**Terminal Evaluation Terms of Reference (ToR) Template**

**for UNDP-supported GEF-financed projects**

*Template 1 - formatted for attachment to the* [*UNDP Procurement website*](http://procurement-notices.undp.org/)

1. **INTRODUCTION**

In accordance with UNDP and GEF M&E policies and procedures, all full- and medium-sized UNDP-supported GEF-financed projects are required to undergo a Terminal Evaluation (TE) at the end of the project. This Terms of Reference (ToR) sets out the expectations for the TE of the full-sized project titled Integrated Landscape Management to Enhance Food Security and Ecosystem Resilience in Ethiopia (PIMS\_5559 implemented through the Environment, Forest and Climate Change Commission formerly known as Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change. The project started on the 12th May 2017 and is in its fifth year of implementation. The TE process must follow the guidance outlined in the document [*‘Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects’*](http://web.undp.org/evaluation/guideline/documents/GEF/TE_GuidanceforUNDP-supportedGEF-financedProjects.pdf)

1. **PROJECT BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT**

Largely dominated by an agrarian economy and experiencing the second highest population in Africa, Ethiopia faces many development challenges. Most of the population still relies on rain-fed production systems for food and income security. Agriculture accounts for over 40% of GDP, employs 80% of the labor force and generates some 90% of export earnings, yet most agricultural activity still occurs within small, subsistence-level farming systems. Whilst average plot sizes vary by region, many households survive on less than a hectare each.

Ethiopia suffers from food insecurity with average annual food production growth an estimated 2.4%, lagging behind population growth of 2.8% per annum. Major causes of food insecurity in Ethiopia include environmental degradation, deforestation, soil erosion, recurrent droughts and pressures caused by population growth. Across the country, environmental degradation has led to loss of production capacity, leaving crop cultivation and livestock husbandry struggling to withstand the immediate impacts of climate variability, including floods and droughts.

Farming in Ethiopia takes place in often highly degraded and vulnerable environments where there is substantial loss of vegetation, associated erosion and declining soil fertility. Huge demand for natural capital including biomass fuels exacerbates environmental degradation and affects food production. Integrated Landscape Management to Enhance Food Security and Ecosystem Resilience in Ethiopia project proposes an integrated approach that brings together capacity to achieve food security with the need to restore and sustainably manage key environmental resources. The project is implemented through three interrelated components: **Component 1** ensures effective multi-stakeholder platforms are in place to support the dissemination and uptake of integrated approaches; **Component 2** develops specific approaches and puts in place effective mechanisms to scale up across target sites and, more widely, in the country; and **Component 3** establishes a systematic monitoring, assessment, learning and knowledge management mechanism that supports influencing at a wider scale in Ethiopia. Infusing all components is a commitment to gender-responsive development, in which women stakeholders within smallholder communities play a central role in economic and environmental transformations.

It is a five-year project implemented by Environment, Forest and Climate Change Commission (EFCCC) in seven regional states of 12 project sites/ woredas. The woredas/sites are Chiro and Doba in Oromia region, Angolelatera and Menzegera in Amhara region, Dugna Fango in SNNPR, Belate-Zuria in Sidama region, Raya Azebo and Tanqua Abergele in Tigray, Gursum and Tuliguled in Somali, and Aba’ala and Amibara in Afar region.

The project has been designed to enhance long-term sustainability and resilience of food production systems by addressing the environmental drivers of food insecurity in Ethiopia. The project intervention combines land management choices and Integrated Natural Resources Management (INRM) with water- and climate-smart agriculture, value chain support and gender responsiveness. It is five years (2017 – 2021) project with a total budget envelop of USD 10,739,450 mobilized from the GEF and UNDP and parallel financing from the government of Ethiopia in kind contribution USD 14,965,431. The project is in line with UNSDCF OUTCOME: By 2025, all people in Ethiopia live in a society resilient to environmental risks and adapted to climate change. The project contributes to UNSDCF Outputs(s): Strengthen resilience to shocks and crises SP 1.7; SP 2.7. The Implementing Partner EFCCC which is responsible and accountable for managing the project, including the monitoring and evaluation of project interventions, achieving project outcomes, and for the effective utilization of the resources.

Given the complex and interrelated development challenges described above, fostering sustainability and resilience of food security in Ethiopia will require effective multi-stakeholder platforms to support uptake of integrated approaches, the scaling up of best practices and proven approaches and technologies, and systematic monitoring, assessment, learning and knowledge management (generation, acquisition and sharing of knowledge and experience).

The project is getting strategic leadership from the National Steering Committee (NSC) which is responsible for strategic decisions while guidance is required by the Project Manager, including recommendation for UNDP/Implementing partner approval of project plans and revisions. The NSC members are drawn from key stakeholder institutions including Environment, Forest and Climate Change Commission (EFCCC)Chair; UNDP (Co-chair); Ministry of Agriculture (MoA); Ministry of Water, Irrigation and Energy ; Ministry of Finance (MoF); National Meteorology Agency (NMA); and regional EFCCC replica of seven regional representatives.

The project has also a steering committee which responsible for the implementation of each and every project activity at district levels. Woreda/district Steering Committee (WSC) is comprised of the Woreda Administrator (Chair); Environment Forest Climate Change Office (Secretary to WSC); woreda project officer (WPO); woreda cooperative promotion office; community-based organization representatives (including women and youth groups); NGO representative; a representative for Micro-Finance Institutions (MFI); and representatives from district/woreda sectoral offices.

In Ethiopia, March 13th, 2020 was the first date that the Federal Ministry of Health has confirmed a coronavirus disease (COVID-19) case in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia. The case, which was announced on the 13th of March 2020, is the first one to be reported in Ethiopia since the beginning of the outbreak in China in December 2019[[1]](#footnote-1).

As per the update from United Nations Ethiopia on Novel Corona Virus (COVID-19) as of the date May 30, 2021 on key highlights of countries statistics Ethiopia reported 145 new confirmed COVID-19 cases in the last 24 hours giving a total 271,345confirmed cases as of 30May2021. A total of 4,155deaths have been reported since the beginning of the outbreak with a Case Fatality Rate is 1.53%▪Majority of the cases (215,319)have been reported by Addis Ababa and Oromia regions constituting 79.4%of the national tally 237,544(87.54%)cases have recovered, however 697confirmed cases are undergoing treatment in the treatment centers of which 413are in severe condition the last 24 hours, 3,572RT-PCR tests were conducted giving a cumulative 2,720,495RT-PCR tests conducted. 29,644 total active cases and 770 recovered and discharged on the same day A total1,805,006 population have been vaccinated that comprise of health workers (21%), population between55-64 years (31%)and persons 65 years and above (48%)[[2]](#footnote-2).

Thirty-four deaths reported in the last 24 hours and there is an average of 31 deaths per day for the last 7 days. Novel Corona Virus (COVID-19) UPDATE#359: 30th May 2021 a total of 271,345 confirmed 145 new cases in last 24 hours. A total of 4,155 Total Deaths (CFR 1.53) again a total of 237,544 Cumulative recovered (87.54%) was recorded in the country. In regional perspective: Addis Ababa 176, 918, Afar 2, 690, Amhara 11,473, Benishangul 3,543, Dire Dawa 5,273, Oromia 38,401, Somali 2,498, SNNP 8,777 and Tigray 7,602 was recorded as convicted cases on the date. The New Deaths of the date was 12 and 413 severe cases 3,572 New lab tests and Total Lab tested 2,720,495 and 770 New recoveries 29,644 Total active cases.[[3]](#footnote-3).

Case fatality rate (%) Global 2.08, Africa 2.70 and Ethiopia range with 1.53. The total Confirmed Cases 169,597,415 New cases 469,996 Deaths 3,530,582. The global cases have been increasing since early March and the global 3rd wave has not peaked 359:30th May2021 Vaccine doses 1,546,316,352[[4]](#footnote-4).

Hence as the above case and statistics shows that, there is high prevalence in main capital and other regional towns which we should take precautions during all data collection and in private activities.

1. **TE PURPOSE**

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

The project contributes to Land Degradation Objective 3 (Reduce pressures on natural resources by managing competing land uses in broader landscapes), Program 4 (Scaling-up sustainable land management through the Landscape Approach). This objective and program seek a range of outcomes increased investments in SLM and support mechanisms for SLM in wider landscapes as well as the adoption by local communities of integrated landscape management practices. The results of the evaluation will significantly benefit the Government of Ethiopia, the regional states, programs/project, the local governments and communities. The best practices, approaches and principles from the TE can be adopted/adapted to similar areas for similar purposes. The recommendations from the evaluation can be used to inform the design of future projects and programs.

1. **TE APPROACH & METHODOLOGY**

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

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

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

Engagement of stakeholders is vital to a successful TE. Stakeholder involvement should include interviews with stakeholders who have project responsibilities, including but not limited to UNDP, EFCCC; executing agencies, senior officials and task team/ component leaders, key experts and consultants in the subject area, Project Board, project stakeholders, academia, local government and CSOs, etc. Additionally, the MTR team is expected to conduct field missions to 7(seven) regional states including the following project sites (Angolelatera, Menzegera , Tanqua-Abergele, Raya-Azebo, Chiro, Doba, Dugna-Fango, Belate-Zuria, Tuliguled, Gursum, Aba'ala and Amibara).

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

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

The final report must 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.

All data collection approach & methodology should follow the COVID-19 safety measures & protocol. Hence the inception report should show on detailed and its outline for any adjusted evaluative approaches/ methodologies that are needed to implement the evaluation effectively, including safety guidance, extended desk reviews for primary use of national consultants and virtual stakeholder meetings and interviews by evaluators as applicable to communication technologies that maintain data quality & its reliability.

1. **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 evaluation process and results will bring about lessons learnt from the project approach linked to all three components:

Component 1: Institutional frameworks for enhanced biodiversity and ecosystem goods and services within food production systems

This component was intended to strengthen existing policy and institutional arrangements allowing stakeholders at national and landscape levels to work together towards an approach to INRM that fosters sustainability and resilience for food security. This will be achieved by building capacity across scales and sectors to understand key actions and how to sequence them to achieve greater impact.

Component 2: Scaling up the Integrated Landscape Management approach to achieve improved productivity of smallholder food production systems & innovative transformations to non-farm livelihoods.

The key was to focus on scaling up approaches that have been shown to work already in the woredas across seven regions, both in increasing availability, improving access to food and Integrated Natural Resource Management (INRM) This is a key element in supporting an incremental approach, i.e., taking existing approaches, and providing innovations in their design, use and uptake through the multi-stakeholder institutional frameworks established under Component 1. This combining of more careful landscape management practice with increasing income from non-natural capital-based livelihoods can support greater long-term food security and the achievement of GEBs. The other important aspect is diversification of agricultural production which is a key element for ensuring the livelihoods of small holders farmers in ethiopia which the project has invested significant resources in terms of multipurpose inputs, technologies, knowledge and skills.

The other element in the approach involves providing incentives for the private sector to invest in ILM, building on efforts underway under the G8 Alliance for Food security and Nutrition to remove barriers for private sector participation. Specifically, this will entail identifying opportunities to fund demand-driven projects that demonstrate value addition for increased private sector investment in landscapes, focusing on specific value chains including livestock production and dairying.

Component 3: Knowledge Management, Learning, Monitoring and Assessment

This component focuses on achieving a system of evidence-based Monitoring and Assessment, Knowledge Management and Learning within which local stakeholders will be key actors. Activities under this component will focus on monitoring and assessment of whether institutional frameworks, integrated approaches, and initiatives for transformation to new livelihoods have a positive impact on resilient food systems and the generation of GEBs. This will include examining changes in provision and use of ecosystem services, new and strengthened livelihoods strategies, value chain development and sharing of benefits and costs; as well as, more generally, understanding trade-offs and synergies among environmental, agricultural and livelihood outcomes. The approach will use a set of standardized tools that can be applied across scales, from local to landscape/woreda and zonal/regional. Support entails establishing integrated baselines, capacity building of key institutions in charge of monitoring and learning (including support to multi-stakeholder platforms), support to the development of tools and systems for monitoring GEBs, such as carbon benefits and GHG emission reductions, as well monitoring of resilience, agricultural productivity and socio-economic benefits and gender-responsive transformation. Guided by needs at each project site, action research has been established to gather and generate evidence and facilitate innovations to achieve more resilient ago-ecosystems, including climate-adapted food production systems and pathways to support new, off-farm livelihoods activities.

A strong emphasis was placed on interdisciplinary approaches between biophysical and social science, with a particular focus on rural development as a nexus between understandings of social and environmental systems, including critical power, decision making and equality issues (including gender, income and group identify).

The design should take into consideration that that the consultant will gather the necessary information from various documents and resources (Annual Workplans, Implementing Partner Agreements, etc.).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 Standards (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 (Safeguards)

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 Additionally
* Catalytic Role / Replication Effect
* Progress to impact

Main Findings, Conclusions, Recommendations and Lessons Learned

* The TE team will include a summary of the main findings of the TE report. Findings should be presented as statements of fact that are based on analysis of the data.
* The section on conclusions will be written in light of the findings. Conclusions should be comprehensive and balanced statements that are well substantiated by evidence and logically connected to the TE findings. They should highlight the strengths, weaknesses and results of the project, respond to key evaluation questions and provide insights into the identification of and/or solutions to important problems or issues pertinent to project beneficiaries, UNDP and the GEF, including issues in relation to gender equality and women’s empowerment.
* Recommendations should provide concrete, practical, feasible and targeted recommendations directed to the intended users of the evaluation about what actions to take and decisions to make. The recommendations should be specifically supported by the evidence and linked to the findings and conclusions around key questions addressed by the evaluation.
* The TE report should also include lessons that can be taken from the evaluation, including best practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance and success that can provide knowledge gained from the particular circumstance (programmatic and evaluation methods used, partnerships, financial leveraging, etc.) that are applicable to other GEF and UNDP interventions. When possible, the TE team should include examples of good practices in project design and implementation.
* It is important for the conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned of the TE report to incorporate gender equality and empowerment of women.

The TE report will include an Evaluation Ratings Table, as shown below:

**ToR Table 2: Evaluation Ratings Table for *Integrated Landscape Management to Enhance Food Security and Ecosystem Resilience in Ethiopia project***

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Monitoring & Evaluation (M&E) | Rating[[5]](#footnote-5) |
| 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 |  |

1. **TIMEFRAME**

The total duration of the TE will be approximately 35 working days over a time period of *10 weeks* starting on August 15,2021 and shall not exceed five months from when the consultant(s) are hired. The tentative TE timeframe is as follows:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Timeframe | Activity |
| *(August 23 – 24, 2021) 2 days* | Document review and preparation of TE Inception Report |
| (Sept.15-16, 2021) 2 days | Finalization and Validation of TE Inception Report; latest start of TE mission |
| *(September 17 – October 1, 2021)*  *15 days* | TE mission: stakeholder meetings, interviews, field visits, etc. |
| *(October 3, 2021)*  *1 day* | Mission wrap-up meeting & presentation of initial findings; earliest end of TE mission |
| *(October 13, 2021)*  *10 days* | Preparation of draft TE report |
| *October 23,2021* | Circulation of draft TE report for comments |
| *October 24, 2021* | Incorporation of comments on draft TE report into Audit Trail & finalization of TE report |
| *October 25, 2021* | Preparation and Issuance of Management Response |
| *October 26, 2021* | Concluding Stakeholder Workshop |
| *October 28, 2021* | Expected date of full TE completion |

Options for site visits should be provided in the TE Inception Report.

1. **TE DELIVERABLES**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| # | Deliverable | Description | Timing | Responsibilities |
| 1 | TE Inception Report | TE team clarifies objectives, methodology and timing of the TE | *August 24/2021* | TE team submits Inception Report to Commissioning Unit and project management |
| 2 | Presentation | Initial Findings | End of TE mission: *October 3/2021* | TE team presents to Commissioning Unit and project management |
| 3 | Draft TE Report | Full draft report *(using guidelines on report content in ToR Annex C)* with annexes | Within 3 weeks of end of TE mission: *October 13/2021* | TE team submits to Commissioning Unit; reviewed by RTA, Project Coordinating Unit, GEF OFP |
| 5 | Final TE Report\* + Audit Trail | Revised final report and TE Audit trail in which the TE details how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final TE report *(See template in ToR Annex H)* | Within 1 week of receiving comments on draft report *October 28/2021* | TE team submits both documents to the Commissioning Unit |

\*All final TE reports will be quality assessed by the UNDP Independent Evaluation Office (IEO). Details of the IEO’s quality assessment of decentralized evaluations can be found in Section 6 of the UNDP Evaluation Guidelines.[[6]](#footnote-6)

1. **TE ARRANGEMENTS**

The principal responsibility for managing the TE resides with the Commissioning Unit. The Commissioning Unit for this project’s TE is the UNDP- Ethiopia Country office.

The Commissioning Unit will contract the evaluators and ensure the timely provision of per diems and travel arrangements within the country for the TE team. The Project Team will be responsible for liaising with the TE team to provide all relevant documents, set up stakeholder interviews, and arrange field visits.

1. **TE TEAM COMPOSITION**

A team of two independent consultants (one international and one national) will conduct the TE. The International Consultant will be the team leader of this assignment and will be responsible for the overall design and writing of the TE report, ensuring a quality deliverable and adherence to the proposed timelines. The national consultant will assess emerging trends with respect to regulatory frameworks, budget allocations, capacity building, and work with the Project Team in developing the TE itinerary, etc.

The evaluator(s) 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.

It is also important that the TE team need have to apply feasible methods and detail ways on managing and implementation of the study/assessment with the consideration that TE team members would able to operate remotely considering COVID 19 protocols.

The selection of evaluators will be aimed at maximizing the overall “team” qualities in the following areas:

Education for Both IC and LC

* A Master’s degree in, Environment Science, Natural Resource Management, Agricultural science, Development Studies or other closely related field, or other closely related field.;

Experience

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ***International consultant:***   * Relevant experience with results-based management evaluation methodologies; * Experience applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios; * Competence in adaptive management, as applied to Land Degradation, Conservation or Climate Change Adaptation * Experience in evaluating projects; * Experience working in *Africa;* * Experience in relevant technical areas for at least *10 years;* * Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender and Land Degradation; experience in gender sensitive evaluation and analysis. * Excellent communication skills; * Demonstrable analytical skills; * Project evaluation/review experience within United Nations system will be considered an asset * Fluency in Written and Spoken English | ***National consultant:***  Relevant experience with results-based management evaluation methodologies;  Competence In adaptive management, as applied to Land Degradation, Conservation or Climate Change Adaptation;  Experience In evaluating projects;  Experience In relevant technical areas for at least 5 years;  Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender and Land Degradation, experience in gender sensitive evaluation and analysis;  Excellent communication skills; Demonstrable analytical skills; Project evaluation/review experience within United Nations system will be considered an asset  Fluency in written and spoken English  Fluency in written and spoken Amharic, knowledge of other local languages will be an advantage |

1. **EVALUATOR ETHICS**

The TE team 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.

1. **Evaluation Criteria**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Criteria** | | **Weight** | **Max. Point** |
| Technical Competence (based on CV, Proposal and interview (f required)) | | 70% | 100 |
| Understanding the Scope of Work (SoW); comprehensiveness of the methodology/approach; and organization & completeness of the proposal | | 30 |  |
| Academic background | | 10 |  |
| Experience in similar consultancy projects | | 30 |  |
| Financial (Lower Offer/Offer\*100) | | 30% |  |
| **Total Score** | **Technical Score \* 70% + Financial Score \* 30%** | | |

1. **PAYMENT SCHEDULE**

* Due to the current COVID-19 situation and its implications, a partial payment may be considered if the consultant invested time towards the deliverable but was unable to complete to circumstances beyond his/her control.
* 20% payment upon satisfactory delivery of the final TE Inception Report and approval by the Commissioning Unit
* 40% payment upon satisfactory delivery of the draft TE report to the Commissioning Unit
* 40% payment upon satisfactory delivery of the final TE report and approval by the Commissioning Unit and RTA (via signatures on the TE Report Clearance Form) and delivery of completed TE Audit Trail

Criteria for issuing the final payment of 40%[[7]](#footnote-7):

* The final TE report includes all requirements outlined in the TE TOR and is in accordance with the TE guidance.
* The final TE report is clearly written, logically organized, and is specific for this project (i.e. text has not been cut & pasted from other TE reports).
* The Audit Trail includes responses to and justification for each comment listed.

1. **APPLICATION PROCESS[[8]](#footnote-8)**

Recommended Presentation of Proposal:

1. **Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability** using the [template](https://intranet.undp.org/unit/bom/pso/Support%20documents%20on%20IC%20Guidelines/Template%20for%20Confirmation%20of%20Interest%20and%20Submission%20of%20Financial%20Proposal.docx)[[9]](#footnote-9) provided by UNDP;
2. **CV** and a **Personal History Form** ([P11 form](http://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/corporate/Careers/P11_Personal_history_form.doc)[[10]](#footnote-10));
3. Brief description **of approach to work/technical proposal** of why the individual considers him/herself as the most suitable for the assignment, and a proposed methodology on how they will approach and complete the assignment; (max 1 page)
4. **Financial Proposal** that indicates the all-inclusive fixed total contract price and all other travel related costs (such as flight ticket, per diem, etc), supported by a breakdown of costs, as per template attached to the [Letter of Confirmation of Interest template](https://popp.undp.org/_layouts/15/WopiFrame.aspx?sourcedoc=/UNDP_POPP_DOCUMENT_LIBRARY/Public/PSU_%20Individual%20Contract_Offerors%20Letter%20to%20UNDP%20Confirming%20Interest%20and%20Availability.docx&action=default). 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.

All application materials should be submitted to the address (insert mailing address) in a sealed envelope indicating the following reference “Consultant for Terminal Evaluation of *Integrated Landscape Management to Enhance Food Security and Ecosystem Resilience in Ethiopia Project*” or by email at the following address ONLY: *(insert email address)* by *(time and date)*. Incomplete applications will be excluded from further consideration.

**Criteria for Evaluation of Proposal:** Only those 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.

1. **TOR ANNEXES**

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

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

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **This project will contribute to the following Sustainable Development Goal (s): SDGs 1, 2, 5, 6, 8, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15** | | | | | |
| **This project will contribute to the following country outcome included in the UNDAF/Country Programme Document:**  *By 2020 key Government institutions at federal and regional levels including cities are better able to plan, implement and monitor priority climate change mitigation and adaptation actions and sustainable resource management.* | | | | | |
| **This project will be linked to the following output of the UNDP Strategic Plan:**  **Output 1.3: Solutions developed at national and sub-national levels for sustainable management of natural resources, ecosystem services, chemicals and waste.** | | | | | |
|  | **Objective and Outcome Indicators**  **(All indicators will be sex-disaggregated to the extent possible)** | **Baseline** | **Mid-term Target**  **(Of which proportion women/FHH)** | **End of Project Target**  **(Of which proportion women/FHH)** | **Assumptions** |
| **Project Objective:**  **To enhance long-term sustainability and resilience of the food production systems by addressing the environmental drivers of food insecurity in Ethiopia** | ***Indicator 1:***  *Number of new partnership mechanisms with funding for sustainable management solutions of natural resources, ecosystem services.* | The Sustainable Land Management Program (1 example), funded by GIZ and implemented by the Min of Agriculture | Two  One at federal level and one at each project woredas | 8(Eight) partnership mechanisms developed  (One at national level, One at each project woreda, Six partnerships with six universities or research institutions) | The ILM partnership provides sufficient coherence and common purpose to drive more effective planning, implementation and monitoring of climate change mitigation and adaptation actions and sustainable resource management |
| ***Indicator 2:***  Number of livelihoods created through management of natural resources, ecosystem services, disaggregated by sex, | The current number of livelihoods created under the project in six target sites is approximately 80% of the total population given the estimates of numbers engaged in agriculture. i.e. there will be 48,000 hhs who need new jobs | The mid-term target would be for livelihoods of 50% of the total number of beneficiaries to be based on better management of natural resources through reducing stress on ecosystem services; 30% of the total based on additional alternative and non-farm livelihoods that are not dependent on natural resource thereby reducing pressures | Jobs and livelihoods created for 100% of the hhs (48000) through engaging them in eco-friendly income generation Activities; 30% of the livelihoods will be alternative on farm and non-farm livelihoods. At least 50% of the beneficiaries will be women | Wider socio-economic and environmental changes do not serve to affect capacities of communities and those working with them to transform their livelihoods, including better management of natural resource systems |
| ***Indicator 3:***  Number of direct project beneficiaries.  1,440,000 people (12 woredas; 20,000 households in each woreda (on average six people in each HH)) [including gender disaggregated data – at least 50% of total beneficiaries will be women] | 10% of existing beneficiaries currently engaged in integrated landscape management | 50% (720,000) (120,000 HHs) | 100% (1,440,000) (240,000 HHs)  (target of 50% of beneficiaries being women) | No major conflict disrupting rural production systems in target sites  No major persistent rainfall anomaly between years leading to upward trend in destitution |
| ***Indicator 4:***  Extent of land productivity of project sites (measured with the Normalized Difference Vegetation Index (NDVI) increased | 64% of the project sites correspond to low productivity corresponding to NDVI values ranging from 0.1 to 0.3 | 5% increase in the higher NDVI values (NDVI >0.3 meaning an increase in land productivity | 15% increase in the higher NDVI values (NDVI >0.3) meaning an increase in land productivity |  |
| ***Indicator 5:***  Beneficiary HH’s have reduced Food security risks | Estimated 240, 000 households were at risk from food insecurity in project sites | 120,000 beneficiary households increased their income by 25%. As a result, reduced FS risk | 240,000 beneficiary households increased their income by 25%. As a result, reduced FS risks |  |
| **Outcome 1.1**  **Multi-stakeholder and multi-scale platforms in support of integrated natural resources management in agricultural landscapes in place**  **Outcome 1.2: Incentives mechanisms and infrastructures in place at national and local levels to support smallholder agriculture and sustainable food production** | ***Indicator 6****:*  Number of multi-stakeholder and multi-scale platforms in place to support integration of natural resources management in food production practices *[including gender dis-aggregated data on participation]* | Agricultural water management platform and one other at national level | At least 12 functioning (convening and decision-making) multi-stakeholder platforms in place in the project sites; plus, one at national-level [including gender dis-aggregated data on participation] | At least 12 functioning (convening and decision-making) multi-stakeholder platforms in place in the project sites; plus, one at national-level [including gender dis-aggregated data on participation] | Willingness and capacity of institutions under the project to engage in collaboration through multi-stakeholder platforms  Wider food insecurity, drought and natural disaster conditions do not preclude active institutional engagement in this component of the project |
| ***Indicator 7:***  Number of gender-responsive- & age-sensitive decision-support tools and participatory processes for INRM in food production practices in place | None | At least one gender/age-sensitive decision-support tool and participatory process applied that leads to more gender equitable outcomes | Two gender-responsive/age-sensitive decision-support tools and participatory processes applied that lead to more gender-responsive outcomes | Capacity and willingness of institutions at all levels to engage in development of gender-responsive and age-sensitive DSTs and support participatory processes  Continued focus on gender equality as a key condition for sustainable development |
| ***Indicator 8:***  Number of functional agricultural value chains developed as an incentive mechanism for smallholder farmers to adapt climate change effects | None | 6(Six) value chain development incentive mechanisms/infrastructure including fruit and vegetable store, ground nut processing machine, etc. | 8(Eight)value chain development incentive mechanisms/infrastructure including fruit and vegetable store, ground nut processing machine, etc | Market conditions continue to favour farmer engagement in value chains |
| ***Indicator9:***  Number of smallholder farmers (60% of whom should be women) benefiting from sustainable food value-chains | Zero | 600 farmers benefited from the sustainable value chain development | 1200 farmers benefited from the sustainable value chain development |  |
| **Outcome 2.1: Increased land area and Agro-ecosystems under Integrated Land Management and supporting significant biodiversity and the goods and services this provides**  **Outcome 2.2: Increase in investment flows to INRM** | ***Indicator 10:***  Extent in ha of land and Agro-ecosystems under Integrated Land Management *[included gender disaggregated data on land ownership / engagement in diversification / MHH and FHH requiring food assistance]* |  | 60,000 ha with improved soil and water management that also enhances biodiversity | 120,000 ha with improved soil and water management that also enhances biodiversity | Sufficient interest amongst communities and local authorities to expand ILM activities and interest in maintaining biodiversity  Major disasters do not preclude a focus on ILM by communities and local authorities |
|  | 60,000 ha under diversified production system. In the entire project sites.  Out of which 5,000 ha of Agro-pastoral systems will be under integrated land management | 120,000 ha under diversified production system. In the entire project sites.  Out of which 10,000 ha of Agro-pastoral systems will be under integrated land management |
| ***Indicator 11:***  Amount of financial resources ($) invested in Integrated and Sustainable Land Management at woreda/ landscape level | Less than US$0.5m current level of investment in ILM in 12 target woredas | US$3m investment leveraged by bilateral and multilateral organizations and the private sector | US$5m investment leveraged by bilateral and multilateral organizations and the private sector | Government and global policy environment continue to prioritize landscape management as an approach to achieving GEBs and food security  Ethiopia remains a priority for investment in GEBs generation in SSA |
| **Outcome 3**  **Capacity and institutions in place to monitor and assess resilience, food security and GEBs (Global Environmental Benefits)** | ***Indicator 12*:** Improved score (%) in capacity of institutions to monitor ecosystem resilience and GEBs [as measured by UNDP Capacity Scorecard] | Less than 30% score in capacity of institutions to monitor ecosystem resilience, food security and GEBs (tbc at inception phase) | 30% capacity score | 50% capacity score | Willingness to participate in training and capacity building initiatives for monitoring.  Technical and data systems sufficient to support robust monitoring |
| ***Indicator 13:***  Integrated web-based and GIS embedded information management system (IWB&GE-IMS) for ecosystem services monitoring developed and being functional by year 5 | No effective basis for monitoring of changes in ecosystem status and impact of development activities on GEBs | Integrated web-based and GIS embedded information management system (IWB&GE-IMS) for ecosystem services monitoring under development | Integrated web-based and GIS embedded information management system (IWB&GE-IMS) for ecosystem services monitoring developed and being functional by End of the Project |  |
| ***Indicator 14****:* *Number of gender-responsive systems/ initiatives in place to monitor multi-scale ecosystem resilience, food security and GEBs at national and landscape levels sites* | No gender-responsive system/initiative in place to monitor multi-scale ecosystem resilience, food security and GEBs in project/program implementation in the 12 sites | At least one gender-responsive multi-scale monitoring of ecosystem services, food security and GEBs system/initiative established at national and landscape levels | At least two gender-responsive systems/initiative in place to monitor multi-scale ecosystem resilience, food security and GEBs established at national and landscape levels |  |

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

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| # | 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 | Oversight mission reports |
| 11 | Minutes of Project Board Meetings and of other meetings (i.e. Project Appraisal Committee meetings) |
| 12 | GEF Tracking Tools (from CEO Endorsement, midterm and terminal stages) |
| 13 | GEF/LDCF/SCCF Core Indicators (from PIF, CEO Endorsement, midterm and terminal stages); for GEF-6 and GEF-7 projects only |
| 14 | Financial data, including actual expenditures by project outcome, including management costs, and including documentation of any significant budget revisions |
| 15 | 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 |
| 16 | Audit reports |
| 17 | Electronic copies of project outputs (booklets, manuals, technical reports, articles, etc.) |
| 18 | Sample of project communications materials |
| 19 | Summary list of formal meetings, workshops, etc. held, with date, location, topic, and number of participants |
| 20 | Any relevant socio-economic monitoring data, such as average incomes / employment levels of stakeholders in the target area, change in revenue related to project activities |
| 21 | List of contracts and procurement items over ~US$5,000 (i.e. organizations or companies contracted for project outputs, etc., except in cases of confidential information) |
| 22 | List of related projects/initiatives contributing to project objectives approved/started after GEF project approval (i.e. any leveraged or “catalytic” results) |
| 23 | 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 |
| 24 | UNDP Country Programme Document (CPD) |
| 25 | List/map of project sites, highlighting suggested visits |
| 26 | List and contact details for project staff, key project stakeholders, including Project Board members, RTA, Project Team members, and other partners to be consulted |
| 27 | Project deliverables that provide documentary evidence of achievement towards project outcomes |
|  | *Additional documents, as required* |

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

1. Title page

* Title of UNDP-supported GEF-financed project
* UNDP PIMS ID and GEF ID
* TE timeframe and date of final TE report
* Region and countries included in the project
* GEF Focal Area/Strategic Program
* Executing Agency, Implementing partner and other project partners
* TE Team members

1. Acknowledgements
2. Table of Contents
3. Acronyms and Abbreviations
4. Executive Summary (3-4 pages)

* Project Information Table
* Project Description (brief)
* Evaluation Ratings Table
* Concise summary of findings, conclusions and lessons learned
* Recommendations summary table

1. Introduction (2-3 pages)

* Purpose and objective of the TE
* Scope
* Methodology
* Data Collection & Analysis
* Ethics
* Limitations to the evaluation
* Structure of the TE report

1. Project Description (3-5 pages)

* Project start and duration, including milestones
* Development context: environmental, socio-economic, institutional, and policy factors relevant to the project objective and scope
* Problems that the project sought to address, threats and barriers targeted
* Immediate and development objectives of the project
* Expected results
* Main stakeholders: summary list
* Theory of Change

1. Findings

(in addition to a descriptive assessment, all criteria marked with (\*) must be given a rating[[11]](#footnote-11))

4.1 Project Design/Formulation

* Analysis of Results Framework: project logic and strategy, indicators
* Assumptions and Risks
* Lessons from other relevant projects (e.g. same focal area) incorporated into project design
* Planned stakeholder participation
* Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector
  1. Project Implementation
* Adaptive management (changes to the project design and project outputs during implementation)
* Actual stakeholder participation and partnership arrangements
* Project Finance and Co-finance
* Monitoring & Evaluation: design at entry (\*), implementation (\*), and overall assessment of M&E (\*)
* UNDP implementation/oversight (\*) and Implementing Partner execution (\*), overall project implementation/execution (\*), coordination, and operational issues
* Risk Management, including Social and Environmental Standards (Safeguards)
  1. Project Results and Impacts
* Progress towards objective and expected outcomes (\*)
* Relevance (\*)
* Effectiveness (\*)
* Efficiency (\*)
* Overall Outcome (\*)
* Sustainability: financial (\*), socio-economic (\*), institutional framework and governance (\*), environmental (\*), and overall likelihood (\*)
* Country ownership
* Gender equality and women’s empowerment
* Cross-cutting Issues
* GEF Additionality
* Catalytic/Replication Effect
* Progress to Impact

1. Main Findings, Conclusions, Recommendations & Lessons

* Main Findings
* Conclusions
* Recommendations
* Lessons Learned

1. Annexes

* TE ToR (excluding ToR annexes)
* TE Mission itinerary, including summary of field visits
* List of persons interviewed
* List of documents reviewed
* Evaluation Question Matrix (evaluation criteria with key questions, indicators, sources of data, and methodology)
* Questionnaire used and summary of results
* Co-financing tables (if not include in body of report)
* TE Rating scales
* Signed Evaluation Consultant Agreement form
* Signed UNEG Code of Conduct form
* Signed TE Report Clearance form
* *Annexed in a separate file*: TE Audit Trail
* *Annexed in a separate file:* relevant terminal GEF/LDCF/SCCF Core Indicators or Tracking Tools, as applicable

**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.)* |
| Was the project relevant to the needs and priorities of the target groups/beneficiaries? Were they consulted during design and implementation of the project? |  |  |  |
| Did the project’s theory of change clearly articulate assumptions about why the project approach is expected to produce the desired change? Was the theory of change grounded in evidence? |  |  |  |
| To what extent was the project in line with the national development priorities, the country programme’s outputs and outcomes, the UNDP Strategic Plan and the SDGs? |  |  |  |
| Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved? | | | |
| To what extent did the project contribute to the country programme outcomes and outputs, the SDGs, the UNDP Strategic Plan and national development priorities? |  |  |  |
| To what extent were the project outcomes and outputs achieved? |  |  |  |
| What factors have contributed to achieving or not achieving intended country programme outputs and outcomes? |  |  |  |
| Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in line with international and national norms and standards? | | | |
| To what extent have resources been used efficiently? Have activities supporting the strategy been cost-effective? |  |  |  |
| To what extent have project funds and activities been delivered in a timely manner? |  |  |  |
| Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, socio-political, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results? | | | |
| To what extent does the interventions have well-designed and well-planned exit strategy? |  |  |  |
| Are there any financial risks that may jeopardize the sustainability of project outputs? |  |  |  |
| To what extent will financial and economic resources be available to sustain the benefits achieved by the project? |  |  |  |
| Does the negative impacts of COVID-19 hinder the sustainability of the project gains? |  |  |  |
| Gender equality and women’s empowerment: How did the project contribute to gender equality and women’s empowerment? | | | |
| To what extent does the project contribute to gender equality, the empowerment of women and the human rights-based approach? |  |  |  |
| To what extent has the project promoted positive changes in women participation? Were there any unintended effects? |  |  |  |
| What impacts COVID-19 brought to the gained women empowerment by the project? |  |  |  |
| Human Rights:  To what extent have poor, indigenous and physically challenged women and other disadvantaged and marginalized groups benefited from the project? |  |  |  |
| 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**

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

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

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

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

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

1. https://www.afro.who.int/news/first-case-covid-19-confirmed-ethiopia [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. UNRCO INFO] COVID-19 SITREP #359-COVID-19 situation report # 359 [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. UNRCO INFO] COVID-19 SITREP #359-COVID-19 situation report # 359 [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. 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-5)
6. Access at: <http://web.undp.org/evaluation/guideline/section-6.shtml> [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. Engagement of evaluators should be done in line with guidelines for hiring consultants in the POPP <https://popp.undp.org/SitePages/POPPRoot.aspx> [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. <https://intranet.undp.org/unit/bom/pso/Support%20documents%20on%20IC%20Guidelines/Template%20for%20Confirmation%20of%20Interest%20and%20Submission%20of%20Financial%20Proposal.docx> [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. <http://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/corporate/Careers/P11_Personal_history_form.doc> [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
11. See ToR Annex F for rating scales. [↑](#footnote-ref-11)