*EEPM*

**TERMS OF REFERENCE**

**SSA No.** **XXX/2021**

**Title**  Terminal evaluator for ExB Project 1101924

**Start of Assignment** **03 March 2021**

**End of Assignment** **05 May 2021**

**Location** Homebased

**Objective** The expert is to conduct Terminal Evaluation of the GEF project “Enabling transboundary co-operation and integrated water resources management in the Dniester River Basin” in line with the Guidance for Conducting Terminal Reviews of GEF Financed Projects.

**Background**

The GEF funded project “Enabling transboundary cooperation and integrated water resources management in the Dniester River Basin”, implemented by the OSCE in close co-operation with UNDP and UNECE is tasked with strengthening Moldovan-Ukrainian cooperation in the area of integrated water resources management in the Dniester basin. The project supports and promotes international dialogue with regard to both countries’ commitments to the implementation of the EU Water Framework Directive, which is part of the EU Association Agreements with Ukraine and Moldova, as well as with regard to the Moldovan-Ukrainian Dniester River basin Commission.

The project is being implemented in the two countries where the Dniester River basin is located, i.e. the Republic of Moldova and Ukraine. The project started in August 2017, was officially registered with the OSCE in October 2017, and will terminate in May 2021. Its implementing agency is UNDP, while the executive agency is the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE); the UNECE is supporting the project implementation with the consultancy on a range of technical issues. The total project budget is 1,950,000 USD, with co-financing from the beneficiaries (ministries of the environment, OSCE, UNDP, UNECE, Swiss Development Cooperation, and Polish water authorities). The project beneficiaries are the ministries of the environment of the two riparian states, its stakeholders include the water authorities, hydropower sector, foreign affairs authorities, authorities of protected areas, fisheries agencies, local communities, scientists, NGOs, general public.

The **overall goal** of the GEF project “Enabling transboundary cooperation and integrated water resources management in the Dniester River Basin” is “to strengthen sustainable development, through the update of the TDA, development and endorsement of the SAP and initiation of its implementation”. The project consists of the following three components.

**Component 1:**

* development of the transboundary diagnostic analysis (TDA, including an inventory of tailing mines),
* study of an influence of the Dniester on the Black Sea,
* analysis of nitrate and phosphorus contamination,
* completion of water balance automated system,
* inventory of tailings in the Dniester basin,
* development of projects for adaptation to climate change in Odesa region of Ukraine.

**Component 2:**

* development of a joint (Moldova-Ukraine) action plan (SAP, = basin management plan),
* supporting work of the national basin councils and the bilateral (Moldova-Ukraine) Dniester River Basin Commission,
* work with hydropower.

**Component 3:**

* support to joint monitoring and data sharing,
* identification of flood risks,
* demonstration projects (restoration of small rivers),
* public awareness (the Dniester Day on May 27, art competition “Colours of the Dniester”, joint expeditions, etc.).

In accordance with UNDP and GEF M&E policies and procedures, all full- and medium-sized UNDP-supported GEF-financed projects are required to undergo a Terminal Evaluation (TE) at the end of the project. This Terms of Reference (ToR) sets out the expectations for the TE of the medium-sized project titled “Enabling transboundary cooperation and integrated water resources management in the Dniester River Basin” (PIMS 5269) implemented through the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE). The project started on the Project Document signature 10 August 2017, was registered in OSCE’s system on 25 October 2017, and is in its last year of implementation.

This TE will be guided by the standards for commissioned evaluations as set out in Section IV of the OSCE Evaluation Framework Administrative Instruction No. 1/2013 and will also follow other applicable international standards. In this case, the TE will follow specific guidelines on the purpose, scope and methodology of terminal reviews, on main evaluation criteria, and the indicators/benchmarks against which the criteria will be assessed as set out in the UNDP Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-supported, GEF-financed Projects (*(*[*http://web.undp.org/evaluation/guideline/documents/GEF/TE\_GuidanceforUNDP-supportedGEF-financedProjects.pdf*](http://web.undp.org/evaluation/guideline/documents/GEF/TE_GuidanceforUNDP-supportedGEF-financedProjects.pdf)*).* This Guidance standardizes the approach to undertaking mid-term reviews of the GEF funded projects and is, therefore, essential to this assignment. Guidance and OSCE Administrative Instructions will be shared with the Contractor at the start of the assignment.

A quality control process will be put in place to ensure that a draft TE report will be reviewed for accuracy of findings and to confirm that recommendations are objective, relevant to the project being assessed and capable of implementation prior to the clearance of the report by the OSCE. Wherever applicable, the TE report will seek to indicate state staff members and entities responsible for implementing recommendations and respective timeframes. The current terminal evaluation is preceded by the mid-term review, carried out in 2019.

The **purpose** of the TE is to provide an impartial evaluation of the project in terms of its relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, sustainability, overall performance, management and achievements.

The **objectives** of the evaluation are to assess the achievement of projects’ results, and to draw lessons that can both improve the sustainability of benefits from these projects, and aid in the overall enhancement of GEF programming.

The TE will assess the extent to which planned project results have been achieved since the beginning of the projects in August 2017/ October 2017 till the end of the project in May 2021 (based on their Project Document and Project Results Framework, as well as considering the results of the MTE). Also, the TE will assess the monitoring and evaluation aspect of the project and its compliance with UNDP and GEF minimum standards, including SMART criteria for indicators.

The information, findings, lessons learned, and recommendations generated by the TE will be used by the OSCE and the implementing partners to inform prospects for eventual replication and sustainability of the intervention.

In line with the donor’s requirement, an international consultant will be hired by the OSCE to assess the progress and performance of the GEF project “Enabling transboundary cooperation and integrated water resources management in the Dniester River Basin” since the start of its implementation in August 2017 (officially registered with the OSCE in October 2017) as per the tasks described below. Kindly refer to Annexes for the TE approach and methodology, detailed scope of the TE and other information relevant for the assignment.

**Tasks**

Under the supervision of **Ms.Tamara Kutonova, National Project Officer,** the Expert will perform the following tasks:

1. To conduct a **desk review** of the project documents (i.e. PIF, Project Document, annual Project Implementation Reports (PIRs), Project Inception Report, finalized GEF focal area Tracking Tools, Project Steering Committee meetings’ minutes, Mid-Term Review Report, project budget revisions, Financial and Administration guidelines used by the Project Team, project files, and any other materials that the evaluator considers useful for this evidence-based assessment) provided by the OSCE Project Team and the implementing agency (UNDP). Data analysis should be conducted in a systematic manner to ensure that all findings, conclusions and recommendations are substantiated by evidence. Appropriate tools should be used to ensure proper analysis (e.g. data analysis matrix). Kindly refer to Annexes for more details.
2. To participate in an **TE inception meeting** with the PSC and the implementing agency to clarify the objectives, methods, deliverables, a timeline and a draft table of content of the TE. The proposed methodology may employ any relevant and appropriate quantitative, qualitative or combined methods to conduct the TE.
3. To conduct interviews with the following (will be clarified during the inception meeting):
	1. UNDP Senior Management,
	2. the Dniester River Basin Commission Co-Chairs and heads of its working groups from the Republic of Moldova and Ukraine,
	3. GEF Operational Focal Points in the Republic of Moldova and Ukraine,
	4. Deputy heads of the national water authorities of the Republic of Moldova and Ukraine,
	5. Project Manager, GEF Dniester Project regional project coordinator and a national project coordinator (OSCE),
	6. relevant NGOs active in the Dniester river basin,
	7. UNECE Regional Adviser on the Environment.

The evaluation questions will be discussed with the evaluator at the start of the assignment.

1. To draft the evaluation report according to the outline presented in Annex C.
2. To present the draft report to those interviewed, the OSCE and the UNDP, collect the feedback and integrate it to the final report.
3. To finalize the evaluation report and prepare an audit trail with details on comments received and incorporated, according to the outline presented in Annex H.

**Expected Deliverables**

1. A draft desk review and TE inception meeting report (incl. objectives, methods, deliverables, the timeline and the draft table of content of the Midterm Review) – 1 (one) week before the TE inception meeting, the final version of the document – 2 days after the inception meeting **– 15 days;**
2. Presentation of the Draft Evaluation Report (as per an outline provided in the Annex C) to the executing agency’s project management (OSCE) and the implementation agency (UNDP), including RTA, up to 20 pp. of a main text – **12 days;**
3. Revised Final Report with recommendations and Audit trail (template in TOR Annex H) in which the TE details how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final TE report – **7 days.**

The final TE report shall be written in English and shall be presented in electronic form in MS Word format. It will be cleared by the OSCE as an executing agency. If applicable, the Project Coordination Unit (OSCE) may choose to arrange for a translation of the report into a language more widely shared by national stakeholders.

**Total 34 days (2 months)**

**CONFIDENTIAL For use in HR Unit only**

**Necessary Qualifications**

* P5 expertise level
* At least a Master of Science degree and relevant demonstrated regional/international consulting experience in transboundary water ecosystems.
* A minimum of 10 years’ relevant experience is required.
* Recent experience with result-based management evaluation methodologies.
* Project evaluation/review experiences within United Nations system will be considered an asset.
* Competence in adaptive management, as applied to GEF International Waters Focal Area.
* Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender and GEF International Waters Focal Area; experience in gender sensitive evaluation and analysis.
* Experience applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios.
* Excellent English writing and communication skills, and demonstrated ability to assess complex situations in order to succinctly and clearly distil critical issues and draw well supported conclusions.
* Understanding of governance, political, economic and institutional issues associated with the region.
* Familiarity with GEF International Waters strategies and its portfolio.

**Selection method and justification**

[ ]  LWC: *[please indicate that assignment is given within xxx/2021 contract]*

[ ]  exemption granted by the head of executive structure (ref. SI 23, para 7.8 or para 6.3): *[attach approved memo]*

[ ]  exception from SI 23 granted by the SG: *[attach approved exception request]*

[x]  open recruitment: **VNUKRC00643**

[ ]  direct selection for low-value contracts: *[provide selection related information]*

[ ]  roster selection: *[provide names of at least 3 experts from the roster considered for this consultancy and state briefly the reasons for selection of the proposed consultant and rejection of the others]*

**ANNEXES TO TERMINAL EVALUATION TERMS OF REFERENCE**

* ToR Annex A: Project Logical/Results Framework
* ToR Annex B: Project Information Package to be reviewed by TE consultant
* ToR Annex C: Content of the TE report
* ToR Annex D: Evaluation Criteria Matrix template
* ToR Annex E: UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluators
* ToR Annex F: TE Rating Scales and TE Ratings Table
* ToR Annex G: TE Report Clearance Form
* ToR Annex H: TE Audit Trail template
* ToR Annex I: TE Approach and Methodology
* ToR Annex J: Detailed scope of the TE
* ToR Annex K: Evaluator ethics

**ToR Annex A: Project Logical/Results Framework**

|  |
| --- |
| **This project will contribute to the following Sustainable Development Goal (s):** *This project is aligned with goals and targets associated with SDG 6 (in particular target 6.5 on IWRM and 6.6 to protect and restore water-related ecosystems), it also contributes to the implementation of the SDG 2 (food security), 5 (gender), 13 (combating climate change and its impacts), 14 (life below water) and 15 (life on land), and will assist the two countries in meeting these targets.* |
| **This project will be linked to the following output of the UNDP Strategic Plan:**Primary Output 1.3: Solutions developed at national and sub-national levels for sustainable management of natural resources, ecosystem services, chemicals and waste.Indicator 1.3.1: Number of new partnership mechanisms with funding for sustainable management solutions of natural resources, ecosystem services, chemicals and waste at national and/or subnational level. Secondary Output 2.5: Legal and regulatory frameworks, policies and institutions enabled to ensure the conservation, sustainable use, and access and benefit sharing of natural resources, biodiversity and ecosystems, in line with international conventions and national legislation.*Output Indicator 2.5.2: Number of countries implementing national and local plans for integrated Water Resource Management.* |

|  | **Objective and Outcome Indicators**  | **Baseline****[[1]](#footnote-1)**  | **Mid-term Target[[2]](#footnote-2)**  | **End of Project Target**  | **Assumptions[[3]](#footnote-3)**  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Project Objective:*****Integrated water resources management in the Dniester river basin to strengthen sustainable development, through the update of the TDA, development and endorsement of the SAP and initiation of its implementation******3-4 indicators maximum*** | Indicator 1.3.1: Number of new partnership mechanisms with funding for sustainable management solutions of natural resources, ecosystem services, chemicals and waste at national and/or subnational levelIndicator 2.5.2: Extent to which capacities to implement national or local plans for integrated water resource management or to protect and restore the health, productivity and resilience of oceans and marine ecosystems have improved. | Established regional collaboration in adjacent water bodies (e.g. through the ICPDR)EU Association Agreements signed by MD/UA promote use of IWRM approaches. Previous studies (EU, GEF and other) will provide substantial information for development of TDA/SAP and RBMP | Partnership with Black Sea through EMBLASAgreed analyses of basin with identified transboundary issues (TDA)  | Functional and sustainable joint body for managing the Dniester River basinRBMP/SAP Endorsed at ‘highest’ level within MD/UA Governments as basis for implementing agreed management actions*MD/UA initiating implementing actions agreed in SAP and progressing with finalizing EU RBMP* | Full active participation in the project by both countries and collaboration with related on-going projects |
| Operational bi-national river authority (commission) functioning with advice from expert working groups and involvement from wide range of stakeholders | Currently no regular meeting of binational authority | *3 bi-national authority meetings and activities supported by project**3 private sector organisations involved with joint river authority and/or river councils**At least 3 civil society groups participating in meetings**10 experts trained on collecting information on the TDA / SAP* | *6 bi-national meetings**5 private sector organisations involved with joint river authority and/or river councils**At least 5 civil society groups participating in meetings**15 experts trained on collecting information on the TDA / SAP* |
| *Countries identify means to implement the SAP/RBMP*  | *TBD* | *Potential sources of financing for SAP/RBMP implementation identified* | *At least 2 potential sources (inc national funds) approached* |

|  | **Objective and Outcome Indicators**  | **Baseline**  | **Mid-term Target** | **End of Project Target**  | **Assumptions** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Component 1 /****In-depth analysis of water resources, related ecosystems and their use*****Outcomes****1) Science- based consensus among the countries and key stakeholders on major transboundary problems of the basin**2) Understanding current and future priority environmental issues, and their transboundary implications, including potential implications for security, by key basin stakeholders and the public**3)Local stakeholders ready to minimize negative consequences for economic sectors as well as the environment in the basin*  | TDA completed and agreed by Moldova and Ukraine | *Data /information not collated for TDA purposes* | *Data gaps addressed**TDA completed**National and TB priorities confirmed**Formally accepted TDA**Inventory of 4 mine tailing dams in the Upper Dniester conducted* | *TDA accepted by mid-term**Inventory of 6 mine tailing dams in the Upper Dniester conducted*  |  |
| Scenarios and methodologies for predicting ‘water futures’ available to basin stakeholders | *Climate change scenarios exist however are no current estimates of water balance*  | *Water balance calculated considering future water demand and climate change*  |  |
| Local strategy for adaptation to climate change developed | *No local strategies in the Ukrainian part of the basin* | *The strategy is developed by the beneficiaries in MD/UA**Strategy development and its application involved 3 towns and 10 private sector organisations* | *At least 2 funding sources are found for implementation of the strategy* *Strategy development involved 15 private sector organisations* |
| **Component 2****Development of the policy, legal and institutional set-up, mandate and capacities of the River Basin Commission for strengthened basin-level cooperation****Outcomes**4) Strengthened environmental transboundary cooperation in the Dniester basin5) Agreed actions to address major transboundary problems of the Dniester basin (SAP) with established collaborative mechanism for multi-country cooperation framework 6) Involvement of stakeholders in the decision making processes of the Commission and its institutions7) Project experiences and lessons disseminated globally and regionally | *Strengthen bilateral bodies* | *3 scenarios have been identified which will define the route taken by the project.* *Targets for mid-term and end-of-project will be defined by month 6* |  *Minimum 2 bilateral meetings held**Rules for exploitation of the Dniester reservoirs drafted* | *5 bilateral meetings held**Rules for exploitation of the Dniester reservoirs agreed upon by the riparians* |
| *SAP Endorsed by high-level representatives from Moldova and Ukraine* | *Data partly available but not analysed through TDA process nor key transboundary issues validated* | *In progress* | *SAP/international RBMP endorsed by ministers from MD/UA for future implementation*  |
| *Increase in stakeholder involvement in water governance/management and awareness* | *Broad stakeholder in governance/ management is currently low.* | *Number of stakeholder organisations increase by 5% from baseline**2meetings of the national River Basin intersectoral councils* *70 information boards installed along river**Successful completion of 1 competition for ‘Eco Dniester Start-ups’**Completion of one kayak expedition**Surveys indicate increased awareness on water/environment by 10%* | *Number of stakeholder organisations increase by 10% from baseline**3meetings of the River Basin Committee**Gender mainstreaming included in national plans for water management* *Surveys indicate increased awareness on water /environment by 20%* |
| *Number of lessons/experiences disseminated* | *n/a* | *At least 1 GEF Experience Notes completed* | *At least 3 GEF Experience Notes completed* |
| *Number of national stakeholders trained* | *N/A* |  *3 inter-sectoral meetings facilitated**15 twinning/exchange participants**Minimum 5 representatives of Hydromet took up half capacity building long-term course* | *6 inter-sectoral meetings facilitated**30 twinning/exchange participants* |
| **Component 3****Strengthening of water resources and biodiversity monitoring and conservation, and information exchange in the Dniester River Basin*****Outcomes***8) Stronger information base and better accessibility of the relevant information in the Dniester basin for the joint management of water resources9) A coordinated institutional and legal framework for access to and exchange of information from monitoring and other sources, including the use and further development of the Dniester basin GIS involving stakeholders from the whole basin10) Improved capacities for monitoring in the basin, and the partial implementation of the agreed monitoring and information exchange programme | *Establishment of framework for flood early warning and forecasting* | *No international flood early warning system available* | *Agreements between MD/UA on procedures* | *Approved framework for flood forecasting and warning* *Warning procedures adopted for use by bi-national river authorities* |
| *Agreement on data exchanges and monitoring with Improvements on hydro-met services* | *As above* | *Procedures for data exchange drafted**An information platform within the adequate institutions with hydromet information in place*  | *Agreed procedures for inter-sectoral exchange of information and ensured access of public to data*  |
| *Implementation of pilot demonstration project* | *N/A* | *3 pilot demonstration project initiated and in-progress**Stress reduction targets for pilots defined and agreed by 2nd PSC meeting.*  | *3 demonstration projects completed and results guiding SAP and RBMP finalization**All demo projects have agreed replication / upscaling strategy*  |
| *Increased availability of basin-wide information* | *N/A* | *130 participants attend a Dniester River Basin Conference* *50 NGOs participated in Dniester NGO Forum (event parallel to Conference)**3 Press conferences related to basin**30 journalist take part in media engagement activities* *Hydro-met information exchange system operational*  | *6 Press conferences related to basin**Conference proceedings are published**Hydro-met information exchange system operational and data are open to public**50 journalist take part in media engagement activities*  |
| *Project website functional and number of visits* | *N/A* | *Website operational**Reported number of website visits – 1500* | *3000 reported number of site visits* |
| *Participation in GEF IW Conference and IW:LEARN exchanges* | *N/A* | *Project represented (PCU/National participation) at IWC 9* | *10 Dniester participants attend IWL sponsored exchanges* |
|  |  |  |  |

**ToR Annex B: Project Information Package to be reviewed by TE consultant**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| # | Item (electronic versions preferred if available) |
| 1 | Project Identification Form (PIF) |
| 2 | UNDP Initiation Plan |
| 3 | Final UNDP-GEF Project Document with all annexes |
| 4 | CEO Endorsement Request |
| 5 | UNDP Social and Environmental Screening Procedure (SESP) and associated management plans (if any) |
| 6 | Inception Workshop Report |
| 7 | Mid-Term Review report and management response to MTR recommendations |
| 8 | All Project Implementation Reports (PIRs) |
| 9 | Progress reports (quarterly, semi-annual or annual, with associated workplans and financial reports) |
| 10 | Minutes of Project Board Meetings and of other meetings  |
| 11 | GEF Tracking Tools (from CEO Endorsement, midterm and terminal stages) |
| 12 | GEF/LDCF/SCCF Core Indicators (from PIF, CEO Endorsement, midterm and terminal stages); for GEF-6 and GEF-7 projects only |
| 13 | Financial data, including actual expenditures by project outcome, including management costs, and including documentation of any significant budget revisions |
| 14 | Co-financing data with expected and actual contributions broken down by type of co-financing, source, and whether the contribution is considered as investment mobilized or recurring expenditures |
| 15 | Audit reports if available |
| 16 | Electronic copies of project outputs (booklets, manuals, technical reports, articles, etc.) |
| 17 | Sample of project communications materials |
| 18 | Summary list of formal meetings, workshops, etc. held, with date, location, topic, and number of participants |
| 19 | List of related projects/initiatives contributing to project objectives approved/started after GEF project approval (i.e. any leveraged or “catalytic” results) |
| 20 | Data on relevant project website activity – e.g. number of unique visitors per month, number of page views, etc. over relevant time period, if available |
| 21 | UNDP Country Programme Document (CPD) |
| 22 | List of project sites – pilot demonstration projects |
| 23 | List and contact details for project staff, key project stakeholders, including Project Board members, RTA, Project Team members, and other partners to be consulted |
| 24 | Project deliverables that provide documentary evidence of achievement towards project outcomes |

**ToR Annex C: Content of the TE report**

1. *Opening page:*
* *Title of the GEF financed project*
* *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*
1. *Executive Summary*
* *Project Summary Table*
* *Project Description (brief)*
* *Evaluation Rating Table*
* *Summary of conclusions, recommendations and lessons*
1. *Acronyms and Abbreviations (See: UNDP Editorial Manual[[4]](#footnote-4))*
2. *Introduction*
* *Purpose of the evaluation*
* *Scope & Methodology*
* *Structure of the evaluation report*
1. *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*
1. *Findings (In addition to a descriptive assessment, all criteria marked with (\*) must be rated[[5]](#footnote-5))*
	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*
	1. *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:*
* *Monitoring and evaluation: design at entry and implementation (\*)*
* *UNDP and Implementing Partner implementation / execution (\*) coordination, and operational issues*
	1. *Project Results*
* *Overall results (attainment of objectives) (\*)*
* *Relevance(\*)*
* *Effectiveness & Efficiency (\*)*
* *Country ownership*
* *Mainstreaming*
* *Sustainability (\*)*
* *Impact*
1. *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*
1. *Annexes*
* *ToR*
* *Itinerary (if applicable)*
* *List of persons interviewed*
* *Summary of interviews*
* *List of documents reviewed*
* *Evaluation Question Matrix*
* *Questionnaire used and summary of results*
1. *Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form*

**ToR Annex D: Evaluation Criteria Matrix template**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Evaluative Criteria Questions** | **Indicators** | **Sources** | **Methodology** |
| Relevance: How does the project relate to the main objectives of the GEF Focal area, and to the environment and development priorities a the local, regional and national level? |
| *(include evaluative questions)* | *(i.e. relationships established, level of coherence between project design and implementation approach, specific activities conducted, quality of risk mitigation strategies, etc.)* | *(i.e. project documentation, national policies or strategies, websites, project staff, project partners, data collected throughout the TE mission, etc.)* | *(i.e. document analysis, data analysis, interviews with project staff, interviews with stakeholders, etc.)* |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved? |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in line with international and national norms and standards? |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, socio-political, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results? |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Gender equality and women’s empowerment: How did the project contribute to gender equality and women’s empowerment?  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status? |
|  |  |  |  |
| *(Expand the table to include questions for all criteria being assessed: Monitoring & Evaluation, UNDP oversight/implementation, Implementing Partner Execution, cross-cutting issues, etc.)* |

**ToR Annex E: UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluators**

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

**Evaluators/Consultants:**

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

**Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form**

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

Name of Evaluator: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

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

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

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

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

**ToR Annex F: TE Rating Scales & Evaluation Ratings Table**

|  |
| --- |
| **Monitoring & Evaluation Ratings Scale**  |
| 6 = Highly Satisfactory (HS)  | There were no short comings; quality of M&E design/implementation exceeded expectations  |
| 5 = Satisfactory (S)  | There were minor shortcomings; quality of M&E design / implementation met expectations  |
| 4 = Moderately Satisfactory (MS)  | There were moderate shortcomings; quality of M&E design/implementation more or less met expectations  |
| 3 = Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)  | There were significant shortcomings; quality of M&E design /implementation was somewhat lower than expected |
| 2 = Unsatisfactory (U)  | There were major shortcomings; quality of M&E design/implementation was substantially lower than expected  |
| 1 = Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)  | There were severe shortcomings in M&E design/implementation  |
| Unable to Assess (UA)  | The available information does not allow an assessment of the quality of M&E design/implementation.  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Implementation/Oversight and Execution Ratings Scale**  |
| 6 = Highly Satisfactory (HS)  | There were no shortcomings; quality of implementation/execution exceeded expectations  |
| 5 = Satisfactory (S)  | There were no or minor shortcomings; quality of implementation/execution met expectations.  |
| 4 = Moderately Satisfactory (MS)  | There were some shortcomings; quality of implementation/execution more or less met expectations.  |
| 3 = Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)  | There were significant shortcomings; quality of implementation/execution was somewhat lower than expected  |
| 2 = Unsatisfactory (U)  | There were major shortcomings; quality of implementation/execution was substantially lower than expected  |
| 1 = Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)  | There were severe shortcomings in quality of implementation/execution  |
| Unable to Assess (UA)  | The available information does not allow an assessment of the quality of implementation and execution  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Outcome Ratings Scale - Relevance, Effectiveness, Efficiency**  |
| 6 = Highly Satisfactory (HS)  | Level of outcomes achieved clearly exceeds expectations and/or there were no shortcomings  |
| 5 = Satisfactory (S)  | Level of outcomes achieved was as expected and/or there were no or minor shortcomings  |
| 4 = Moderately Satisfactory (MS)  | Level of outcomes achieved more or less as expected and/or there were moderate shortcomings.  |
| 3 = Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)  | Level of outcomes achieved somewhat lower than expected and/or there were significant shortcomings  |
| 2 = Unsatisfactory (U)  | Level of outcomes achieved substantially lower than expected and/or there were major shortcomings.  |
| 1 = Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)  | Only a negligible level of outcomes achieved and/or there were severe shortcomings  |
| Unable to Assess (UA)  | The available information does not allow an assessment of the level of outcome achievements  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Sustainability Ratings Scale**  |
| Ratings  | Description  |
| 4 = Likely (L)  | There are little or no risks to sustainability  |
| 3 = Moderately Likely (ML)  | There are moderate risks to sustainability  |
| 2 = Moderately Unlikely (MU)  | There are significant risks to sustainability  |
| 1 = Unlikely (U)  | There are severe risks to sustainability  |
| Unable to Assess (UA)  | Unable to assess the expected incidence and magnitude of risks to sustainability  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Evaluation Ratings Table** |
| Monitoring & Evaluation (M&E) | Rating[[6]](#footnote-6) |
| M&E design at entry |  |
| M&E Plan Implementation |  |
| Overall Quality of M&E |  |
| Implementation & Execution | Rating |
| Quality of UNDP Implementation/Oversight  |  |
| Quality of Implementing Partner Execution |  |
| Overall quality of Implementation/Execution |  |
| Assessment of Outcomes | Rating |
| Relevance |  |
| Effectiveness |  |
| Efficiency |  |
| Overall Project Outcome Rating |  |
| Sustainability | Rating |
| Financial resources |  |
| Socio-political/economic |  |
| Institutional framework and governance |  |
| Environmental |  |
| Overall Likelihood of Sustainability |  |

**Co-financing table\***

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Co-financing(type/source) | UNDP own financing (mill. US$) | Government(mill. US$) | Partner Agency(mill. US$) | Total(mill. US$) |
| Planned | Actual | Planned | Actual | Planned | Actual | Actual | Actual |
| Grants  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Loans/Concessions  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| * In-kind support
 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| * Other
 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Totals |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

\* format of the table to be adjusted according to the needs and method of the data collection

**ToR Annex G: TE Report Clearance Form**

|  |
| --- |
| **Terminal Evaluation Report for** *(Project Title & UNDP PIMS ID*) **Reviewed and Cleared By:****Commissioning Unit (M&E Focal Point)**Name: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_Signature: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**Regional Technical Advisor (Nature, Climate and Energy)**Name: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_Signature: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ |

**ToR Annex H: TE Audit Trail**

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

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

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

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

**ToR Annex I: TE Approach and Methodology**

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

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

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

Engagement of stakeholders is vital to a successful TE. Stakeholder involvement should include interviews with stakeholders who have project responsibilities, including but not limited to executing agencies, senior officials and task team/component leaders, key experts and consultants in the subject area, Project Board, project beneficiaries, academia, local government and CSOs, etc. (the list will be submitted at the stage of performing the TE).

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

The final methodological approach including interview schedule and data to be used in the evaluation should be clearly outlined in the inception report and be fully discussed and agreed between UNDP, stakeholders and the TE consultant.

Owing to the ground situation and where it is not advisable to physically go for the meetings, the project team will facilitate the TE consultant to plan and carry out virtual interviews and meetings with the relevant stakeholders. The evaluation consultant should be able to revise the approach in consultation with the evaluation manager and key stakeholders. These changes in approach should be agreed and reflected clearly in the TE Inception Report.

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

An assessment of project performance will be carried out, based against expectations set out in the Project Logical Framework/Results Framework, 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 (The rating scales are provided in the TOR Annex F). The completed table must be included in the evaluation executive summary.

**Evaluation Ratings Table**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Monitoring & Evaluation (M&E) | Rating[[7]](#footnote-7) |
| M&E design at entry |  |
| M&E Plan Implementation |  |
| Overall Quality of M&E |  |
| Implementation & Execution | Rating |
| Quality of UNDP Implementation/Oversight  |  |
| Quality of Implementing Partner Execution |  |
| Overall quality of Implementation/Execution |  |
| Assessment of Outcomes | Rating |
| Relevance |  |
| Effectiveness |  |
| Efficiency |  |
| Overall Project Outcome Rating |  |
| Sustainability | Rating |
| Financial resources |  |
| Socio-political/economic |  |
| Institutional framework and governance |  |
| Environmental |  |
| Overall Likelihood of Sustainability |  |
|  |  |

The Evaluation will also 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 will receive assistance from the PCU to obtain financial data in order to complete the co-financing table (example template is in the TOR Annex F), which will be included in the terminal evaluation report.

**ToR Annex J: Detailed Scope of the TE**

The TE will assess project performance against expectations set out in the project’s Logical Framework/Results Framework (see TOR Annex A). The TE will assess results according to the criteria outlined in the Guidance for TEs of UNDP-supported GEF-financed Projects *(*[*http://web.undp.org/evaluation/guideline/documents/GEF/TE\_GuidanceforUNDP-supportedGEF-financedProjects.pdf*](http://web.undp.org/evaluation/guideline/documents/GEF/TE_GuidanceforUNDP-supportedGEF-financedProjects.pdf)*)*. The scope of the TE should detail and include aspects of the project to be covered by the TE, such as the time frame, and the primary issues of concern to users that the TE needs to address.

The Findings section of the TE report will cover the topics listed below. A full outline of the TE report’s content is provided in ToR Annex C. The asterisk “(\*)” indicates criteria for which a rating is required.

Findings

1. Project Design/Formulation
* National priorities and country driven-ness
* Theory of Change
* Gender equality and women’s empowerment
* Social and Environmental Safeguards
* Analysis of Results Framework: project logic and strategy, indicators
* Assumptions and Risks
* Lessons from other relevant projects (e.g. same focal area) incorporated into project design
* Planned stakeholder participation
* Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector
* Management arrangements
1. Project Implementation
* Adaptive management (changes to the project design and project outputs during implementation)
* Actual stakeholder participation and partnership arrangements
* Project Finance and Co-finance
* Monitoring & Evaluation: design at entry (\*), implementation (\*), and overall assessment of M&E (\*)
* Implementing Agency (UNDP) (\*) and Executing Agency (\*), overall project oversight/implementation and execution (\*)
* Risk Management, including Social and Environmental Standards
1. Project Results
* Assess the achievement of outcomes against indicators by reporting on the level of progress for each objective and outcome indicator at the time of the TE and noting final achievements
* Relevance (\*), Effectiveness (\*), Efficiency (\*) and overall project outcome (\*)
* Sustainability: financial (\*), socio-political (\*), institutional framework and governance (\*), environmental (\*), overall likelihood of sustainability (\*)
* Country ownership
* Gender equality and women’s empowerment
* Cross-cutting issues (poverty alleviation, improved governance, climate change mitigation and adaptation, disaster prevention and recovery, human rights, capacity development, South-South cooperation, knowledge management, volunteerism, etc., as relevant)
* GEF Additionality
* Catalytic Role / Replication Effect
* Progress to impact
1. Main Findings, Conclusions, Recommendations and Lessons Learned
* The TE consultant will include a summary of the main findings of the TE report. Findings should be presented as statements of fact that are based on analysis of the data.
* The section on conclusions will be written in light of the findings. Conclusions should be comprehensive and balanced statements that are well substantiated by evidence and logically connected to the TE findings. They should highlight the strengths, weaknesses and results of the project, respond to key evaluation questions and provide insights into the identification of and/or solutions to important problems or issues pertinent to project beneficiaries, UNDP and the GEF, including issues in relation to gender equality and women’s empowerment.
* Recommendations should provide concrete, practical, feasible and targeted recommendations directed to the intended users of the evaluation about what actions to take and decisions to make. The recommendations should be specifically supported by the evidence and linked to the findings and conclusions around key questions addressed by the evaluation.
* The TE report should also include lessons that can be taken from the evaluation, including best practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance and success that can provide knowledge gained from the particular circumstance (programmatic and evaluation methods used, partnerships, financial leveraging, etc.) that are applicable to other GEF and UNDP interventions. When possible, the TE consultant should include examples of good practices in project design and implementation.
* It is important for the conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned of the TE report to include results related to gender equality and empowerment of women.

**ToR Annex K: Evaluator Ethics**

The TE consultant will be held to the highest ethical standards and is required to sign a code of conduct upon acceptance of the assignment. This evaluation will be conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG ‘Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation’.

The evaluator must safeguard the rights and confidentiality of information providers, interviewees and stakeholders through measures to ensure compliance with legal and other relevant codes governing collection of data and reporting on data.

The evaluator must also ensure security of collected information before and after the evaluation and protocols to ensure anonymity and confidentiality of sources of information where that is expected. The information knowledge and data gathered in the evaluation process must also be solely used for the evaluation and not for other uses without the express authorization of UNDP and partners.

The evaluator cannot have participated in the project preparation, formulation and/or implementation (including the writing of the project document), must not have conducted this project’s Mid-Term Review and should not have a conflict of interest with the project’s related activities.

1. Baseline, mid-term and end of project target levels must be expressed in the same neutral unit of analysis as the corresponding indicator. Baseline is the current/original status or condition and need to be quantified. The baseline must be established before the project document is submitted to the GEF for final approval. The baseline values will be used to measure the success of the project through implementation monitoring and evaluation. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Target is the change in the baseline value that will be achieved by the mid-term review and then again by the terminal evaluation. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Risks must be outlined in the Feasibility section of this project document. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. UNDP Style Manual, Office of Communications, Partnerships Bureau, updated November 2008 [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. Using a six-point rating scale: 6: Highly Satisfactory, 5: Satisfactory, 4: Marginally Satisfactory, 3: Marginally Unsatisfactory, 2: Unsatisfactory and 1: Highly Unsatisfactory, see section 3.5, page 37 for ratings explanations. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. Outcomes, Effectiveness, Efficiency, M&E, I&E Execution, Relevance are rated on a 6-point rating scale: 6 = Highly Satisfactory (HS), 5 = Satisfactory (S), 4 = Moderately Satisfactory (MS), 3 = Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU), 2 = Unsatisfactory (U), 1 = Highly Unsatisfactory (HU). Sustainability is rated on a 4-point scale: 4 = Likely (L), 3 = Moderately Likely (ML), 2 = Moderately Unlikely (MU), 1 = Unlikely (U) [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. Outcomes, Effectiveness, Efficiency, M&E, Implementation/Oversight & Execution, Relevance are rated on a 6-point scale: 6=Highly Satisfactory (HS), 5=Satisfactory (S), 4=Moderately Satisfactory (MS), 3=Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU), 2=Unsatisfactory (U), 1=Highly Unsatisfactory (HU). Sustainability is rated on a 4-point scale: 4=Likely (L), 3=Moderately Likely (ML), 2=Moderately Unlikely (MU), 1=Unlikely (U) [↑](#footnote-ref-7)