



United Nations Development Programme / Government of Mauritius

Terms of Reference for the Appointment of National Consultant for Terminal Evaluation of the Climate Change Adaptation Programme in the Coastal Zone of Mauritius

TITLE:	National Consultant for Terminal Evaluation of the Climate Change Adaptation Programme in the Coastal Zone of Mauritius
SECTOR:	Climate and Disaster Resilience
LOCATION:	Republic of Mauritius
DUTY STATION:	Home Based and UNDP Mauritius Country Office
DURATION:	20 working days
STARTING DATE:	September 2019
END DATE:	November 2019

A. Project title:

Climate Change Adaptation Programme in the Coastal Zone of Mauritius

B. Project Description:

The Republic of Mauritius (ROM) is a group of islands in the South West of the Indian Ocean, consisting of the main island of Mauritius and several islands, namely, Rodrigues, St Brandon, Agalega, Chagos, Tromelin and a group of volcanic and coral islets located a short distance from their coasts. As a Small Island Developing State (SIDS), the ROM is particularly vulnerable to the adverse effects of climate change, especially in the coastal zone, where a convergence of accelerating sea level rise and increasing frequency and intensity of tropical cyclones (with more intense rainfall events and stronger winds) will result in considerable economic loss, humanitarian stresses, and environmental degradation.

The Government of Mauritius had secured a grant from the Adaptation Fund with the support of UNDP for the implementation of the project entitled "Climate Change Adaptation Programme in the Coastal Zone of Mauritius" since 2012. This fund, set up under the Kyoto Protocol of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, is targeted to assist developing-country parties to the above

protocol that are particularly vulnerable to the adverse effects of climate change in meeting the costs of adaptation projects and actions that will limit the impacts on the party.

The objective of the project is to increase climate resilience of communities and livelihoods in coastal areas in Mauritius (all islands), through the following components/outcomes:

- Application of adaptation measures to protect currently vulnerable coastal ecosystem and community features (at three priority sites on the island of Mauritius);
- Development and implementation of an early warning system for incoming surge on ROM;
- Training to promote compliance with climate-proofed planning, design, and location guidelines;
- Policy mainstreaming; and,
- Knowledge dissemination and management.

In accordance with the rules and procedures established by UNDP and GEF, as reflected in the UNDP Evaluation Guidance for GEF Financed Projects a Terminal Evaluation of the “Climate Change Adaptation Programme in the Coastal Zone of Mauritius” is being initiated.

The objectives of the evaluation are to assess the achievement of project results, and to draw lessons that can both improve the sustainability of benefits from this project, and aid in the overall enhancement of UNDP programming.

The team leader will be an International Consultant and will be responsible for the quality of the report and timely submission. The National Consultant will provide supportive roles in terms of logistical/meeting arrangements, professional inputs, knowledge of local policies, local navigation, translation/language support, etc.

C. Evaluation approach and method

An overall approach and method for conducting project terminal evaluations of UNDP supported GEF financed projects has been developed over time. The evaluation should include a mixed methodology of document review, interviews, and observations from project site visits, at minimum, and the evaluators should make an effort to triangulate information. The evaluator is expected to frame the evaluation effort using the criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and impact, as defined and explained in the UNDP Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-supported, GEF-financed Projects.

The evaluation must provide evidence - based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The evaluator is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with government counterparts, in particular the GEF operational focal point, UNDP Country Office, project team, UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based in the region and key stakeholders.

The National Consultant is expected to support the Team leader who will conduct a field mission to Mauritius, including implementation sites where works have been completed or nearing completion. Interviews will be held with the following organizations and individuals at a minimum, depending on availability of the officials at the time of evaluation:

- Ministry of Social Security, National Solidarity, and Environment and Sustainable Development (Environment and Sustainable Development Division)
- Mauritius Meteorological Services
- University of Mauritius
- Local Authorities
- Ministry of Ocean Economy, Marine Resources, Fisheries, Shipping and Outer Islands
- Beach Authority
- Ministry of Finance and Economic Development
- Local community

The evaluator will review all relevant sources of information, such as the project document, project reports – including Annual Project Performance Reports (PPRs), project budget revisions, midterm review, progress reports, project files, national strategic and legal documents, and any other materials that the evaluator considers useful for this evidence-based assessment. A list of documents that the project team will provide to the evaluator for review is included in Annex B of this Terms of Reference.

C.2 Functions and Responsibilities

The International Consultant will be the team leader and will be responsible for the quality of the report and timely submission. The **National Consultant** will provide supportive roles in terms of logistical/meeting arrangements, professional inputs, knowledge of local policies, local navigation, translation/language support, etc.

The review team is expected to prepare an Evaluation Report based on the outline listed in [Annex C](#) while specifically including the following aspects:

1. Adequacy of the overall project concept, design, implementation methodology, institutional structure, timelines, budgetary allocation or any other aspect of the project design that the evaluation team may want to comment upon.
2. Extent of progress achieved against the overall project objective disaggregated by each of the individual Outcomes, Outputs and Activities (including sub-activities); as against the Impact Indicators identified and listed in the project document. Extent of the incremental value added with project implementation.
3. Performance in terms of in-time achievement of individual project activities as well as overall project in terms of adherence to planned timelines.
4. Relevance and adequacy of mid-course changes in implementation strategy with Project Steering Committee (PSC) approval, if any and the consequent variations in achievements, if any.
5. Degree of effectiveness of the Project Management Unit to identify gaps, if any with lessons learned and alternative scenarios, if any
6. Evaluate the impact of the project activities on the various government and private institutions
7. Extent of effectiveness of awareness generation activities by way of quality of promotional packages/awareness material, number of Awareness Programmes, Trainings undertaken and level of awareness created. Quality of documentation, if any, produced under the project like, brochure, etc. should also be considered

8. Pattern, in which funds have been leveraged, budgeted, spent and accounted for in the project

The team should also focus their assessments on project impacts as listed:

1. Perceptions on the “Situation at the end of the Project” as it seems to the review team at the terminal review stage
2. Extent of effectiveness of capacity building initiatives undertaken under the aegis of the project
3. Appropriateness and effectiveness of the institutional arrangement deployed in the project with alternative scenarios, if any
4. Details of co-funding, if any, leveraged by the project and its impact on the project;
5. The effectiveness of monitoring and overseeing systems such as PSC and suggestion on improvements if any
6. Potentials for replication of projects to other sites within the ROM

Evaluation Criteria & Ratings

An assessment of project performance will be carried out, against expectations set out in the Project Logical Framework/Results Framework (see Annex A), which provides performance and impact indicators for project implementation along with their corresponding means of verification. The evaluation will at a minimum cover the criteria of: **relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact**. Ratings must be provided on the following performance criteria. The completed table must be included in the evaluation executive summary. The obligatory rating scales are included in Annex D.

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:	

Project Finance/Co-finance

The Evaluation will assess the key financial aspects of the project, including the extent of co-financing planned and realized. Project cost and funding data will be required, including annual expenditures.

Variiances between planned and actual expenditures will need to be assessed and explained. Results from recent financial audits, as available, should be taken into consideration.

The evaluator(s) will receive assistance from the Country Office (CO) and Project Team to obtain financial data in order to complete the co-financing table below, which will be included in the terminal evaluation report.

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

Mainstreaming

UNDP supported GEF financed projects are key components in UNDP country programming, as well as regional and global programmes. The evaluation will assess the extent to which the project was successfully mainstreamed with other UNDP priorities, including poverty alleviation, improved governance, the prevention and recovery from natural disasters, and gender.

Impact

The evaluators will assess the extent to which the project is achieving impacts or progressing towards the achievement of impacts. Key findings that should be brought out in the evaluations include whether the project has demonstrated: a) verifiable improvements in ecological status, b) verifiable reductions in stress on ecological systems, and/or c) demonstrated progress towards these impact achievements.¹

Conclusions, recommendations & lessons

The evaluation report must include a chapter providing a set of **conclusions, recommendations and lessons**. The evaluators will also follow and provide response according to the “management response template” at [Annex I](#). Conclusions should build on findings and be based on evidence. Recommendations should be prioritized, specific, relevant, and targeted, with suggested implementers of the recommendations. Lessons should have wider applicability to other initiatives across the region, the area of intervention, and for the future.

¹ A useful tool for gauging progress to impact is the Review of Outcomes to Impacts (ROtI) method developed by the GEF Evaluation Office: [ROtI Handbook 2009](#)

C3. Team Composition and Reporting

The National Consultant will work under the guidance of the Team Leader and will also report to the National Project Director of the Ministry of Social Security, National Solidarity, and Environment and Sustainable Development (Environment and Sustainable Development Division) and the Head of Environment Unit, UNDP.

All reports are to be written in English. The Consultant will provide an electronic version of all the required deliverables.

The Consultant is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with government counterparts, in particular UNDP Country Office, Project Team and other key stakeholders.

D. Duration of the Work

The National Consultant will be allocated 20 person days input over a period of two months according to the following plan:

Deliverable	Content	Timing	Responsibilities
Inception Report	Evaluator provides clarifications on timing and method	No later than 2 weeks before the evaluation mission.	Evaluator submits to UNDP CO, IEO
Presentation	Initial Findings	End of evaluation mission	To project management, UNDP CO, Project Steering Committee, Key Stakeholders
Draft Final Report	Full report, (per annexed template) with annexes	Within 3 weeks of the evaluation mission	Sent to CO, reviewed by RTA, Project team, GEF OFPs
Final Report*	Revised report	Within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft	Sent to CO for uploading to UNDP ERC.

**When submitting the final evaluation report, the evaluator is required also to provide an 'audit trail' (see [annex H](#)), detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final evaluation report.*

E. Expected Outputs and Deliverables

The evaluation team is expected to deliver the following:

%	Milestone
50%	Following submission and approval of the draft terminal evaluation report
50%	Following submission and approval (UNDP-CO, UNDP RTA) of the final terminal evaluation report

E.1 Reporting

All deliverables shall be submitted in **English** and in appropriate format, in editable MS Word and in PDF as per requirement of the Client to the following address:

Mr Satyajeet Ramchurn
Head of Environment Unit
6th Floor, Anglo Mauritius Building
Intendance Street,
Port Louis
Email: satyajeet.ramchurn@undp.org
Tel: +230 212 3726
Fax: +230 208 4871

The deliverables should be of high quality in form and substance and with appropriate professional presentation. The Consultant should fully comply with the requirements of UNDP in terms of content and presentation and respect UNDP visibility guidelines, since unsatisfactory performance may result in termination of contract.

F. Duty Station

Home-based and UNDP Mauritius Country Office.

G. Confidentiality

The contractor should keep strict confidentiality on all the information that has become available within the framework of this contract, except that which is public.

H. Qualifications of the Successful Individual Contractor

Education:

Postgraduate degree (Masters) in Coastal Engineering or Coastal Zone Management or Environmental Science or Natural Resources Management or Environmental Economics or related subjects

Experience:

- Excellent knowledge and a minimum of 5 years general experience in coastal engineering and project implementation, similar to those implemented in the project, especially artificial reefs and breakwaters and/or other relevant fields;
- At least 5 years' experience in coastal remedial works;
- Experience in Disaster Risk Reduction and specialized related activities would be an asset;
- Demonstrated experience with UNDP and other International Institutions safeguards policies in relation to coastal projects and climate change will be a distinct advantage;
- Recent experience with result-based management evaluation methodologies, especially GEF funded project evaluations. Past experience as evaluator of GEF projects and knowledge of GEF M&E guidelines and tools (PPR, METT, Financial Score Card, etc.) will constitute a strong asset;
- Experience with internationally funded climate change adaptation related projects is desired;
- Project evaluation experiences within United Nations system will be considered an asset;

- Experience applying participatory monitoring approaches;
- Experience applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios;
- Knowledge of the GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy will be an advantage;
- Demonstrable analytical skills;
- Excellent communication skills in English and French;
- Fully computer literate with strong editing skills.

Skills:

- Excellent writing, analytical and research skills
- Showing strong attention to details
- Excellent interpersonal skills
- Ability to work under pressure and to meet tight deadlines

Language:

- • Excellent spoken, written English and French required

Corporate Competencies:

- Demonstrates integrity and ethical standards
- Creative and innovative
- Sound analytic capacities
- Ability to address complex concepts and to gather written materials in a clear, concise and meaningful manner with a high level of accuracy and attention to detail
- Highly organized ensuring that deadlines are met

I. Scope of Price Proposal and Schedule of Payments

The financial offer should be quoted as a lump sum amount, all-inclusive (professional fee, insurance, all travel costs, per diem, etc.). In general, UNDP should not accept travel costs exceeding those of an economy class ticket. Should the consultant wish to travel on a higher class he/she should do so using their own resources.

The contract price is fixed regardless of changes in the cost components. In the case of unforeseeable travel (additional mission for example), payment of travel costs including tickets, accommodation and terminal expenses should be agreed upon prior to travel between UNDP and Individual Consultant and will be reimbursed.

Payments will be made based on deliverables as per section D.

J. Recommended Presentation of Offer

The following documents are requested:

- a) Duly completed **Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability** using the template provided by UNDP;
- b) **Personal CV or P11**, indicating all past experience from similar projects, as well as the contact details (email and telephone number) of the Candidate and at least three (3) professional references;
- c) **Technical offer: Brief description** of why the individual considers him/herself as the most suitable for the assignment and a **methodology** on how they will approach and complete the assignment;
- d) **Financial Proposal** that indicates the all-inclusive fixed total contract price, supported by a breakdown of costs, as per template provided by UNDP.

If the Offeror is employed by an organization/company/institution, and he/she expects his/her employer to charge a management fee in the process of releasing him/her to UNDP under Reimbursable Loan Agreement (RLA), the Offeror must indicate and ensure that all such costs are duly incorporated in the financial proposal submitted to UNDP

UNDP applies a fair and transparent selection process that will take into account the competencies/skills of the applicants as well as their financial proposals. Qualified women and members of social minorities are encouraged to apply.

K. Criteria for Selection of the Best Offer

Individual consultants will be evaluated based on the following methodology:

Cumulative analysis

When using this weighted scoring method, the award of the contract should be made to the individual consultant whose offer has been evaluated and determined as:

- a) Responsive/technically compliant/acceptable, and
- b) Having received the highest score out of a pre-determined set of weighted technical and financial criteria specific to the solicitation.

Technical evaluation:

Criteria	Max. Point
Postgraduate degree (Masters) in Coastal Engineering or Coastal Zone Management or Environmental Science or Natural Resources Management or Environmental Economics or related subjects with specific expertise in the area of Integrated Coastal Zones Management	20
At least 5 years-experience in coastal remedial works and/or other relevant fields;	15
Experience in Disaster Risk Reduction and specialized related activities;	5
Recent experience with result-based management evaluation methodologies, especially	5

GEF funded project evaluations. Past experience as evaluator of GEF projects and knowledge of GEF M&E guidelines and tools (PPR, METT, Financial Score Card, etc.);	
Experience with internationally funded Climate Change Adaptation related projects. Project evaluation experiences within United Nations system will be considered an asset;	5
Fully computer literate with strong editing skills.	5
Experience applying participatory monitoring approaches;	
Experience applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios;	
Knowledge of the GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy;	5
Ability to address complex concepts and to gather written materials in a clear, concise and meaningful manner with a high level of accuracy and attention to detail	10
Sound analytic capacities	5
Excellent English and French communication skills;	5
TOTAL max.	100

Candidates scoring 70 or above will be selected for the analysis of their respective financial offers. The financial offers will be evaluated giving the lowest price proposal 30 marks and marking the other more expensive proposals reverse proportionally to the cheapest offer.

The final scoring of short-listed candidates will take into account the technical score and the financial score:

Criteria	Weight	Max. Point
Technical score	70%	100
Financial score	30%	30

The candidate ranking highest shall be selected.

L. Approval

This TOR is approved by:

Signature

Name and Designation Satyajeet Ramchurn, Head of Environment Unit

Date of signing

Annex A: Project Logical Framework

Project Strategy	Indicator (As per Prodoc)	Baseline Level (As per Prodoc)	Means of Verification Outcome level
Objective: <i>increased climate resilience of communities and livelihoods in coastal areas in Mauritius (all islands)</i>			
<p>Outcome 1: Increased adaptive capacity within relevant development and natural resource sectors developed in a gender sensitive way</p> <p>Outputs</p> <p>1.1 Detailed technical assessment of each site, with chronology of previous flood and erosion events and collection of nearshore oceanographic data, during “quiet” periods and “active” periods (one month each) to inform the design of the technical interventions at each of the three sites.</p> <p>1.2 Technical design of coastal protection measures at each of three sites, with detailed costing, carried out in a gender sensitive way</p> <p>1.3 Successful construction of physical</p>	<p>Number of physical assets strengthened or constructed to withstand conditions resulting from climate variability and change (by asset types)</p>	<p><u>Mon Choisy</u> The beach at Mon Choisy is eroding at a rate of about 2 metres/year;</p> <p><u>Riviere des Galets</u> Riviere des Galets is exposed to storm surges, with a failing seawall, openings in the wave overtopping wall, and an inadequate drainage system in the village;</p> <p><u>Quatre Soeurs</u> Buildings in Quatre Soeurs frequently flood during high tides</p>	<p>Review of coastal monitoring data for the three technical project sites.</p> <p>Field observations at the technical project sites.</p>

Project Strategy	Indicator (As per Prodoc)	Baseline Level (As per Prodoc)	Means of Verification Outcome level
<p>interventions at each of the three sites</p> <p>1.4 Analysis of data and development of recommendations on how the interventions can be adjusted for other vulnerable coastal locations in ROM</p> <p>1.5 Monitoring programme designed, to include scoping of suitable parameters, including beach width and slope; depth of adjacent lagoonal sediments; wave height, period, and run-up; direction of nearshore currents, etc</p> <p>1.6 A targeted coastal process/weather event monitoring system in place</p>			
<p>Outcome 2: Reduced exposure at national level to climate related hazards and threats</p> <p>Outputs</p> <p>2.1 Assessment of the current sea state monitoring systems (Mauritius Meteorological Services and Mauritius Oceanography Institute) and definition of required critical parameters and operational requirements for an early warning system</p> <p>2.2 The early warning system installed and implemented (with links to early warning system for cyclones), with communication linkages</p>	<p>Relevant threat and hazard information generated and disseminated to stakeholders on a timely basis</p>	<p>MMS provides warnings to shipping based on perceived wave climate, and cyclone warnings for the general populace, but this system does not anticipate rogue swell conditions.</p>	<p>Visits to the early warning system facility (expected to be in Mauritius Oceanography Institute, with connections to the MMS); review of the early warning logs.</p> <p>Interviews with coastal communities that have experienced surges, to confirm the effectiveness of the early warnings.</p>

Project Strategy	Indicator (As per Prodoc)	Baseline Level (As per Prodoc)	Means of Verification Outcome level
established from level of National Coast Guard at Headquarters down to the level of coastal communities			
<p>Outcome 3: Strengthened institutional capacity to reduce risks associated with climate induced socio-economic and environmental losses</p> <p>Outputs 3.1 “Handbook on Coastal Adaptation” packaged as training modules for coastal communities, relevant Government agencies, and private sector stakeholders (such as hotel operators); training sessions delivered on a regular basis over the course of the project (at least twice annually)</p> <p>3.2 Short course on Coastal Engineering designed and delivered (twice during programme period)</p> <p>3.3 Specialized course on Cost-Benefit Analysis of coastal adaptation measures designed and delivered (annually, over four years)</p>	No. of staff trained to respond to, and mitigate impacts of, climate-related events	Public agencies are unclear on their obligations regarding management of climate change effects in the coastal zone, and the private sector and general populace do not know what options there are for coastal adaptation, nor how to initiate such measures in the most practical, cost-effective manner.	<p>Examination of site designs for Coastal adaptation measures (at the project sites, and elsewhere).</p> <p>Monitoring of beach erosion rates at all sites with new coastal protection measures; post-surge observations in coastal villages.</p> <p>Review of Applications and plans for new coastal adaptation measures and for new development in the ROM coastal zone.</p>
<p>Outcome 4 Improved policies and regulations that promote and enforce resilience measures</p> <p>Outputs</p>	Number, type and sector of policies introduced or adjusted to address climate change risks.	Current policies and regulations are inconsistent with regard to management of climate change effects in the coastal zone (they do not	Review of the draft National Coastal Zone Adaptation Strategy, District Outline Schemes, and

Project Strategy	Indicator (As per Prodoc)	Baseline Level (As per Prodoc)	Means of Verification Outcome level
<p>4.1 A National Coastal Zone Adaptation that addresses all perceived climate change risks in the coastal zone of ROM over at least the next 20 years, with recommendations for supporting policies and regulations</p> <p>4.2 A set of recommendations on best technical and institutional adaptation practices suitable for the coastal zone of ROM</p> <p>4.3 Definition of the required structure and processes for one “clearinghouse” for climate change oversight in the coastal zone of ROM (a unit or institution, or collection of individuals from various agencies, which is able to make final decisions on the climate appropriateness of future development projects; also having a follow-up enforcement capacity)</p> <p>4.4 Recommendations for new economic instruments</p>		<p>envision the coastal zone in 2060), and do not provide clear guidance or incentives for practical implementation of adaptive measures.</p>	<p>National Tourism Development Plan for references to relevant policies, strategies, plans, and regulations. Review of draft policies, strategies, plans, and regulations for clear reference to a 2060 vision, consistency in references to climate change effects in the coastal zone, and assurance that all stakeholder groups are addressed.</p> <p>Review of the proposed institutional structure and processes for coastal zone management.</p>
<p>Outcome 5 Effective capturing and dissemination of lessons from the applied activities in the programme</p> <p>Outputs 5.1 Handbook, training modules, and website content capturing best coastal adaptation practices for the Mauritius context</p>	<p>Capturing and dissemination of lessons learned</p>	<p>There is no consistent awareness nor understanding of the implications of climate change in the coastal zone; households, communities, and Government organizations do not factor into their plans and activities the possible climate</p>	<p>Review of government approvals for coastal zone adaptation measures and development schemes in coastal areas. Review of District and National Plans for inclusion of climate change risks in the coastal zone. Field</p>

Project Strategy	Indicator (As per Prodoc)	Baseline Level (As per Prodoc)	Means of Verification Outcome level
<p>5.2 Dissemination of lessons learned from the programme with coastal stakeholders in other locations in the southern Indian Ocean</p> <p>5.3 Interpretive signs and small-scale models of coastal processes designed and installed at each site, explaining the science of climate change and coastal processes (in lay terms), so that the linkages between weather, stability of coastal features, and adaptation measures are clear.</p> <p>5.4 Public awareness campaigns on climate change in the coastal zone designed and delivered, involving the Mauritian media (TV, radio, Internet)</p> <p>5.5 Priority ranking of vulnerable coastal sites established, to guide the order of future investment by the Government of Mauritius and the private sector.</p>		change effects 50 years from now.	observations of representative infrastructure and building development in the coastal zone.

Annex B: List of Documents to be reviewed by the evaluators

- Project Document;
- Inception Report
- Project Performance Reports (PPRs);
- Quarterly progress reports and work plans;
- Audits reports
- Mid Term Evaluation Report
- List and contact details for project staff, key project stakeholders, including Project Boards, and other partners to be consulted
- Project budget and financial data

The following documents will also be available:

- The project M&E framework
- Project operational guidelines, manuals ;
- Minutes of the Project Steering Committees;
- Maps: Project sites, highlighting suggested visits
- The UNDP Monitoring and Evaluation Frameworks.

Annex C: Evaluation Questions

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 at the local and national levels?				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are the project objectives conforming to agreed priorities in the UNDP Country Programme Document (CPD)? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How does the project support the environment and sustainable development objectives of the Republic of Mauritius? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In line with the national priorities mentioned in the UNDP Country Programme Document 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> UNDP Country Programme Document Project document 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Documents analyses Interviews with UNDP and project team
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is the project relevant to the Adaptation Fund climate change mitigation area? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How does the project support the Adaptation Fund climate change mitigation area? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Existence of a clear relationship between the project objectives and Adaptation Fund climate change mitigation area? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project documents Adaptation Fund focal areas strategies and documents 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Documents analyses Adaptation Fund website Interviews with UNDP and project team
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is the project relevant to the Republic of Mauritius environment and sustainable development objectives? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is the project country-driven? What was the level of stakeholder participation in project design? What was the level of stakeholder ownership in implementation? Does the project adequately take into account the national realities, both in 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Degree to which the project supports national environmental objectives Degree of coherence between the project and national's priorities, policies and strategies Appreciation from national stakeholders with respect to adequacy of project design and 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project documents National policies and strategies Key project partners 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Documents analyses Adaptation Fund website Interviews with UNDP and project team

	<p>terms of institutional and policy framework in its design and its implementation?</p>	<p>implementation to national realities and existing capacities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Level of involvement of government officials and other partners in the project design process ▪ Coherence between needs expressed by national stakeholders and UNDP-GEF criteria 		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Is the project addressing the needs of target beneficiaries at the local level? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ How does the project support the needs of relevant stakeholders? ▪ Has the implementation of the project been inclusive of all relevant stakeholders? ▪ Were local beneficiaries and stakeholders adequately involved in project design and implementation? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Strength of the link between expected results from the project and the needs of relevant stakeholders ▪ Degree of involvement and inclusiveness of stakeholders in project design and implementation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Project partners and stakeholders ▪ Project documents 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Document analysis ▪ Interviews with relevant stakeholders
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Is the project internally coherent in its design? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Are there logical linkages between expected results of the project (log frame) and the project design (in terms of project components, choice of partners, structure, delivery 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Level of coherence between project expected results and project design internal logic ▪ Level of coherence between project design and project 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Program and project documents ▪ Key project stakeholders 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Document analysis ▪ Key interviews

	<p>mechanism, scope, budget, use of resources etc.)?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Is the length of the project sufficient to achieve Project outcomes? ▪ Whether gender issues had been taken into account in project design and implementation and in what way has the project contributed to greater consideration of gender aspects, (i.e. project team composition, gender-related aspects of pollution impacts, stakeholder outreach to women’s groups, etc.). If so, indicate how 	<p>implementation approach</p>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ How is the project relevant with respect to other donor-supported activities? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Does the Adaptation Fund support activities and objectives not addressed by other donors? ▪ How do Adaptation Fund help to fill gaps (or give additional stimulus) that are necessary but are not covered by other donors? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Degree to which program was coherent and complementary to other donor programming nationally and regionally 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Documents from other donor supported activities ▪ Other donor representatives ▪ Project documents 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Documents analyses ▪ Interviews with project partners and relevant stakeholders

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is there coordination and complementarity between donors? 			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the project provide relevant lessons and experiences for other similar projects in the future? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has the experience of the project provided relevant lessons for other future projects targeted at similar objectives 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Data collected throughout evaluation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Data analysis
Evaluative Criteria	Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved?				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has the project been effective in achieving the expected outcomes and objectives? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has the project been effective in achieving its expected outcomes? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> See indicators in project document results framework and log frame 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project documents Project team and relevant stakeholders Data reported in project annual and quarterly reports 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Documents analysis Interviews with project team Interviews with relevant stakeholders
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How is risk and risk mitigation being managed? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How well are risks, assumptions and impact drivers being managed? What was the quality of risk mitigation strategies developed? Were these sufficient? Are there clear strategies for risk mitigation related with long-term sustainability of the project? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Completeness of risk identification and assumptions during project planning and design Quality of existing information systems in place to identify emerging risks and other issues Quality of risk mitigations strategies developed and followed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project documents UNDP, project team, and relevant stakeholders 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Document analysis Interviews

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ What lessons can be drawn regarding effectiveness for other similar projects in the future? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ What lessons have been learned from the project regarding achievement of outcomes? ▪ What changes could have been made (if any) to the design of the project in order to improve the achievement of the project's expected results? 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Data collected Throughout evaluation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Data analysis
---	--	--	--	---

Evaluative Criteria	Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
---------------------	-----------	------------	---------	-------------

Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards?

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Was project support provided in an efficient way? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Was adaptive management used or needed to ensure efficient resource use? ▪ Did the project logical framework and work plans and any changes made to them use as management tools during implementation? ▪ Were the accounting and financial systems in place adequate for project management and producing accurate and timely financial information? ▪ Were progress reports produced accurately, timely and responded to 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Availability and quality of financial and progress reports ▪ Timeliness and adequacy of reporting provided ▪ Level of discrepancy between planned and utilized financial expenditures ▪ Planned vs. actual funds leveraged ▪ Cost in view of results achieved compared to costs of similar projects from other organizations ▪ Adequacy of project choices in view of existing context, infrastructure and cost 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Project documents and evaluations ▪ UNDP ▪ Project team 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Document analysis ▪ Key interviews
---	---	--	---	---

	<p>reporting requirements including adaptive management changes?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Was project implementation as cost effective as originally proposed (planned vs. actual) ▪ Did the leveraging of funds (co-financing) if any, happen as planned? ▪ Were financial resources utilized efficiently? Could financial resources have been used more efficiently? ▪ Was procurement carried out in a manner making efficient use of project resources? ▪ How was results-based management used during project implementation? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Quality of results-based management reporting (progress reporting, monitoring and evaluation) ▪ Occurrence of change in project design/ implementation approach (i.e. restructuring) when needed to improve project efficiency ▪ Cost associated with delivery mechanism and management structure compared to alternatives 		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ How efficient are partnership arrangements for the project? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ To what extent partnerships/ linkages between institutions/ organizations were encouraged and supported? ▪ Which partnerships/linkages were facilitated? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Specific activities conducted to support the development of cooperative arrangements between partners ▪ Examples of supported partnerships 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Project documents and evaluations ▪ Project partners and relevant stakeholders 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Document analysis ▪ Interviews

	<p>Which ones can be considered sustainable?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ What was the level of efficiency of cooperation and collaboration arrangements? ▪ Which methods were successful or not and why? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Evidence that particular partnerships/linkages will be sustained ▪ Types/quality of partnership cooperation methods utilized 		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Did the project efficiently utilize local capacity in implementation? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Was an appropriate balance struck between utilization of international expertise as well as local capacity? ▪ Did the project take into account local capacity in design and implementation of the project? ▪ Was there an effective collaboration between institutions responsible for implementing the project? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Proportion of expertise utilized from international experts compared to national experts ▪ Number/quality of analyses done to assess local capacity potential and absorptive capacity 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Project documents and evaluations ▪ UNDP ▪ Beneficiaries 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Document analysis ▪ Interviews
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ What lessons can be drawn regarding efficiency for other similar projects in the future? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ What lessons can be learnt from the project regarding efficiency? ▪ How could the project have more efficiently carried out implementation (in terms of management 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Data collected throughout evaluation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Data analysis

	<p>structures and procedures, partnerships arrangements etc.)?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> What changes could have been made (if any) to the project in order to improve its efficiency? 			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has the project been effective in achieving the expected outcomes and objectives? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has the project been effective in achieving its expected outcomes? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> See indicators in project document results framework and log frame 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project documents Project team and relevant stakeholders Data reported in project annual and quarterly reports 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Documents analysis Interviews with project team Interviews with relevant stakeholders
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How is risk and risk mitigation being managed? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How well are risks, assumptions and impact drivers being managed? What was the quality of risk mitigation strategies developed? Were these sufficient? Are there clear strategies for risk mitigation related with long-term sustainability of the project 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Completeness of risk identification and assumptions during project planning and design Quality of existing information systems in place to identify emerging risks and other issues Quality of risk mitigations strategies developed and followed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project documents UNDP, project team, and relevant stakeholders 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Document analysis Interviews
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What lessons can be drawn regarding effectiveness for 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What lessons have been learned from the project regarding 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Data collected throughout evaluation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Data analysis

other similar projects in the future?	<p>achievement of outcomes?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> What changes could have been made (if any) to the design of the project in order to improve the achievement of the project's expected results? 			
Evaluative Criteria	Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, social-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is the Project financially sustainable? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are there financial risks that may jeopardize the sustainability of project outcomes? What is the likelihood of financial and economic resources not being available once Adaptation Fund grant assistance ends? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The likely ability of an intervention to continue to deliver benefits for an extended period of time after completion. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> UNDP, project team, and relevant stakeholders 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Document analysis Interviews
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is the Project environmentally and socially sustainable? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are there ongoing activities that may pose an environmental threat to the sustainability of project outcomes? 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> UNDP, project team, and relevant stakeholders 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Document analysis Interviews
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To what extent the stakeholders will sustain the project? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are there social or political risks that may threaten the sustainability of project outcomes? 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> UNDP, project team, and relevant stakeholders 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Document analysis Interviews

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ What is the risk for instance that the level of stakeholder ownership (including ownership by governments and other key stakeholders) will be insufficient to allow for the project outcomes/benefits to be sustained? ▪ Do the various key stakeholders see that it is in their interest that project benefits continue to flow? ▪ Is there sufficient public/stakeholder awareness in support of the project's long-term objectives? 			
--	--	--	--	--

Evaluative Criteria	Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
---------------------	-----------	------------	---------	-------------

Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward, reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status?

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Assess the likely permanence (long lasting nature) of the impacts 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Clarify based on extent: a) verifiable improvement in climate resilience; and/or ▪ b) through specified indicators that progress is being made towards achievement of project objectives 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The positive and negative, foreseen and unforeseen changes to and effects produced by a development intervention 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Project documents ▪ UNDP, project team, and relevant stakeholders 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Document analysis ▪ Interviews
---	---	--	--	---

Annex D: Rating Scales

<p><i>Ratings for Outcomes, Effectiveness, Efficiency, M&E, I&E Execution</i></p> <p>6: Highly Satisfactory (HS): no shortcomings</p> <p>5: Satisfactory (S): minor shortcomings</p> <p>4: Moderately Satisfactory (MS)</p> <p>3. Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): significant shortcomings</p> <p>2. Unsatisfactory (U): major problems</p> <p>1. Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): severe problems</p>	<p><i>Sustainability ratings:</i></p> <p>4. Likely (L): negligible risks to sustainability</p> <p>3. Moderately Likely (ML): moderate risks</p> <p>2. Moderately Unlikely (MU): significant risks</p> <p>1. Unlikely (U): severe risks</p>	<p><i>Relevance ratings</i></p> <p>2. Relevant (R)</p> <p>1.. Not relevant (NR)</p> <p><i>Impact Ratings:</i></p> <p>3. Significant (S)</p> <p>2. Minimal (M)</p> <p>1. Negligible (N)</p>
<p><i>Additional ratings where relevant:</i></p> <p>Not Applicable (N/A)</p> <p>Unable to Assess (U/A)</p>		

Annex E: Evaluation Consultant Code of Conduct and Agreement Form

Evaluators:

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

Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form²

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

Name of Consultant: _____

Name of Consultancy Organization (where relevant): _____

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

Signed at *place* on *date*

Signature: _____

²www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct

ANNEX F: EVALUATION REPORT OUTLINE³

- i.** Opening page:
 - Title of UNDP supported Adaptation Fund financed project
 - UNDP and Adaptation Fund project ID#s.
 - Evaluation time frame and date of evaluation report
 - Region and countries included in the project
 - GEF Operational Program/Strategic Program
 - Implementing Partner and other project partners
 - Evaluation team members
 - Acknowledgements
- ii.** Executive Summary
 - Project Summary Table
 - Project Description (brief)
 - Evaluation Rating Table
 - Summary of conclusions, recommendations and lessons
- iii.** Acronyms and Abbreviations
(See: UNDP Editorial Manual⁴)
- 1.** Introduction
 - Purpose of the evaluation
 - Scope & Methodology
 - Structure of the evaluation report
- 2.** Project description and development context
 - Project start and duration
 - Problems that the project sought to address
 - Immediate and development objectives of the project
 - Baseline Indicators established
 - Main stakeholders
 - Expected Results
- 3.** Findings
(In addition to a descriptive assessment, all criteria marked with (*) must be rated⁵)
- 3.1** Project Design / Formulation
 - Analysis of LFA/Results Framework (Project logic /strategy; Indicators)
 - Assumptions and Risks
 - Lessons from other relevant projects (e.g., same focal area) incorporated into project design
 - Planned stakeholder participation
 - Replication approach
 - UNDP comparative advantage

³The Report length should not exceed 40 pages in total (not including annexes).

⁴ UNDP Style Manual, Office of Communications, Partnerships Bureau, updated November 2008

⁵ Using a six-point rating scale: 6: Highly Satisfactory, 5: Satisfactory, 4: Marginally Satisfactory, 3: Marginally Unsatisfactory, 2: Unsatisfactory and 1: Highly Unsatisfactory, see section 3.5, page 37 for ratings explanations.

- Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector
 - Management arrangements
- 3.2** Project Implementation
- Adaptive management (changes to the project design and project outputs during implementation)
 - Partnership arrangements (with relevant stakeholders involved in the country/region)
 - Feedback from M&E activities used for adaptive management
 - Project Finance
 - Monitoring and evaluation: design at entry and implementation (*)
 - UNDP and Implementing Partner implementation/execution (*) coordination, and operational issues
- 3.3** Project Results
- Overall results (attainment of objectives) (*)
 - Relevance (*)
 - Effectiveness & Efficiency (*)
 - Country ownership
 - Mainstreaming
 - Sustainability (*)
 - Impact
- 4.** Conclusions, Recommendations & Lessons
- Corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project
 - Actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the project
 - Proposals for future directions underlining main objectives
 - Best and worst practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance and success
- 5.** Annexes
- ToR
 - Itinerary
 - List of persons interviewed
 - Summary of field visits
 - List of documents reviewed
 - Evaluation Question Matrix
 - Questionnaire used and summary of results
 - Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form
 - Report Clearance Form
 - *Annexed in a separate file:* TE audit trail

Annex G: Evaluation Report Clearance Form

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

Evaluation Report Reviewed and Cleared by	
UNDP Country Office	
Name: _____	
Signature: _____	Date: _____
UNDP GEF RTA	
Name: _____	
Signature: _____	Date: _____

Annex I: management response template
UNDP-GEF TE Management Response Template

Management response to the Terminal Evaluation of (*title of the Project*)⁶

Project Title:

UNDP Project ID (PIMS) #:

GEF Project ID (PMIS) #:

Terminal Evaluation Mission Completion Date:

Date of Issue of Management Response:

Prepared by: *This will most likely be the Consultants and Commissioning Unit*

Contributors: *For example, the UNDP-GEF RTA, the TE team, the Project Board*

Cleared by: *The Commissioning Unit, UNDP-GEF RTA, Project Board*

Context, background and findings

1. *Insert here up to several paragraphs on context and background and UNDP's response to the validity and relevance of the findings, conclusions and recommendations.*
2. *Second paragraph.*
3. *Third paragraph, etc.*

⁶ This template is in alignment with the [Management Response Template](#) for UNDP project-level evaluations in the Evaluation Resource Centre.

Recommendations and management response

Terminal Evaluation recommendation 1.				
Management response:				
Key action(s)	Time frame	Responsible unit(s)	Tracking ⁷	
			Comments	Status ⁸
1.1				
1.2				
1.3				

Terminal Evaluation recommendation 2.				
Management response:				
Key action(s)	Time frame	Responsible unit(s)	Tracking	
			Comments	Status
2.1				
2.2				
2.3				

Terminal Evaluation recommendation 3.				
Management response:				
Key action(s)	Time frame	Responsible unit(s)	Tracking	
			Comments	Status
3.1				
3.2				
3.3				

⁷ If the TE is uploaded to the ERC, the status of implementation is tracked electronically in the Evaluation Resource Centre database (ERC).

⁸ Status of Implementation: Completed, Partially Completed, Pending.