV or a UNDP Personal History form (P11) available at http://procurement-notices.undp.org/view_notice.cfm?notice_id=63033 , indicating all past experience, as well as the contact details (email and telephone number) of the candidate and three professional references;

c) Financial proposal that indicates the all-inclusive fixed total contract price, supported by the breakdown of costs. The breakdown should contain: professional fee for home-based work (number of working days), professional fee for work on mission (number of working days), travel costs (international/local travel and per diems). Per diems cannot exceed maximum UN daily allowance rates (http://icsc.un.org) and consultants are encouraged to bid lower amount to make their offers more competitive.

Please note that the professional fee is all-inclusive and shall take into account various expenses incurred by the consultant/contractor during the contract period (e.g. fee, health insurance, vaccination and any other relevant expenses related to the performance of service, etc.). All envisaged international travel costs must be included in the financial proposal.

If an applicant is employed by an organization/company/institution, and he/she expects his/her employer to charge a management fee in the process of releasing him/her to UNDP under reimbursable loan agreement (RLA), the applicant must indicate at this point, and ensure that all such costs are duly incorporated in the financial proposal submitted to UNDP.

Incomplete applications will not be considered. Please make sure you have provided all requested materials.

Payments will be made only upon confirmation of UNDP on delivering on the contract obligations in a satisfactory manner.

Individual consultants are responsible for ensuring they have vaccinations/inoculations when travelling to certain countries, as designated by the UN Medical Director. Consultants are also required to comply with the UN security directives set forth under dss.un.org

General terms and conditions as well as other related documents can be found under: http://on.undp.org/t7fJs.

Qualified women and members of minorities are encouraged to apply.
Due to large number of applications we receive, we are able to inform only the successful candidates about the outcome or status of the selection process.

Criteria for Evaluation

Only applications which are responsive and compliant will be evaluated. Offers will be evaluated according to the Combined Scoring method – where the educational background and experience on similar assignments will be weighted at 70% and the price proposal will weigh as 30% of the total scoring. The applicant receiving the Highest Combined Score that has also accepted UNDP's General Terms and Conditions will be awarded the contract. Detail component of technical evaluation criteria is presented below:

Technical Evaluation Criteria	Obtainable Score
Minimum 7 years of experience in conducting evaluation for development projects and GEF funded project. Experience working in the UN system is a strong asset;	30
Minimum of 7 years of relevant professional experience in relevant technical areas of Climate Information and Early Warning System.	15
Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender and climate resilient development and adaption to climate change; experience in gender sensitive evaluation and analysis	10
Experience working for development projects, with multi stakeholders including government agencies, development agencies, and UN agencies	10
Knowledge of UNDP and GEF monitoring and evaluation policies	15
Previous experience with results-based monitoring and evaluation methodologies, application of SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios	20
Total Obtainable Score:	100

Evaluation Ethics

Evaluation consultant will be held to the highest ethical standards and is 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'

ANNEX A: PROJECT LOGICAL FRAMEWORK

to be added

ANNEX B: LIST OF DOCUMENTS TO BE REVIEWED BY THE EVALUATORS

Kingdom of Cambodia (2015). Law on Disaster Management.

UNDP (2014). Project Document. Strengthening climate information and early warning systems in Cambodia to support climate resilient development and adaptation to climate change. PIMS 5235, Signed, 25th November 2014. 139 pages.

UNDP Cambodia (2015). Inception Report. Strengthening climate information and early warning systems in Cambodia to support climate resilient development and adaptation to climate change Project, May 2015.

UNDP Cambodia (2017). Minutes of the Consultation Meeting on the Project Refined Strategy. SCIANCE-WS Project. August 10th 2017, Phnom Penh.

UNDP Cambodia (2017). Project Refinement Report. Strengthening climate information and early warning systems in Cambodia to support climate resilient development and adaptation to climate change Project, August 2017.

UNDP Cambodia (2017). Key Summary of the Refined Project Implementation Strategy. Strengthening climate information and early warning systems in Cambodia to support climate resilient development and adaptation to climate change Project, 2017.

UNDP Cambodia (2018). Minutes of Key Stakeholders Meeting. Strengthening Climate Information and Early Warning System, May 7th 2018, Phnom Penh.

UNDP Cambodia (2018). Minutes of Project Board Meeting. Strengthening Climate Information and Early Warning System (EWS) Project, 26 September 2018, Phnom Penh.

UNDP Cambodia (2018). Refined Stakeholder Engagement Plan.

UNDP Cambodia (2018). Grant Agreement with People in Need.

UNDP Cambodia (2018). Grant Agreement with DCA.

UNDP Cambodia (2019). Project Brief. Strengthening climate information and early warning systems in Cambodia to support climate resilient development and adaptation to climate change Project. www.kh.undp.org http://www.adaptation-undp.org/projects/ldcf-ews-cambodia

UNDP Cambodia (2019). Annual Project Progress Report, UNDP Cambodia, Strengthening climate information and early warning systems in Cambodia to support climate resilient development and adaptation to climate change Project, January-December 2018.

UNDP Cambodia (2019). Transfer of title of assets from the UNDP to the Government of the Kingdom of Cambodia. March 22, 2019

UNDP Cambodia (2020). Annual Project Progress Report, UNDP Cambodia, Strengthening climate information and early warning systems in Cambodia to support climate resilient development and adaptation to climate change Project, January-December 2019.

Additionally: Quarterly reports for 2015 to 2019, APRs (2015-2019), PIRs (2015-2019), project website and online-media / platform.

ANNEX C: EVALUATION QUESTIONS

(Note: This could be amended after the consultation with the UNDP Project Team)

This Evaluation Criteria Matrix must be fully completed/amended by the consultant and included in the TE inception report and as an Annex to the TE report.

Evaluative Questions	Indicators	Data sources
1.Project Strategy		
Design		
Is the project strategy relevant to the country priorities and aligned with development priorities?	Alignment with policies, new policy development	Project documents, (draft) policies, project staff and partners
Has the country taken full ownership?	Project Board meetings, replication of activities, budget lines reserved for post-project continuation.	Minutes, project documents, project staff and partners
Were planned monitoring and evaluation arrangement adequate?	M&E Plan use, need for change/adjustment of M&E	M&E plan, reports, staff
Are other strategies possible to achieve expected results? BAU?	Other projects/partners/initiatives	Project documents
Results Framework/ Log frame		
Are the indicators and targets SMART and are amendments/revisions needed?	Logframe indicators, MT and EoP targets	Project reports, M&E
Are the objectives and outcomes clear and realistic? Are revisions needed?	Logframe objectives/outcomes	Project reports, M&E
Are there indicators reflecting beneficial development effects: e.g. income generation?	Agricultural production (ECCA survey for baseline and EoP)	Project reports, M&E, Survey format and results
2. Progress Towards Results		
To which extent progresses towards outputs or outcomes have been achieved?	% of outputs and outcomes achieved: See Progress Towards Results Matrix	M&E reports, Interviews (PMT)
	GEF TT: AMAT at baseline and MTR	AMAT1 and AMAT-MTR
What are remaining barriers to achieving the project objective in the remainder of the project?	Description of specific challenges/barriers/constraints	Project reports, risk table/assessment, interviews
Early signs of successful interventions?	Replication/adoption of approaches, methodologies, collaboration efforts etc.	Project reports, interviews
Inclusive gender approach?	UNDP Gender Marker, disaggregated beneficiaries/participants	Project reports, interviews
3. Project Implementation and Adaptive Management		
Management Arrangements		
Project management set-up effective?	Timely and accurate reporting,	
Effective coordination between partners/stakeholders?		Interviews of stakeholders/partners
Is the Project's governance effective?	Is the governance structure well designed? Do governance bodies (PB) function well?	Interviews, Minutes, reports.
Is the Project's management efficient?	Are planning and budget activities carried out well? Are effective quality-assurance arrangements established?	
Is the programme well designed?	Does the project logical framework allow for good project management?	Logframe Interview (PMT)
	Has the programme been able to adapt successfully to changing circumstances?	Interviews
Is the quality of the outputs sufficient?	Stakeholders perception of the quality of outputs	Interviews
	Quality of expertise involved	Interviews, CV of main experts(?)

Work Planning		
Are work plans and implementation timely and of good quality?	Stakeholders perception, AWP-Bs review, timely delivery	Interviews, reports
Is work planning participatory?	Participation of stakeholders Gender sensitive	Interviews, reports
Finance and co-finance		
Is the project able to spend its budget on-time?	Rate of delivery against approved budget; evolution over time (Y to Y)	M&E reports
Are interventions cost-effective?	Procurement options for cost-effectiveness; Stakeholder perception.	Interviews, reports
Co-finance use/expenditure?	Co-financing table, reporting by co-financing partners, actual versus planned.	Reports, interviews
Is financial management effective?	Fund flow issues, audit objections etc.	Audit reports, project reports, interviews
Project-level M&E Systems		
Is the M&E system functioning and effective?	Are results well monitored and evaluated in terms of activities, outputs and outcomes?	M&E reports, interviews
How is M&E information used?	Partners involvement, management decisions, M&E missions-field visits?	Reports, interviews
Stakeholder engagement		
Has the project developed appropriate partnerships with key stakeholders?	Stakeholder perception, stakeholder plan,	Reports, interviews
Are stakeholder engaged and involved in planning and decision-making?	Stakeholder perception, reports	Reports, interviews
Reporting		
Has the Project produced timely and quality reports?	Stakeholder perception, QA of UNDP-RTAs	Quarterly, annual reports, GEF TTs etc.
Communications		
Is internal project communication with stakeholders regular and effective?	Stakeholder perception,	Interviews, reports
How does the public reach the general public?	Social media, web site, brochures, video's, newspapers, manuals etc.	Reports, interviews
4. Sustainability		
Are the risks identified in the ProDoc still valid? Have they changed over time?	Risk Table, changes?	Reports, Interviews
How have these risks affected the Project? How have they been mitigated?	Delays, failure, strategy changes etc.	Reports, Interviews
Availability of resources Post-Project?	Budgets internalized in government budget (e.g. O&M budget, training, staffing etc.)	Reports, Interviews
Technical knowledge and human resource capacity secured?	Staffing, budget, built awareness, knowledge, curriculum developed.	Reports, Interviews

Long List of Questions divided over the 4 evaluation categories

A   Project Strategy

Project design:

- Does the project address the underlying problem and are the underlying assumptions valid?
- Have changes to the context or incorrect assumptions affected to achieving the project results as outlined in the Project Document?
- Is the project strategy relevant and does it provides the most effective route towards expected/intended results?
- Were lessons from other relevant projects properly incorporated into the project design?
- Does the project address country priorities? How can we prove this?
- Has Cambodia taken full ownership. Was the project concept in line with the national sector development priorities and plans of the country?
- Has the project been able to be responsive and respond flexibly to the needs of the RGC?
- Was the project design adequate to meet its objective?
- Looking back: was the formulation process participatory with involvement of key stakeholders and beneficiaries?
- To what extent were gender issues raised and integrated in the project design? (See Annex 9 of Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects for further guidelines.)
- To what extent was the project design adequate and effective for strengthening capacities (technical and administration)?
- Were the planned monitoring and evaluation arrangements adequate?
    - How appropriate and useful were the project's M&E framework, including targets and indicators, in assessing progress?
    - Were the targeted indicator values realistic and can they be tracked?
    - Has the M&E framework been adapted (have indicators or targets been adjusted?)?

Results Framework/Logframe:

- Are the project's logframe indicators and targets, at the midterm and end-of-project SMART? (Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Relevant, Time-bound), and are specific amendments or revisions needed to the targets and indicators?
- Are the project's objectives and outcomes or components clear, practical, and feasible within its time frame? Is there any need for adjustment or redefinition?
- Has progress so far led to, or could in the future, catalyse beneficial development effects (i.e. income generation, gender equality and women's empowerment, improved governance etc...) that should be included in the project results framework and monitored on an annual basis? E.g. the indicator used for increased agricultural production and the ECCA baseline?
- Are broader development and gender aspects of the project being monitored effectively? Does the project have 'development' indicators, including sex-disaggregated indicators and indicators that capture development benefits?

B   Progress Towards Results

Progress Towards Outcomes Analysis:

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

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

Project Strategy	Indicator[5]	Baseline Level[6]	Level in 1st PIR (self-reported)	Midterm Target[7]	End-of-project Target	Midterm Level & Assessment[8]	Achievement Rating[9]	Justification for Rating
Objective:	Indicator (if applicable):							
Outcome 1:	Indicator 1:							
	Indicator 2:							
Outcome 2:	Indicator 3:							
	Indicator 4:							
	Etc.							
Etc.								

Indicator Assessment Key

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

In addition to the progress towards outcomes analysis:
- The GEF Tracking Tool at the Baseline will be compared and analysed with the one completed right before the Midterm Review (***the EWS Project makes use of the Tracking Tool for Climate Change Adaptation, the AMAT, the Adaptation Monitoring and Assessment Tool***).
- What are remaining barriers to achieving the project objective in the remainder of the project?
- Building on the aspects of the project that have already been successful (which?), in what manner could the project further expand these benefits?
- What is the performance of the project in achieving the results stipulated in the UNDP Gender Marker (i.e. "GEN2")?

C   Project Implementation and Adaptive Management

---

[5] Populate with data from the Logframe and scorecards

[6] Populate with data from the Project Document

[7] If available

[8] Colour code this column only

[9] Use the 6 point Progress Towards Results Rating Scale: HS, S, MS, MU, U, HU

Management Arrangements:

- Is the of project management set-up of the project effective?
- Have changes been made and are they effective?
- Are responsibilities and reporting lines clear?
- Is decision-making transparent and undertaken in a timely manner?
- Have the project implementation arrangements contributed to the enhanced capacity of the key implementation partners?
- How is the quality of support provided by the GEF Partner Agency (UNDP) assessed by the key stakeholders? Are these areas for improvement?
- In which areas does the project have the greatest achievements? Why is this and what have been supporting factors?
- In which areas does the project have least achievements? What have been the constraining factors and how have these been mitigated?

Work Planning:

- What have been the main reasons for the initial implementation delay after project approval?
- What was the reason for a project strategy refinement and how has this affected or improved the effectiveness of the project implementation?
- Are work-planning processes results-based?
- is the results framework/ logframe effectively used as a management tool and have any changes made to it since project start (and why)?
- Has relevant gender expertise been sought? Have available gender mainstreaming tools been adapted and mainstreamed?
- Have the quantity and quality of the outputs been satisfactory?
    - Are the project partners using the outputs?
    - Have they transformed into outcomes?
    - To what extent are the project implemented activities/outputs having impact and how have these been coordinated with other stakeholders in Cambodia and abroad?

Finance and co-finance:

- Has the financial management of the project been efficient, with specific reference to the cost-effectiveness of interventions?
- Have there been changes in fund allocations as a result of budget revisions (what and why)?
- Does the project have the appropriate financial controls, including reporting and planning, that allow management to make informed decisions regarding the budget and allow for timely flow of funds? Has fund flow been timely?
- Have the audits been without major issues?
- What have been yearly expenditure rates as indication of financial delivery (spent versus planned ratio)?
- Is co-financing being used strategically to help the objectives of the project? Is the Project Team meeting with all co-financing partners regularly in order to align financing priorities and annual work plans? **(Co-financing monitoring table to be filled-out).**

Project-level Monitoring and Evaluation Systems:

- Are the monitoring tools currently being used providing the necessary information?
- Do they involve key partners? Who is monitoring?
- Are they aligned or mainstreamed with national systems?
- Do they use existing information? Are they efficient? Are they cost-effective?
- Are additional tools required? How could they be made more participatory and inclusive?
- Are sufficient resources being allocated to monitoring and evaluation? Are these resources being allocated effectively?
- Has relevant information and data systematically been collected? Was reporting satisfactory. Was data disaggregated by sex?
- Has information been regularly analysed to feed into management decisions?

Stakeholder Engagement:

- Has the project developed and leveraged the necessary and appropriate partnerships with direct and tangential stakeholders? E.g., see the refined stakeholder plan in their involvement over time.
- Do local and national government stakeholders support the objectives of the project? Do they continue to have an active role in project decision-making that supports efficient and effective project implementation?
- To what extent has stakeholder involvement and public awareness contributed to the progress towards achievement of project objectives?

Reporting:

- Have adaptive management changes been reported by the project management and shared with the Project Board.
- How well have the Project Team and partners undertaken and fulfilled GEF reporting requirements?
- Have lessons derived from the adaptive management process been documented, shared with key partners and internalized by partners?

Communications:

- Is internal project communication with stakeholders regular and effective? Are there key stakeholders left out of communication? Are there feedback mechanisms when communication is received? Does this communication with stakeholders contribute to their awareness of project outcomes and activities and investment in the sustainability of project results?
- Are proper means of communication established or being established to express the project progress and intended impact to the public (is there a web presence, has the project used social media for Knowledge Management/Outreach? Did the project implement appropriate outreach and public awareness campaigns?)?
- How has the project been able to reach illiterate or vulnerable households as beneficiaries or in building public awareness?

D   Sustainability

- Are the risks identified in the Project Document, Annual Project Review/PIRs and the ATLAS Risk Management Module still the most important and are the risk ratings applied still appropriate and up to date. Have they changed over time?
- Which risks and assumptions were identified and managed? To what extent have they affected the project?
    - What were these main risks and have they been mitigated adequately?
    - What were main assumptions so that the project could be achieved? Are these assumptions still valid?
    - Have new or unforeseen challenges and/or risks come up during the implementation period?

Financial risks to sustainability:

- What is the likelihood of financial and economic resources not being available once the GEF assistance ends (consider potential resources can be from multiple sources, such as the public and private sectors, income generating activities, and other funding that will be adequate financial resources for sustaining project's outcomes)?
- Are O&M budgets now planned for sufficient for adequate maintenance and operation and for what period?
- Is the private sector able to contribute or are other funding sources being explored?

Socio-economic risks to sustainability:

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

Institutional Framework and Governance risks to sustainability:

- Do the legal frameworks, policies, governance structures and processes pose risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project benefits? Are the required systems/ mechanisms for accountability, transparency, and technical knowledge transfer are in place.

Environmental risks to sustainability:

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

Likelihood of Impact (social and environmental)
Questions related to what extent the Project has contributed to, or is likely to contribute towards impact, such as changes in the governance systems and stakeholder behaviour, and to impact on the environment and how it affects human well-being.

- What have been the impacts of the Project, both in social and environmental dimension? What are the future likely impacts?
    - What is the Project 's impact in terms of initial objectives?
    - What are the emerging impacts of the Project and the changes that can be causally linked to the Project interventions?
    - What are the arrangements to measure the Project 's impact during and at the end of the Project? Are these arrangements adequate and will they deliver reliable findings?
    - In how far has the Project made a contribution to the broader, longer-term climate change adaptation and sustainable development strategy?
    - What has changed in the life of beneficiaries? (e.g ECCA baseline and EoP Survey, other quantitative sources of evidence).
- Has the Project identified opportunities for it to be scaled up? If so, how should in future the programme objectives and strategies be adjusted?

Sustainability of Impact
Questions geared at analysing the likelihood of sustainable outcomes at termination of the Project's mandate, with attention to sustainability of financial resources, the socio-political environment, catalytic or replication effects, institutional and governance factors, and environmental risks.

- Is there an effective and realistic exit strategy for the Project?
    - Are local governments and implementing partners able, willing and committed to continue with similar interventions? How effectively has the project built national ownership and capacity?
    - Has the project successfully built or strengthened an enabling environment (laws, policies, technical capacities, local knowledge, people's attitudes, etc.)?
    - Are the impacts of the project's sustainable and what have been key factors to ensure sustainability of impact?
- Are apparent impacts of the project's actions likely to be lasting after the completion of the project, or is there a need for future additional support?

Questions related to the Project's performance in terms of gender mainstreaming, integration of social and environmental safeguards at design and during implementation, and contributions to broader organisational learning of the participating agencies.

The project progress in gender equality and promotion
- To what extent has the Project progress/achievement contributed to address gender issues identified and to promote gender justice?
- What strategies have been developed and what explicit actions have been taken to ensure women participation in the programme implementation?
- Has the Project identified/strengthened skills by gender?

Environmental and social safeguards
- What kind of environmental and social safeguard mechanisms have been applied by the Project to identify potentially negative impacts of activities and how to mitigate these?

Organisational learning and knowledge management
- How has the Project promoted organisational learning and how has it enhanced knowledge sharing with its beneficiaries and partners within and outside of the UN System?
- What are emerging key lessons and best practices from the Project and how have these been documented and shared with a wider audience?

ANNEX D: RATING SCALES

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

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

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

Relevance ratings:
2. Relevant (R)
1. Not Relevant (NR)
Additional ratings where relevant:
Not Applicable (N/A)
Unable to Assess (U/A)

ANNEX E: EVALUATION CONSULTANT CODE OF CONDUCT AND AGREEMENT FORM

Evaluators:

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

Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form[10]

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

Name of Consultant: _____

Name of Consultancy Organization (where relevant)**:** _____

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

Signed at *place* on *date*

Signature: _____

ANNEX F: EVALUATION REPORT OUTLINE[11]

i.   Opening page:
   - Title of UNDP supported GEF financed project
   - UNDP and GEF project ID#s
   - Evaluation time frame and date of evaluation report
   - Region and countries included in the project
   - GEF Operational Program/Strategic Program
   - Implementing Partner and other project partners
   - Evaluation team members
   - Acknowledgements

ii. Executive Summary
   - Project Summary Table
   - Project Description (brief)
   - Evaluation Rating Table
   - Summary of conclusions, recommendations and lessons

iii. Acronyms and Abbreviations (See: UNDP Editorial Manual[12])

1.   Introduction
   - Purpose of the evaluation
   - Scope & Methodology
   - Structure of the evaluation report

2.   Project description and development context
   - Project start and duration
   - Problems that the project sought to address
   - Immediate and development objectives of the project
   - Baseline Indicators established
   - Main stakeholders
   - Expected Results

3.   Findings (In addition to a descriptive assessment, all criteria marked with (*) must be rated[13])

3.1 Project Design / Formulation
   - Analysis of LFA/Results Framework (Project logic /strategy; Indicators)
   - Assumptions and Risks
   - Lessons from other relevant projects (e.g., same focal area) incorporated into project design
   - Planned stakeholder participation
   - Replication approach
   - UNDP comparative advantage
   - Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector
   - Management arrangements

3.2 Project Implementation
   - Adaptive management (changes to the project design and project outputs during implementation)
   - Partnership arrangements (with relevant stakeholders involved in the country/region)
   - Feedback from M&E activities used for adaptive management
   - Project Finance

---

[11]The Report length should not exceed *40* pages in total (not including annexes).

[12] UNDP Style Manual, Office of Communications, Partnerships Bureau, updated November 2008

[13] See Annex D for rating scales.

- Monitoring and evaluation: design at entry (*), implementation (*), and overall assessment (*)
- Implementing Agency (UNDP) execution (*) and Executing Agency execution (*), overall project implementation/ execution (*), coordination, and operational issues

3.3   Project Results

- Overall results (attainment of objectives) (*)
- Relevance (*)
- Effectiveness (*)
- Efficiency (*)
- Country ownership
- Mainstreaming
- Sustainability: financial resources (*), socio-economic (*), institutional framework and governance (*), environmental (*), and overall likelihood (*)
- Impact

4.   Conclusions, Recommendations & Lessons

- Corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project
- Actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the project
- Proposals for future directions underlining main objectives
- Best and worst practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance and success

5.   Annexes

- ToR
- Itinerary
- List of persons interviewed
- Summary of field visits
- List of documents reviewed
- Evaluation Question Matrix
- Questionnaire used and summary of results
- Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form
- Report Clearance Form
- *Annexed in a separate file:* TE audit trail
- *Annexed in a separate file:* Terminal GEF Tracking Tool, if applicable

ANNEX G: EVALUATION REPORT CLEARANCE FORM

(to be completed by CO and UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based in the region and included in the final document)

Evaluation Report Reviewed and Cleared by

UNDP Country Office

Name: _____

Signature: _____ Date: _____

UNDP GEF RTA

Name: _____

Signature: _____ Date: _____

ANNEX H: TE REPORT AUDIT TRAIL

The following is a template for the evaluator 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*) (UNDP *PIMS #)*

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