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**BASIC CONTRACT INFOMATION**

**Location:** UNDP Kampala

**Application Deadline:** 30th June 2021

**Type of contract:** Individual Contract (IC)

**Assignment type:** TE International Consultant

**Languages required:** English

**Starting date:** 19th July

**Duration of Initial Contract:** 27 working days

**Expected Duration of Assignment:** July – November 2021 (27 working days)

**BACKGROUND**

**INTRODUCTION**

In accordance with UNDP and GEF M&E policies and procedures, all full- and medium-sized UNDP-supported GEF-financed projects are required to undergo a Terminal Evaluation (TE) at the end of the project. This Terms of Reference (ToR) sets out the expectations for the TE of the medium-sized project titled “Strengthening Institutional Capacity for Effective Implementation of Rio Conventions in Uganda” (PIMS #5643) implemented through the National Environment Management Authority of Uganda. The project started on the 01st November 2017 and is in its 4th year of implementation. The TE process follows 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).

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

The project is designed to the project’s strategy emphasizes a long-term approach to institutionalizing capacities to meet Rio Conventions obligations through a set of activities that form the foundation for effective decision-making and policy making regarding global environmental benefits. Three outcomes of the project include 1) Strengthened and elaborated national institutional framework for managing the environment and natural resources 2) Technical and management staff sufficiently trained in monitoring and data analysis, and linkage to decision-making processes.; 3) An improved national system to manage (i.e. collect, store, and access) data and information that supports monitoring and implementations of Rio Conventions.

The project goal is to strengthen institutional capacity for Rio Conventions implementation and environmental data and information management in Uganda, in order to improve the reporting process to the Rio Conventions and ensure sustainable development through better design and enforcement of environmental policy. The project’s strategy emphasizes a long-term approach to institutionalizing capacities to meet Rio Conventions obligations through a set of activities that form the foundation for effective decision-making and policy making regarding global environmental benefits. Specifically, the project is implemented through two components, namely, establishing a national institutional framework for environmental management, and development of coordinated information and data management system. Active participation of stakeholder representatives in the project life cycle facilitates the strategic implementation of project activities, mainly at the district level, in line with project objectives. Moreover, the inclusion of different stakeholders contributes to the adaptive collaborative management of project implementation and promotes long-term sustainability of project outcomes.

With 900,000.00 US$ from the GEF, the MEAs will have a total volume of 1.950 million US$. Co-financing is provided by Ugandan institutions and UNDP in-kind (National Environment Management Authority 275,000.00 USD, UNDP 200,000.00 USD) Ministry of Water and Environment (MWE) 200,000.00 USD, Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries (MAAIF) 150,000.00 USD, recipient District Local Governments 125,000.00 USD, Civil Society Organizations (CSOs) at local level 100,000.00)

In accordance with UNDP and GEF M&E policies and procedures, all full and medium-sized UNDP support GEF financed projects are required to undergo a terminal evaluation upon completion of implementation. These terms of reference (TOR) sets out the expectations for a Terminal Evaluation (TE) of the project “Strengthening Institutional Capacity for Effective Implementation of Rio Conventions in Uganda)” (PIMS# 5643)

The project is executed by the UNDP and NEMA in cooperation with other government and non-government institutions including five local governments. The Main project partners are the Ministry of Water and Environment, Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries, the pilot district local governments of Wakiso, Mukono, Buikwe, Kayunga and Jinja, and the local Civil Society Organizations.

The project is aligned with the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) this project contributes to the following Sustainable Development Goal (s):

*Goal 15*: Protect, restore, and promote sustainable use of terrestrial ecosystems, sustainably manage forests, combat desertification, and halt and reverse land degradation and halt biodiversity loss.

Goal 17: Strengthen the means of implementation and revitalize the global partnership for sustainable development.

**TE PURPOSE**

The TE report will assess the achievement of project results against what was planned 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 TE will be conducted according to the guidelines, rules, and procedures established by UNDP and GEF as reflected in the UNDP Evaluation Guidance for GEF Financed Projects.

**DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITY**

**TE APPROACH AND 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 representatives of the Ministry of Water and Environmental, Ministry Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries, Ministry of Local Government, Makerere University Department of Environmental Management, Nature Uganda, Environmental Alert and Action Coalition for Development and Environment, Pilot district local governments of Wakiso, Mukono, Kayunga, Buikwe and Jinja. Project Board, project beneficiaries, academia, local government and CSOs, etc. No requirements for field visits since there were no local interventions**.**

The national TE consultant is expected to work-with international TE consultant during the field mission to Uganda. Interviews will be held with the following organizations and individuals at a minimum: Ministry of Water and Environmental, Ministry Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries, Ministry of Local Government, Makerere University Department of Environmental Management, Nature Uganda, Environmental Alert and Action Coalition for Development and Environment, Pilot district local governments of Wakiso, Mukono, Kayunga, Buikwe and Jinja and UNDP Uganda Country Office. In case of travel restriction to Uganda due to the COVID-19 crisis, the interviewees will be held by national TE consultant only or will be held remotely.

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.

**DETAILED SCOPE OF THE TE**

The TE will assess project performance against expectations as set out in the project’s 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).

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 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:

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

**EXPECTED OUTPUTS AND DELIVERABLES**

The TE consultant/team shall prepare and submit:

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| # | Deliverable | Description | Timing | Responsibilities |
| 1 | TE Inception Report | TE team clarifies objectives, methodology and timing of the TE | 06 August 2021 | TE team submits Inception Report to UNDP Commissioning Unit and project management |
| 2 | Presentation | Initial Findings | End of TE mission: 18 August 2021 | TE team presents to UNDP Commissioning Unit and project management |
| 3 | Draft TE Report | Full draft report (using guidelines on report content in ToR. | Within 3 weeks of end of TE mission: 24 September 2021  | TE team submits to UNDP Commissioning Unit; reviewed by BPPS-GEF 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  | Within 1 week of receiving comments on draft report: 15 October 2021 | TE team submits both documents to the UNDP Commissioning Unit |

\*The final TE report must be in English. If applicable, the Commissioning Unit may choose to arrange for a translation of the report into a language more widely shared by national stakeholders.

\*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.

*NOTE: Flexibility and delays should be included in the timeframe for the TE, with additional time for implementing the TE virtually recognizing possible delays in accessing stakeholder groups due to COVID-19. Consideration may be given to a time contingency should the evaluation be delayed in any way due to COVID-19.*

**TE ARRANGEMENTS**

The principal responsibility for managing the TE resides with the Commissioning Unit. The Commissioning Unit for this project’s TE is UNDP Uganda Country Office.

The Commissioning Unit will contract the consultants 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.

**TIMEFRAME**

The total duration of the TE will be approximately 27 working days over a time period of 16 weeks starting on 19 July 2021 and shall not exceed five months from when the TE team is hired. The tentative TE timeframe is as follows:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Timeframe | Activity |
| 15 June 2021 | Application closes |
| 22 June 2021 | Selection of TE team |
| 15 July 2021 | Preparation period for TE team (handover of documentation) |
| 30 July 2021 (4 days) | Document review and preparation of TE Inception Report |
| 15 August 2021 (2 days) | Finalization and Validation of TE Inception Report; latest start of TE mission |
| 16 August – 21 August 2021 (10 days)  | TE mission: stakeholder meetings, interviews, etc. |
| 06 September 2021 | Mission wrap-up meeting & presentation of initial findings; earliest end of TE mission |
| 13 September 2021 (6 days) | Preparation and submission of draft TE report |
| 21 – 30 September 2021 | Circulation of draft TE report for comments |
| 01 - 05 September 2021 (2 days) | Incorporation of comments on draft TE report into Audit Trail & finalization of TE report  |
| 18 October 2021 | Expected date of full TE completion. Submission of final report and supporting documentation  |
| 27 October 2021 | Preparation and Issuance of Management Response |

**DUTY STATION**

**Travel:**

* International travel **might** not be possible for the team leader given the current situation with the COVID-19 pandemic and travel restriction imposed by number of countries in the region and globally;
* In case of travel, the BSAFE course must be successfully completed prior to commencement of travel;
* Individual Consultants are responsible for ensuring they have vaccinations/inoculations when travelling to certain countries, as designated by the UN Medical Director.
* Consultants are required to comply with the UN security directives set forth under: <https://dss.un.org/dssweb/>
* All related travel expenses will be covered and will be reimbursed as per UNDP rules and regulations upon submission of an F-10 claim form and supporting documents.

**REQUIRED SKILLS AND EXPERIENCE**

**TE TEAM COMPOSITION AND REQUIRED QUALIFICATIONS**

A team of two independent evaluators will conduct the TE – one team leader/ International Consultant (with experience and exposure to projects and evaluations in other regions) and one national team expert. The team leader will be responsible for the overall design and writing of the TE report. The National consultant is expected to work under the supervision of the Team Leader.

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.

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

Education

* Master’s degree in in environment/forestry/agriculture/process engineering or economy or other closely related field;

Experience

* Recent experience with results-based management evaluation methodologies;
* Experience applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios;
* Competence in adaptive management, as applied to biodiversity, climate change and land degradation;
* 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 biodiversity, climate change and land degradation; experience in gender responsive evaluation and analysis;
* Excellent communication skills;
* Demonstrable analytical skills;
* Project evaluation/review experience within United Nations system will be considered an asset;

Language

* Fluency in written and spoken English.

**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 the collection of data and reporting on data. The evaluator must also ensure the 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.

**PAYMENT SCHEDULE**

* 20% payment upon satisfactory delivery of the final TE Inception Report and approval of 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%:

* 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.

*In line with the UNDP’s financial regulations, when determined by the Commissioning Unit and/or the consultant that a deliverable or service cannot be satisfactorily completed due to the impact of COVID-19 and limitations to the TE, that deliverable or service will not be paid.*

*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.*

**APPLICATION PROCESS**

**SCOPE OF PRICE PROPOSAL AND SCHEDULE OF PAYMENTS**

Financial Proposal:

* Financial proposals must be “all inclusive” and expressed in a lump-sum for the total duration of the contract. The term “all inclusive” implies all cost (professional fees, travel costs, living allowances etc.)
* The lump sum is fixed regardless of changes in the cost components.

**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) 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));
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 email 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 should be submitted by email to procurement.ug@undp.org and with the subject name “**Consultant for Terminal Evaluation of Strengthening Institutional Capacity for Effective Implementation of Rio Conservation in Uganda”** no later than**15th June, 2021 (5pm - Uganda Time).**Any request for clarification must be sent by standard electronic communication to procurement.ug@undp.org. Incomplete applications will be excluded from further consideration.

**CRITERIA FOR THE SELECTION OF THE BEST OFFER**

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.

**ANNEXES TO THE TOR**

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

Annex A: Project Logical Framework

**UPDATED LOGFRAME BASED ON RECOMMENDATIONS FROM INCEPTION WORKSHOP AND INCEPTION REPORT**

During Project inception, it was recommended that **Indicator 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, disaggregated by partnership type, be merged with some targets of indicator 4 (**4** inter-ministerial cooperation protocols on the implementation of Rio Conventions are in place, tested and adopted by the State agencies). This was due to the relationships of their intentions and also to avoid very many partnerships which might be hard to implement.

Suggested changes were elaborated in the Inception report and summarized in the table below.

|  |
| --- |
| **Project Results Framework** |
| This project will contribute to the following Sustainable Development Goal (s): |
| ***Goal 15*: Protect, restore, and promote sustainable use of terrestrial ecosystems, sustainably manage forests, combat desertification, and halt and reverse land degradation and halt biodiversity loss.** |
| **Goal 17: Strengthen the means of implementation and revitalize the global partnership for sustainable development.** |
| This project will contribute to the following country outcome included in the UNDAF/Country Programme Document: |
| ***UNDAF 2016-2020: Outcome 3.1. Natural Resource Management and Climate Change resilience: By end 2020, Natural resources management and energy access are gender responsive, effective, and efficient, reducing emissions, negating the impact of climate-induced disasters and environmental degradation on livelihoods and production systems, and strengthening community resilience.*** |
| ***UNDAF 2016-2020: Outcome 1.3. Institutional Development, Transparency, and Accountability: By end 2020, targeted public institutions and Public-Private*** |
| ***Partnerships are fully functional at all levels, inclusive, resourced, performance-oriented, innovative and evidence seeking supported by a strategic evaluation function; and with Uganda’s population enforcing a culture of mutual accountability, transparency, and integrity.*** |
| ***UNDP's Country Programme Document (2016-2020): “to strengthen natural resources management and resilience to climate change and disaster risks, while expanding livelihood and employment opportunities for excluded groups”.*** |
| 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.** |
| Project Objective: T**o strengthen institutional capacity for effective implementation and monitoring of the Rio Conventions in Uganda** | **Objective and Outcome Indicator** | **Baseline** | **Mid-Term Target** | **End of Project Target** | **Assumptions**  |
| **Indicator 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, disaggregated by partnership type. | Currently, there are no (Zero) effective partnership mechanisms in place | 3 partnership mechanisms | 4 partnership mechanisms developed, approved, and implemented. | Proposed partnership mechanisms are approved and politically supported by the State agencies. |
| **Indicator 2:** % of institutions and stakeholders trained on how to use different tools available to manage information. | Very limited institutional capacities (Less than 50%) to collect, analyse, share and monitor data at national and district levels.  | 75% of institutions and the concerned staff at national and district levels | 100% of the targeted institutions and the staffs receive timely and professional training. At least 30% of the people involved in the training programmes are women. | The project will be executed in a transparent, holistic, adaptive, and collaborative manner. Concerned staff to be involved in the capacity development programmes. |
| Outcome 1: **Strengthened and elaborated national Institutional framework for managing the environment and natural resources** | **Indicator 3:** Number of established and approved institutional frameworks for environmental management at national level | There are currently no and /or fragmented and individualized frameworks for environmental management | 2 Draft institutional frameworks for management of the environment and natural resources, in acceptance by government representatives and other stakeholder representatives. Rio Conventions focal points will document references to MEA Coordination Unit show an improvement in institutional responses to monitoring and implementation of the Rio Conventions | 2 Proposed Institutional frameworks are approved and implemented. | The project will be executed in a transparent, holistic, adaptive, and collaborative manner. The concerned States Departments in Uganda will approve the proposed frameworks. |
| **Indicator 4:** Existence of inter-ministerial cooperation on the implementation of Rio Conventions | There is little inter-ministerial/Agencies coordination on the implementation of Rio Conventions. | Inter-ministerial cooperation on the implementation of Rio Conventions (Partial),  4 training workshops per year, for technical staff, decision-makers, and key stakeholders. 4 inter-ministerial cooperation protocols developed, | Formal Inter-ministerial cooperation on the implementation of Rio Conventions in place.  Specifically, Satisfactory trainees’ evaluation of the implementation of the proposed inter-ministerial cooperation protocols.  **N/A (integrate the partnership in indicator/target 1** | Institutional reforms and modifications recommended by the project are political, technically, and financially feasible and approved by the States Agencies.Not applicable |
| Outcome 2 **Technical and management staff sufficiently trained in monitoring and data analysis, and linkage to decision-making processes.** | **Indicator 5:** Existence of institutional and technical capacities to create knowledge and monitor the implementation of Rio Conventions  |  Institutional capacities for managing the RioConventions arepiecemeal and takes place through RioConvention-specific projects |  Institutional and technical capacities to create knowledge and monitor the implementation of Rio Conventions (Partial). Annual dialogues involving men and women held by quarters 3, 6, 9, 12.Capacities of at least 4 institutions and 75 (females and males) are enhanced |  Institutional and technical capacities to create knowledge and monitor the implementation of Rio Conventions in place Annual dialogues involving men and women held by quarters 4,7,10, 13.Capacities of at least 4 institutions and 150 (females and males) are enhanced.At least 30% of the staff trained are women. | Government staff and nongovernmental stakeholder representatives are actively engaged in the project |
|  Outcome 3 **An improved national system to manage (i.e. collect, store and access) data and information–that supports monitoring and implementations of Rio Conventions** |  **Indicator 6:** Existence of environmental information management and decisions support system for improved implementation and monitoring of the Rio Conventions. |  Most the environmental data are available separately but not accessible to end-users in a comprehensive way.There are several systems for environmental data collection, analysis, and sharing pertaining, but are not all unified and data are not easily accessible |  A unified system for monitoring the implementation of Rio Conventions and reporting on them is proposed and designed. |  A unified system for monitoring the implementation of Rio Conventions and reporting on them is established and operational. |  The right representation from the various government ministries, departments, and agencies participate in project activitiesCooperation from different agencies to share data with the NEMA. |
|   |  **Indicator 7:** Existence of an agreed environmental clear house unified system for improved implementation and reporting of the Rio Conventions |  There is a clear house mechanism exist in NEMA for the Biodiversity area. There is a need to create a unified system for the three Rio Conventions. |  A unified system for data collection, analysis, and sharing established at NEMA. |  Sectoral environmental data (system) is accessible to end users in a comprehensive and policy-relevant way. |  Decision-makers are resistant to adopt new attitudes towards the global environment.Institutions and individuals’ willingness to cooperate |

Annex B: PROJECT INFORMATION PACKAGE to be reviewed by the 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  | Annual Progress reports  |
| 8 | Minutes of Project Board Meetings  |
| 9 | GEF Tracking Tools (from CEO Endorsement, midterm and terminal stages)  |
| 10 | GEF/LDCF/SCCF Core Indicators (from PIF, CEO Endorsement, midterm and terminal stages); for GEF-6 and GEF-7 projects only  |
| 11 | Financial data, including actual expenditures by project outcome, including management costs, and including documentation of any significant budget revisions  |
| 12  | 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  |
| 13 | Audit reports  |
| 14 | Electronic copies of project outputs (booklets, manuals, technical reports, articles, etc.)  |
| 15 | Sample of project communications materials  |
| 16 | Summary list of formal meetings, workshops, etc. held, with date, location, topic, and number of participants  |
| 17 | Any relevant socio-economic monitoring data |
| 18 | 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)  |
| 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  |
| 21 | UNDP Country Programme Document (CPD)  |
| 22 | List and contact details for project staff, key project stakeholders, Project Board members, RTA and other partners |
| 23 | Project deliverables that provide documentary evidence of achievement towards project outcomes |

Annex C: CONTENT OF THE REPORT

* 1. **Title page**
* Tile of UNDP-supported GEF-financed project
* UNDP PIMS ID and GEF ID
* TE timeframe and date of final TE report
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Annex D: Evaluation criteria matrix template

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Evaluation Criteria\*** | **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?** |
| • Is CCCD project’s theory of change clearly articulated? |  |  |  |
| • What specific methods and tools were used to assess the needs of the project beneficiaries? |  |  |  |
| • Have the interventions match the capacities needs for the institutions and individuals? |  |  |  |
| • How well does CCCD project react to changing work environment and how well has the design able to adjust to changing external circumstances? |  |  |  |
| **Effectiveness and results: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been****achieved?** |
| • To what extent is CCCD project successful in achieving the expected results? |  |  |  |
| • To what extent were target institutions (MEP primarily) engaged in the implementation of the project? |  |  |  |
| • How effective CCCD project has been in developing institutional capacity especially in preparing policy review and monitoring MEP in gender responsive budgeting? |  |  |  |
| • To what extent are CCCD project interventions been implemented/ coordinated with appropriate and effective partnership and strategies? What has been the nature and added value of these partnerships |  |  |  |
| • What results are evident short-term to long term results that can be directly or indirectly attributed to the project? |  |  |  |
| • To what extent the project was effective in coordinating its activities with UN agencies, relevant development partners, donors, CSO, NGOs and academic institution? |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| **Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in line with international and national norms and****standards?** |
| • To what extent are funding, staff, and other resources used to achieving the expected results of the project? |  |  |  |
| • Based on cost-benefit analysis what conclusions can be drawn regarding ‘value for money’ and cost related efficiencies or inefficiencies in implementing CCCD project? |  |  |  |
| • Were there any unanticipated events, opportunities or constraints contributed to or hindered the delivery of the interventions on timely manner? |  |  |  |
| • Have associated risks at the national and local level been anticipated and addressed?  |  |  |  |
| • To what extent the project used UNDP’s internal expertise and adopted joint planning and programming with other UNDP projects? |  |  |  |
| **Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, socio-political, and/or environmental****risks to sustaining long-term project results?** |
|  |  |  |  |
| • To what extent GEP-II has taken the necessary steps to transfer capacities and skills to MEP and other institutional partners? |  |  |  |
| • How, and to what extent did UNDP/ CCCD project design, implementation strategy/partnership, and governance foster national ownership and capacity development? |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| **Gender equality and women’s empowerment: How did the project contribute to gender equality and women’s empowerment?** |
| • How did UNDP/ CCCD project contribute towards, and advance gender equality aspirations of the Government of the republic of Uganda; UNDAF outcomes; and CPD outcomes? |  |  |  |
| • What factors contribute or influence CCCD project’s ability to positively contribute to policy change from a gender perspective, women’s economic empowerment, and access to justice and human rights? |  |  |  |
| • To what extent the project adopted a coordinated and participatory approach in mainstreaming gender into policies and programs? |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| **Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward reduced****environmental stress and/or improved ecological status?** |
| • To what extent did the capacity building activities under each of the pillars produce lasting results? |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

**\*Please note that the questions are indicative and that they could be revised by the Evaluation Team, as appropriate**

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). **See end od Doc**

Annex F: TE Rating scales

**Ratings Scale for:**

* **Monitoring & Evaluation**
* **Implementation/Oversight and Execution Outcome**
* **Relevance, Effectiveness, Efficiency**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Rating** | **Description** |
| 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.  |

**Sustainability Ratings Scale**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Rating** | **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  |

Annex G: Evaluation Report Clearance Form

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

Terminal Evaluation Report for”Capacity Development for Improved Implementation of Multilateral Environmental Agreements (MEAs)”, Reviewed and Cleared By:

**Commissioning Unit (M&E Focal Point)**

Name: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

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

**Regional Technical Advisor (Nature, Climate and Energy)**

Name: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

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