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

**for UNDP-supported GEF-finance projects**

**BASIC CONTRACT INFORMATION**

**Location: Home-based with possible travel to Skopje**

**Application Deadline: UNDP roster of experts**

**Type of Contract: Individual Contract**

**Assignment Type: International Consultant**

**Languages Required: English**

**Starting Date: 22 Dec 2021**

**Duration of Initial Contract: 22 Dec 2021-11 March 2022**

**Expected Duration of Assignment: 3 months**

**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 and technical Macedonian capacities to enhance transparency in the framework of the Paris Agreement,” or the CBIT project (PIMS 6223) implemented through the Ministry of Environment and Physical Planning (MOEPP). The project started on the *12 June 2019* and is in its2nd 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’ ([TE\_GuidanceforUNDP-supportedGEF-financedProjects.pdf](http://web.undp.org/evaluation/guideline/documents/GEF/TE_GuidanceforUNDP-supportedGEF-financedProjects.pdf)).

##### **Project Description**

The objective of the CBIT project is to meet enhanced transparency requirements as defined in Article 13 of the Paris Agreement by strengthening institutional and technical capacity for measuring and reporting on emissions, mitigation and adaptation activities, and support received. It uses three means of strengthening capacity in this area: 1) Strengthening national institutions for MRV and aligning transparency activities with country priorities; 2) Ensuring that organizations and individuals have the necessary training and tools to conduct MRV activities; and 3) Transitioning arrangements for data collection, analysis, and reporting from a project-based cycle to a continuous process. Gender is as a key component of the project’s holistic approach for MRV, and there is a dedicated output that addresses gender in MRV. The UNDP gender marker is GEN 2.

The goal of the CBIT project is to assist the country in mainstreaming and integration of climate change consideration into national and sectorial development policies by providing continuity to the institutional and technical capacity strengthening process. This project will additionally improve the sustainability for the improvement of the country’s current and future NDCs and the preparation of future National Communication/ /Biennial Transparency Reports on Climate Change, also facilitating reporting requirements to the UNFCCC, the UN Sustainable Development Goals, the Energy Community, and the European Union.

The project budget totals USD 1,320,000 in grant funding from the GEF. Parallel co-financing totals at project inception were USD 1,410,000 (USD 1.4 million from the European Union and USD 10,000 from the Ministry of Environment and Physical Planning).

The Republic of North Macedonia has submitted ambitious goals of 82% reduction of GHG net emissions compared to 1990 for its enhanced NDC under the Paris Agreement. To achieve this goal, the enhanced NDC indicates 63 climate actions that need to be implemented by 2030. Government officials have expressed support for the project at a high level, and there has been active participation at the ministerial level in project briefings and events.

The operational environment of the project has been affected by the COVID-19 pandemic, which affected the timing of elections, the subsequent formation of a new government, and the timing of the adoption of the Law and Strategy on Climate Action, which will provide the institutional underpinning for the CBIT platform. International and country-level restrictions related to the pandemic have also affect the format of delivery of services: in-person events have been replaced with virtual events due to restrictions on gatherings, and work by international consultants and companies had to be done remotely due to travel restrictions.

##### **TE Purpose**

The TE report will assess the achievement of project results against what was expected to be achieved, 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 is a requirement for the GEF, and its results will be used by in-country project stakeholders, particularly government partners; by UNDP at the country, regional, and global level; and by other transparency stakeholders at the international level, such as climate funds and donors, to inform project design and programming.

As per the monitoring and evaluation plan in the project document, the TE will take place upon completion of all major project outputs and activities and will begin three months before operational closure of the project, allowing the evaluation mission to proceed while the project team is still in place, yet ensuring the project is close enough to completion for the evaluation team to reach conclusions on key aspects such as project sustainability. The evaluation will be ‘independent, impartial and rigorous’.

**DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES**

The evaluation should respond to the following Evaluative Criteria Questions

1. 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?

2. To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved?

3. Was the project implemented efficiently, in line with international and national norms and standards?

4. To what extent are there financial, institutional, socio-political, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?

1. How did the project contribute to gender equality and women’s empowerment?
2. Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status?

##### **TE Approach & Methodology**

The TE 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 TE team consider 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, the UNFCCC Focal point, the UNFCCC Gender and Climate Change Focal Point), Implementing Partners, the UNDP Country Office(s), the Regional Technical Advisors, direct beneficiaries and other stakeholders.

Engagement of stakeholders is vital to a successful TE. Stakeholder involvement should include interviews with stakeholders who have project responsibilities, including but not limited to executing agencies, senior officials and task team/component leaders, key experts and consultants in the subject area, the Project Board, project beneficiaries, academia, local government and CSOs, etc. Specific key stakeholders include: Ministry of Environment and Physical Planning (MOEPP), the Secretariat for European Affairs, the Ministry of Economy (ME), the Ministry of Labour and Social Policy (MLSP), and the Macedonian Academy of Sciences and Arts (MASA), the Network of Climate Change Practitioners (Government representatives from various institutions).

***International and domestic travels will be determined subject to the impact of COVID-19 and corporate and national/international travel restrictions, the TE may have to take place virtually; if not, the TE team is expected to conduct a field mission to Skopje.***

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 evaluation methods, survey and interview tools, interview schedules, field visits and data to be used in the evaluation should be clearly outlined in the inception report and be fully discussed and agreed between UNDP, stakeholders and the TE team.

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

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 *(*[TE\_GuidanceforUNDP-supportedGEF-financedProjects.pdf](http://web.undp.org/evaluation/guideline/documents/GEF/TE_GuidanceforUNDP-supportedGEF-financedProjects.pdf)*)*. The TE should pay particular attention to capturing best practices and lessons learned, which will be highly relevant to similar UNDP-GEF CBIT projects, and strategies for communicating project activities and results to stakeholders.

The Findings section of the TE report will cover the topics listed below. A full outline of the TE report’s content is provided in ToR Annex C.

The asterisk “(\*)” indicates criteria for which a rating is required.

Findings

1. Project Design/Formulation

* National priorities and country driven-ness
* Theory of Change
* Gender equality and women’s empowerment
* Social and Environmental Safeguards
* Analysis of Results Framework: project logic and strategy, indicators
* Assumptions and Risks
* Lessons from other relevant projects (e.g. same focal area) incorporated into project design
* Planned stakeholder participation
* Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector
* Management arrangements

1. Project Implementation

* Adaptive management (changes to the project design and project outputs during implementation)
* Actual stakeholder participation and partnership arrangements
* Project Finance and Co-finance
* Monitoring & Evaluation: design at entry (\*), implementation (\*), and overall assessment of M&E (\*)
* Implementing Agency (UNDP) (\*) and Executing Agency (\*), overall project oversight/implementation and execution (\*)
* Risk Management, including Social and Environmental Standards

1. Project Results

* Assess the achievement of outcomes against indicators by reporting on the level of progress for each objective and outcome indicator at the time of the TE and noting final achievements
* Relevance (\*), Effectiveness (\*), Efficiency (\*) and overall project outcome (\*)
* Sustainability: financial (\*) , socio-political (\*), institutional framework and governance (\*), environmental (\*), overall likelihood of sustainability (\*)
* Country ownership
* Gender equality and women’s empowerment
* Cross-cutting issues (poverty alleviation, improved governance, climate change mitigation and adaptation, disaster prevention and recovery, human rights, capacity development, South-South cooperation, knowledge management, volunteerism, etc., as relevant)
* GEF Additionality
* Catalytic Role / Replication Effect
* Progress to impact

1. Main Findings, Conclusions, Recommendations and Lessons Learned

* The TE 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 include results related to gender equality and empowerment of women.

The TE report will include an Evaluation Ratings Table, as shown in the ToR Annex.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Monitoring & Evaluation (M&E) | Rating[[1]](#footnote-1) |
| 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. **Expected Outputs and Deliverables**

The TE *team* shall prepare and submit:

* TE Inception Report: TE team clarifies objectives and methods of the TE no later than *1 week* before the TE mission. TE team submits the Inception Report to the Commissioning Unit and project management. Approximate due date: *16 Jan 2022*
* Presentation: TE team presents initial findings to project management and the Commissioning Unit at the end of the TE mission. Approximate due date: *2 Feb 2022*
* Draft TE Report: TE team submits full draft report with annexes *within 3 weeks* of the end of the TE mission. Approximate due date: *16 Feb 2022*
* Final TE Report\* and Audit Trail: TE team submits revised report, with Audit Trail detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final TE report, to the Commissioning Unit *within 1 week* of receiving UNDP comments on draft. Approximate due date: *11 Mar 2022*

\*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.[[2]](#footnote-2)

1. **TE Arrangements**

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

1. **Duration of the Work**

The total duration of the TE will be approximately *30 working days* over a time period of *16 weeks* starting on *22 December 2021*. The tentative TE timeframe is as follows:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Timeframe | Activity |
| *16 Nov – 20 December 2021* | Selection from roster |
| *18 Nov 2021* | Selection of TE team |
| *23-30 Dec 2021* | Preparation period for TE team (handover of documentation) |
| *12-16 Jan 2022* | Document review and preparation of TE Inception Report |
| *17-21 Jan 2022* | Finalization and Validation of TE Inception Report; latest start of TE mission |
| *(24–28 Jan 2022) 5 days* | TE mission: stakeholder meetings, interviews, etc. |
| *1 Feb 2022* | Mission wrap-up meeting & presentation of initial findings; earliest end of TE mission |
| *(3-15 Feb 2022) 10 days* | Preparation of draft TE report. |
| *(16 Feb – 28 Feb 2022)* | Circulation of draft TE report for comments |
| *(01 Mar – 04 Mar 2022)* | Incorporation of comments on draft TE report into Audit Trail & finalization of TE report |
| *(09 Mar 2022)* | Preparation and Issuance of Management Response |
| *(11 Mar 2022)* | Expected date of full TE completion |

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

1. **Duty Station**

*International and domestic travels will be determined subject to the impact of COVID-19 and corporate and national/international travel restrictions, the TE may have to take place virtually; if not, the TE team is expected to conduct a field mission to Skopje.*

**Travel:**

* International travel will be required to the Republic of North Macedoniaduring the TE mission;
* 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**

1. **TE Team Composition and Required Qualifications**

A team of *two independent evaluators (international and national)* will conduct the TE – *one team leader (international - with experience and exposure to projects and evaluations in other regions) and one team expert (national), from Skopje, North Macedonia*. The team leader will  *be responsible for the overall design and writing of the TE report.* The team expert will *assess emerging trends with respect to regulatory frameworks, budget allocations, capacity building, work with the Project Team in developing the TE itinerary, etc.*

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

**For International Consultant (Team Leader)**

The selection of the evaluator will be aimed at maximizing the attributes in the following areas:

Education

* Master’s degree in the natural sciences, social sciences, technical sciences or other relevant field;

Experience

* 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 climate change projects;
* Experience in evaluating projects;
* Experience working in the Western Balkans;
* Experience in relevant technical areas for at least 10 years;
* Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender and climate change; experience in gender responsive evaluation and analysis;
* Excellent communication skills;
* Demonstrable analytical skills;
* Experience working with the GEF or GEF-evaluations; Project evaluation/review experience within United Nations system will be considered an asset.

Language

* Fluency in written and spoken English.

Specifically, the international expert (team leader) will perform the following tasks:

• Lead and manage the evaluation mission; Guide the national expert in collecting data and information and preparation of relevant sections in the report

• Design the detailed evaluation scope and methodology (including the methods for data collection and analysis);

• Conduct an analysis of the outcome, outputs and partnership strategy (as per the scope of the evaluation described above);

• Draft related parts of the evaluation report; and

• Finalize the entire evaluation report.

1. **Evaluator Ethics**

The TE evaluator 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. **Payment Schedule**

* 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%

* 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 MTR reports).
* The Audit Trail includes responses to and justification for each comment listed.

**APPLICATION PROCESS**

GPN/ExpRes roster

1. **Annexes to the TE ToR**

* 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 and TE Ratings Table
* ToR Annex G: TE Report Clearance Form
* ToR Annex H: TE Audit Trail template

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

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **This project will contribute to the following Sustainable Development Goal (s):**  SDG 13 - Take urgent action to combat climate change and its impacts and SDG target  16.6: Develop effective, accountable and transparent institutions at all levels | | | | | |
| **This project will contribute to the following country outcome included in the UNDAF/Country Programme Document:** Outcome 4. By 2020, individuals, the private sector and state institutions base their actions on the principles of sustainable development and communities are more resilient to disasters and environmental risks  CPD Outcome Indicator: 4.1. Greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions (CO2 eq kT) Baseline (2012): 12,707.74 Target (2020): 11,309.89 | | | | | |
| **This project will be linked to the following output of the UNDP Strategic Plan:** Output 1.4: Scaled up action on climate change adaptation and mitigation cross sectors which is funded and implemented. | | | | | |
|  | | **Objective and Outcome Indicators** | **Baseline** | **Mid-Term Target** | **End of Project Target** | **Data Collection Methods and Risks/Assumptions** |
| **Project Objective:**  **To assist the country with meeting enhanced transparency requirements as defined in Article 13 of the Paris Agreement by strengthening institutional and technical capacity for measuring and reporting on emissions, mitigation and adaptation activities, and support received** | | *Indicator 1* (CBIT TT Indicator 3):  Quality of MRV Systems\* | 5\* | -- | 7\* | **Data Collection Methods:**  Project Documentation  Structured Interviews  Beneficiary survey  Official Gazette of RM  Final Project Evaluation Report  [UNFCCC web site](http://unfccc.int/national_reports/non-annex_i_natcom/reporting_on_climate_change/items/8722.php)  **Risks**:  Political turmoil and change of Government priorities  **Assumptions**:  Stable political situation and firm commitment of the Government to fulfil its commitments towards the UNFCCC and the Paris Agreement |
| *Indicator 2:* (CBIT TT indicator 4):  Status of Convention obligations on reporting, including mitigation contribution | Initial NDC, TNC, SBUR submitted | 3BUR endorsed by the Government and submitted to the UNFCCC by Q1 2020 | Updated NDC endorsed by the Government and submitted to the UNFCCC by Q4 2020 |
| *Indicator 3* (CBIT TT indicator 5):  Qualitative Assessment of Institutional Capacity for Transparency-Related Activities\*\* | 2\*\* | - | 3\*\* |
| *Indicator 4:*  Number of direct project beneficiaries disaggregated by gender as co-benefit of GEF investment | 29, out of which 12 are women | 50 of project beneficiaries, 20 of whom are women | 120 of project beneficiaries, 60 of whom are women |
| **Component/Outcome 1**  Institutional capacity strengthening for MRV | | *Indicator 5:*  Existence of a designated CC MRV unit at MoEPP. | MoEPP does not have a designated unit for CC MRV | MRV unit established at MOEPP to oversee climate change reporting on national and international commitments | MRV unit continues to function and oversee climate change reporting on national and international commitments | **Data Collection Methods**:  Project documentation,  MoEPP documentation  Open Governance Partnership Report  Survey  **Risks**: Lack of resources on the part of the government to support the infrastructure for the new unit.  **Assumptions**:  The NCCC will assure inter-agency coordination on issues related to MRV |
| *Indicator 6:*  Quality of transparency activities undertaken by government organizations | 5 | \_ | 7 |
| *Indicator 7*:  Presence of national networks established of staff responible for MRV within the key relevant government organizations, as well as local experts. | No network existing |  | Network established |
| *Indicator 8*:  Level of capacity to ensure gender equality and equity in climate change projects | Gender and Climate Change Action Plan developed |  | At least 30% of the Action Plan implemented |
| **Component/ Outcome 2**  Training and tools for activities conducted under Article 13 | | *Indicator 9:*  Number of toolkits on MRV for Climate Change Mitigation and Climate Change Adaptation:  a) developed  b) used | 1. Country-specific toolkits on MRV are not available, and there is a general shortage of information on MRV in adaptation. 2. 0 | a) 5 toolkits on MRV are available to stakeholders  b) 2 | a) 8 toolkits on MRV are available to stakeholders  b) Employees working in at least 3 government agencies report using the toolkits in their work | **Data Collection Methods:**  Training manuals and technical documentation  Reports, strategies and plans on national and local levels.  Stakeholder interviews/questionnaires/  surveys  **Risks**:  Unwillingness to incorporate the findings and recommendations into relevant policy instruments that will facilitate investments in low carbon development, especially for the industry and private sector;  **Assumptions**:  Government employees will have sufficient time to complete training  Strong commitment from the national and local governments to invest in capacity building and increasing human and financial resources for establishment and operationalization of a national MRV system. |
| *Indicator 10:*  Integration of transparency concepts into key sectoral policies/legislation | Transparency concepts are not currently integrated into key sectoral policies and/or legislation. |  | At least 2 policies or laws integrate transparency concepts. |
| *Indicator 11:*  Country-specific training on gender and climate change | General materials exist, but sectoral ministries require country-appropriate, sector-specific information | At least 3 sector-specific trainings on gender issues have been developed and delivered for sectoral ministries | A gender module has been developed for delivery in the context of climate finance training |
| *Indicator 12:*  Level of dissemination of knowledge products produced by the project | 0 (no knowledge products on MRV produced) | Knowledge products generated by the project to date are available on the internet. | All knowledge products generated by the project are available on the internet, including a list of these products. |
| **Component / Outcome 3**  Design and implementation of a sustainable national MRV system | | *Indicator 13:*  A national platform fully functional to manage transparency data and report on NDC progress | 0 | 0 | 1 | **Data Collection:** Institutional arrangements of transparency system (Law on Climate Action and respective bylaws)  MoUs with relevant institutions  Interviews with agency personnel  **Risks:** Insufficient human and financial resources for operationalization of a national platform/MRV system |
| *Indicator 14:*  Number of government agencies reporting data to the national platform on a regular basis | 0 | 2 | 4 |
| *Indicator 15:*  Number of government agencies accessing data and information on the national platform | 0 | 4 | 10 |
| *Indicator 16:*  Number of MRV tools that incorporate Gender-sensitive measurement and reporting | 0 | 0 | 2 |

\* The rating for CBIT Indictor 3 is based on a 10-point scale specified by the GEFSec as follows:

Very little measurement is done, reporting is partial and irregular and verification is not there;

Measurement systems are in place, but data is of poor quality and/or methodologies are not very robust; reporting is done only on request or to limited audience or partially; verification is not there;

Measurement systems are in place for a few activities, improved data quality and methodologies, but not cost or time efficient; wider access to reporting is still limited and information is partial; verification is rudimentary/non-standardized;

Measurement systems are strong in a limited set of activities however, analyses still needs improvement; periodic monitoring and reporting although not yet cost/time efficient; verification is only upon specific request and limited;

Measurement systems are strong for a limited set of activities and periodically report on key GHG related indicators i.e. mainstreamed into the activity implementation; reporting is improved through few pathways but limited audience and formats; verification limited;

Measurement systems are strong and cover a greater percentage of activities – feedback loops exist even if they are not fully functioning; reporting is available through multiple pathways and formats but may not be complete/transparent; verification is done through standard methodologies but only partially (i.e. not all data is verifiable);

Measurement regarding GHG is broadly done (with widely acceptable methodologies), need for more sophisticated analyses to improve policy; Reporting is periodic with improvements in transparency; verification is done through more sophisticated methods even if partially;

Strong standardized measurements processes established for key indicators and mainstreamed into institutional policy implementation; reporting is widely available in multiple formats; verification is done for a larger set of information;

Strong Monitoring and Reporting systems – robust methodologies, cost effective and efficient, periodic; verification done to a significant degree;

Strong MRV systems that provide quality GHG-related information in a transparent, accurate and accessible to a wide audience, with feedback of information from MRV flowing into policy design and implementation

\*\* The rating for CBIT Indicator 5 is based on a 4-point scale specified by the GEFSec as follows:

No designated transparency institution to support and coordinate the planning and implementation of transparency activities under Article 13 of the Paris Agreement exists.

Designated transparency institution exists, but with limited staff and capacity to support and coordinate implementation of transparency activities under Article 13 of Paris Agreement. Institution lacks authority or mandate to coordinate transparency activities under Article 13.

Designated transparency institution has an organizational unit with standing staff with some capacity to coordinate and implement transparency activities under Article 13 of the Paris Agreement. Institution has authority or mandate to coordinate transparency activities under Article 13. Activities are not integrated into national planning or budgeting activities.

Designated transparency institution(s) has an organizational unit with standing staff with some capacity to coordinate and implement transparency activities. Institution(s) has clear mandate or authority to coordinate activities under Article 13 of the Paris Agreement, and activities are integrated into national planning and budgeting activities.

**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 | All Project Implementation Reports (PIRs) |
| 8 | Progress reports (quarterly, semi-annual or annual, with associated workplans and financial reports) |
| 9 |  |
| 10 | Minutes of Project Board Meetings and of other meetings (i.e. Project Appraisal Committee meetings) |
| 11 | GEF Tracking Tools (from CEO Endorsement, midterm and terminal stages) |
| 12 | GEF/LDCF/SCCF Core Indicators (from PIF, CEO Endorsement, midterm and terminal stages); for GEF-6 and GEF-7 projects only |
| 13 | Financial data, including actual expenditures by project outcome, including management costs, and including documentation of any significant budget revisions |
| 14 | Co-financing data with expected and actual contributions broken down by type of co-financing, source, and whether the contribution is considered as investment mobilized or recurring expenditures |
| 15 | Electronic copies of project outputs (booklets, manuals, technical reports, articles, etc.) |
| 16 | Sample of project communications materials |
| 17 | Summary list of formal meetings, workshops, etc. held, with date, location, topic, and number of participants |
| 18 | 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 |
| 19 | 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) |
| 20 | List of related projects/initiatives contributing to project objectives approved/started after GEF project approval (i.e. any leveraged or “catalytic” results) |
| 21 | 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 |
| 22 | UNDP Country Programme Document (CPD) |
| 23 | List and contact details for project staff, key project stakeholders, including Project Board members, RTA, Project Team members, and other partners to be consulted |
| 24 | Project deliverables that provide documentary evidence of achievement towards project outcomes |

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

1. Title page

* Tile 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

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[[3]](#footnote-3))

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 incl. Social and Environmental Standards (Safeguards)
  1. Project Results
* Progress towards objective and expected outcomes (\*)
* Relevance (\*)
* Effectiveness (\*)
* Efficiency (\*)
* Overall Outcome (\*)
* Country ownership
* Gender
* Other Cross-cutting Issues
* 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 Role / 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
* List of persons interviewed
* List of documents reviewed
* Summary of field visits
* 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.)* |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved? | | | |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in line with international and national norms and standards? | | | |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, socio-political, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results? | | | |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Gender equality and women’s empowerment: How did the project contribute to gender equality and women’s empowerment? | | | |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status? | | | |
|  |  |  |  |
| *(Expand the table to include questions for all criteria being assessed: Monitoring & Evaluation, UNDP oversight/implementation, Implementing Partner Execution, cross-cutting issues, etc.)* | | | |

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

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

**Evaluators/Consultants:**

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

**Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **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 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Evaluation Ratings Table** | |
| Monitoring & Evaluation (M&E) | Rating[[4]](#footnote-4) |
| 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 |  |

**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. 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-1)
2. Access at: <http://web.undp.org/evaluation/guideline/section-6.shtml> [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. See ToR Annex F for rating scales. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. Outcomes, Effectiveness, Efficiency, M&E, I&E Execution, Relevance are rated on a 6-point rating scale: 6 = Highly Satisfactory (HS), 5 = Satisfactory (S), 4 = Moderately Satisfactory (MS), 3 = Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU), 2 = Unsatisfactory (U), 1 = Highly Unsatisfactory (HU). Sustainability is rated on a 4-point scale: 4 = Likely (L), 3 = Moderately Likely (ML), 2 = Moderately Unlikely (MU), 1 = Unlikely (U) [↑](#footnote-ref-4)