



STRENGTHENING CLIMATE RESILIENCE OF AGRICULTURAL LIVELIHOODS IN AGRO-ECOLOGICAL REGIONS I AND II IN ZAMBIA

TERMS OF REFERENCE (TOR)

For the procurement of International Consultant to conduct the Interim Evaluation

Project Title:	STRENGTHENING CLIMATE RESILIENCE OF AGRICULTURAL LIVELIHOODS IN AGRO-ECOLOGICAL REGIONS I AND II IN ZAMBIA
Scope of Advertisement:	International
Type of Contract:	Individual Consultant
Post Type:	International Consultant
Duty Station:	Home-based
Languages:	English
Duration of Contract:	45 working days spread over 11.5 weeks
Start Date	Immediately after concluding the Individual Contract Agreement

1.0 INTRODUCTION

This is the Terms of Reference (ToR) for the Interim Evaluation (IE) of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) - supported Green Climate Fund (GCF) financed project titled *Strengthening Climate Resilience of Agricultural Livelihoods in Agro-Ecological Regions I and II in Zambia* (SCRALA) (PIMS 5858). The budget of the project is US \$ 137 million and is implemented by the Ministry of Agriculture with following responsible parties: Zambia Meteorological Department (ZMD), Water Resource Management Authority (WARMA), Food Agriculture Organization (FAO) and World Food Programme (WFP). The project's duration is 7 years from September 2018 to September 2025. The project is implemented based on UNDP's National Implementation Modality (NIM). The project site covers 16 districts of Zambia namely: Chama, Mafinga, Mambwe, Nyimba, Luangwa, Rufunsa, Chongwe, Chirundu, Siavonga, Gwembe, Namwala, Kazungula, Sioma, Sesheke, Senanga and Mulobezi. The project is currently in its third year of implementation. The ToR sets out the expectations for this Interim Evaluation (IE).

2.0 PROJECT BACKGROUND AND INFORMATION

The Strengthening Climate Resilience for Agriculture Livelihoods in Agro-Ecological Regions I and II (SCRALA) project supports the Government of Zambia's long-term vision of becoming a prosperous middle-income country by 2030 as encapsulated in the Vision 2030 and Zambia's Seventh National Development Plan (7NDP). It aims to increase the resilience of smallholder farmers in view of climate change and variability.

The Government urgent need for small holder agriculture to be resilient as it contributes immensely towards food security and sustainable livelihoods particularly in rural areas. In this regard, high co-finance has been made available to the project through shifting public financing on agriculture towards climate resilient agriculture to complement funding through strong partnership with Green Climate Fund (GCF) and United Nations Development Programme (UNDP).

Agro-Ecological Regions I and II are facing increasing risks because of climate change, primarily variability of rainfall and increased frequency of droughts and floods, which have direct impacts on the agricultural production in the regions. They are also the regions of Zambia which have been breadbasket and have the highest concentration of poverty incidence due to rain-fed agriculture dominance thus, the poorest smallholder farmers in these regions are facing devastating impacts on their livelihoods which will further erode development gains. Women are disproportionately affected by these impacts, given their role in ensuring household food production and food/nutritional security, despite their unequal access to land, information, and inputs (e.g., improved seeds, fertilizer, and appropriate tools).

The project employs a value chain approach, addressing risks posed across key stages of the value chain – planning, inputs, production, and post-production. The project capitalizes on opportunities to strengthen and promote viable climate-resilient value chains relating to smallholder agriculture in the target regions, specifically targeting value chains that are gender sensitive and provide viable economic opportunities for women given their unique capacities and vulnerabilities. This includes three interrelated outputs: 1) strengthening capacity of farmers to plan for climate risk; 2) strengthening resilient agricultural production and diversification practices (for both food security and income generation); and 3) strengthening farmers' access to markets and commercialization of introduced resilient agricultural commodities. Capacity-building from the national to the community level across project outputs and institutions, is also a key strategy of the project.

Within the two Agro-Ecological Regions, smallholder farmers in the five provinces (namely, Eastern, Lusaka, Muchinga, Southern and Western) are directly targeted, specifically in: Mambwe, Nyimba, Chongwe, Luangwa, Chirundu, Rufunsa, Chama, Mafinga, Kazungula, Siavonga, Gwembe, Namwala, Senanga, Sioma, Sesheke and Mulobezi. The direct beneficiaries represent approximately 946,153 people. These districts were selected given their specific vulnerability to climate change risks, primarily increasing droughts, variability of rainfall and occasional floods, coupled with high incidence of poverty. Target beneficiaries currently have little resilience to cope with climate impacts or sustain livelihoods in the face of climate.

The project is also anchored in the country's National Adaptation Programme of Action on Climate Change (NAPA, 2007), National Climate Change Response Strategy (2010), National Strategy for Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation (REDD, 2015) and contributes to the implementation of the Nationally Determined Contributions that has been revised in 2021 NDC enhancement process, which prioritizes "promotion of conservation/smart agriculture activities leading to adaptation benefits and enhancing climate resilience, especially in rural areas," as well as conservation of water, water technologies for irrigation, and strengthening climate information services. It promotes a paradigm shift by taking a comprehensive approach to addressing the entire value chain and providing the initial trigger for poor and vulnerable farmers to shift on to a resilient trajectory for agricultural livelihoods. This will also result in sustainable development benefits, as

these vulnerable farmers and their families will see increases in income and enhanced food security – leading to health and environmental co-benefits.

3.0 OBJECTIVES OF THE INTERIM EVALUATION

The Interim Evaluation (IE) will assess implementation of the project progress towards the achievement of the project objectives and outcomes as specified in the Project Document and GCF Funded Activity Agreement (FAA), and assess early signs of project success, or failure with the goal of identifying the necessary changes to be made to set the project on-track to achieve its intended results. The IE will also review the project's strategy and its risks to sustainability.

The IE will take into consideration assessment of the project in line with the following evaluation criteria from the GCF IEU TOR (GCF/B.06/06) and draft GCF Evaluation Policy, along with guidance provided by the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) and the Development Assistance Committee (DAC). Additional evaluation criteria can be assessed, as applicable. The IE must assess the following:

- **Implementation and adaptive management** – seek to identify challenges and propose additional measures to support more efficient and effective implementation. The following aspects of project implementation and adaptive management will be assessed: management arrangements, work planning, finance and co-finance, project-level monitoring and evaluation systems, stakeholder engagement, reporting, and communications.
- **Risks to sustainability** – seeks to assess the likelihood of continued benefits after the project ends. The assessment of sustainability at the IE stage considers the risks that are likely to affect the continuation of project outcomes. The IE should validate the risks identified in the Project Document, Annual Project Reports, and the ATLAS Risk Management Module and whether the risk ratings applied are appropriate and up to date.
- **Relevance, effectiveness and efficiency** - seeks to assess the appropriateness in terms of selection, implementation and achievement of FAA and project document results framework activities and expected results (outputs, outcomes and impacts).
- **Coherence in climate finance delivery with other multilateral entities** - looks at how GCF financing is additional and able to amplify other investments or de-risk and crowd-in further climate investment.
- **Gender equity** - ensures integration of understanding on how the impacts of climate change are differentiated by gender, the ways that behavioural changes and gender can play in delivering paradigm shift, and the role that women play in responding to climate change challenges both as agents but also for accountability and decision-making.
- **Country ownership of projects and programmes** - examines the extent of the emphasis on sustainability post project through country ownership; on ensuring the responsiveness of the GCF investment to country needs and priorities including through the roles that countries play in projects and programmes.
- **Innovativeness in results areas** - focuses on identification of innovations (proof of concept, multiplication effects, new models of finance, technologies, etc.) and the extent to which the project interventions may lead to a paradigm shift towards low-emission and climate-resilient development pathways.

- **Replication and scalability** – the extent to which the activities can be scaled up in other locations within the country or replicated in other countries (this criterion, which is considered in document GCF/B.05/03 in the context of measuring performance could also be incorporated in independent evaluations).
- **Unexpected results, both positive and negative** - identifies the challenges and the learning, both positive and negative, that can be used by all parties (governments, stakeholders, civil society, AE, GCF, and others) to inform further implementation and future investment decision-making.

4.0 INTERIM EVALUATION APPROACH AND METHODOLOGY

The IE team, consisting of an International Consultant and a counterpart National Consultant, must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable, and useful. The latter to provide the local content while the former will be the Lead Consultant to ensure the deliverables are realized.

Responsibilities of the International consultant

The International Consultant will be the Team Leader and assume a leading role in the evaluation process and coordinate the work of all other team members. The specific roles and responsibilities include:

- Ensure the quality of the evaluation process, outputs, methodology and timely delivery of all products.
- Lead the conceptualization and design of the IE and produce the inception report.
- Review documents and define the IE scope, methodology and work plan.
- Conduct the evaluation process in a timely manner and communicate with the Evaluation team on a regular basis and highlight progress made/challenges encountered.
- Oversee the data collection and analysis, producing the draft & final evaluation reports and support the stakeholder workshop.

Responsibilities of the National consultant

The National Consultant will be responsible for performing the following tasks under the guidance of the International Consultant:

- Review documents and provide substantive support to defining the IE scope, methodology and work plan.
- Contribute to the production of the inception report and finalisation of the IE design and methodology.
- Data collection as per the approved inception report and allocation of responsibilities as agreed with the team leader.
- Data analysis and drafting parts of the IE report as agreed on the with the International Consultant.
- Assist the International Consultant in finalizing the inception and IE report and PowerPoint presentation for stakeholder workshop.

The National Consultant will be expected to collaborate with the International Consultant (Team Leader), and to be responsible for the overall assistance to the Team Leader including collection

and analysis of all relevant data from field and preparation of all consultations and meetings with selected different stakeholders. The National Consultant will contribute fundamentally to the work of the Team Leader, providing practical advice and context in the drafting and finalizing the inception and final IE reports.

The two consultants shall be engaged jointly to commence the IE working as per planned schedule to be accomplished by 10th May 2022.

The IE team will review all relevant sources of information including documents prepared during the preparation phase (i.e. baseline funding proposal submitted to GCF, Funded Activity Agreement (FAA), the Project Document, project reports including Annual Performance Reports, Quarterly Progress Reports, UNDP Environmental & Social Safeguard Policy, project budget revisions, records of surveys conducted, national strategic and legal documents, stakeholder maps, and any other materials that the team considers useful for this evidence-based review).

The IE is expected to follow a collaborative and participatory approach¹ ensuring close engagement with the Project Team, Implementing Partner, government counterparts, the UNDP Country Office, Regional Technical Advisers, and other principal stakeholders including responsible parties and beneficiaries.

Engagement of stakeholders is vital to a successful IE. Stakeholder involvement should include (where possible) surveys/questionnaires, focus groups, interviews with stakeholders who have project responsibilities, including but not limited to executing agencies, senior officials and task team/component leaders, key experts and consultants in the subject area, Project Steering Committee, project stakeholders, local government, CSOs, project beneficiaries, etc. Within the COVID restrictions, the IE team is expected to conduct field missions to the 16 project districts (Mambwe, Nyimba, Chongwe, Luangwa, Chirundu, Rufunsa, Chama, Mafinga, Kazungula, Siavonga, Gwembe, Namwala, Senanga, Sioma, Sesheke and Mulobezi) of the country where the IE team should be able to meet the project responsible parties and conduct site verification, to be decided in consultation with the project team. Data collection (government data/records, field observation visits, co-financing expenditure reporting, GIS data, etc.) will be used to validate evidence of results and assessments (including but not limited to; assessment of Theory of Change, activities delivery, and results/changes occurred). It is important to interact and interrogate the beneficiaries and districts including verification of palpable achievements of the project.

The specific design and methodology for the IE should emerge from consultations between the IE team and the above-mentioned parties regarding what is appropriate and feasible for meeting the IE purpose and objectives and answering the evaluation questions, given limitations of budget, time, data and COVID restrictions. The IE team must, however, 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 IE report.

¹ For ideas on innovative and participatory Monitoring and Evaluation strategies and techniques, see [UNDP Discussion Paper: Innovations in Monitoring & Evaluating Results](#), 05 Nov 2013.

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

The final IE report should describe the full IE approach taken and the rationale for the approach making explicit the underlying assumptions, challenges, strengths and weaknesses about the methods and approach of the review. The final report must also describe any limitations encountered by the IE team during the evaluation process, including limitations of the methodology, data collection methods, and any potential influence of limitation on how findings may be interpreted, and conclusions drawn. Limitations include, among others: language barriers, inaccessible project sites, limitations due to COVID-19 pandemic, issues with access to data or verification of data sources, issues with availability of interviewees, methodological limitations to collecting more extensive or more representative qualitative or quantitative evaluation data, deviations from planned data collection and analysis set out in the ToR and Inception Report, etc. Efforts made to mitigate the limitations should also be included in the IE report.

5.0 DETAILED SCOPE OF THE IE

The IE team will assess the following categories of project progress. The following questions are intended to guide the IE team to deliver credible and trusted evaluations that provide assessment of progress and results achieved in relationship to the GCF investment, can identify learning and areas where restructuring or changes through adaptive management in project implementation are needed, and can make evidence-based clear and focused recommendations that may be required for enhancing project implementation to deliver expected results and to what extent these can be verified and attributed to GCF investment.

5.1 Project Strategy

5.1.1 Project design:

- i) Review the problem addressed by the project and the underlying assumptions. Review the effect of any incorrect assumptions or changes to the context to achieving the project results as outlined in the Project Document.
- ii) Review the relevance of the project strategy and assess whether it provides the most effective route towards expected/intended results. Were lessons from other relevant projects properly incorporated into the project design?
- iii) Review how the project addresses country priorities. Review country ownership. Was the project concept in line with the national sector development priorities and plans of the country (or of participating countries in the case of multi-country projects)?
- iv) Review decision-making processes: were perspectives of those who would be affected by project decisions, those who could affect the outcomes, and those who could contribute information or other resources to the process, considered during project design processes?
- v) Review the extent to which relevant gender issues were raised in the project design. See Annex 9 of *Guidance for Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects* for further guidelines.
- vi) If there are major areas of concern, recommend areas for improvement.

5.1.2 Results Framework/Log frame:

- i) Undertake a critical analysis of the project's log frame indicators and targets, assess how "SMART" the midterm and end-of-project targets are (Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Relevant, Time-bound), and suggest specific amendments/revisions to the targets and indicators as necessary.
- ii) Are the project's objectives and outcomes or components clear, practical, and feasible within its time frame?
- iii) Examine if progress so far has led to or could in the future catalyse beneficial development effects (i.e., income generation, gender equality and women's empowerment, improved governance, etc.) that should be included in the project results framework and monitored on an annual basis.
- iv) Ensure broader development and gender aspects of the project are being monitored effectively.
- v) Ensure that the indicators (gender-disaggregated) are SMART, aligned with GCF/Results Management Framework (RMF)/Performance Measurement Frameworks (PMFs) and the guidance in the GCF programming manual.

5.2 Relevance, Effectiveness and Efficiency

- i) Was the context, problem, needs and priorities well analyzed and reviewed during project initiation?
- ii) Are the planned project objectives and outcomes relevant and realistic to the situation on the ground?
- iii) How is the project Theory of Change (ToC) used in helping the project achieve results/ How is the ToC applied through the project??
- iv) Verify the mitigation impact that the project has achieved. Has an appropriate MRV system for GHG emission been established and implemented? Do outputs link to intended outcomes which link to broader paradigm shift objectives of the project?
- v) Are the planned inputs and strategies identified realistic, appropriate and adequate to achieve the results? Were they sequenced sufficiently to efficiently deliver the expected results?
- vi) Are the outputs being achieved in a timely manner? Is this achievement supportive of the ToC and pathways identified?
- vii) What and how much progress has been made towards achieving the overall outputs and outcomes of the project (including contributing factors and constraints)?
- viii) To what extent is the project able to demonstrate changes against the baseline (assessment in approved Funding Proposal) for the GCF investment criteria (including contributing factors and constraints)?
- ix) How realistic are the risks and assumptions of the project?
 - x) How did the project deal with issues and risks in implementation?
- xi) To what extent did the project's M&E data and mechanism(s) contribute to achieving project results?
- xii) Are the project's governance mechanisms functioning efficiently?
- xiii) To what extent did the design of the project help or hinder achieving its own goals?
- xiv) Were there clear baselines indicators and/or benchmark for performance measurements? How were these used in project management? To what extent and how the project applies adaptive management?

- xv) What, if any, alternative strategies would have been more effective in achieving the project objectives?

5.3 Progress Towards Results

5.3.1 Progress Towards Outcomes and Outputs Analysis:

- i) By reviewing the aspects of the project that have already been successful, identify ways in which the project can further expand these benefits.
- ii) Review the log frame indicators against progress made towards the end-of-project targets using the Progress Towards Results Matrix and colour code progress in a “traffic light system” based on the level of progress achieved; assign a rating on progress for each indicator; make recommendations from the areas marked as “Not on target to be achieved” (red).

Table. Progress Towards Results Matrix (Achievement of outcomes against End-of-project Targets)

Project Strategy	Indicator ²	Baseline Level ³	Level in 1 st APR (self-reported)	Midterm Target ⁴	End-of-project Target	Midterm Level & Assessment ⁵	Achievement Rating ⁶	Analysis: status of indicator; justification for rating (triangulated with evidence and data); how realistic it is for target to be achieved
Fund Level Impact 1:	Indicator 1:							
	Indicator 2:							
Fund Level Impact 2:	Indicator 1:							
	Indicator 2:							
Outcome	Indicator 1:							

² Populate with data from the Log frame and scorecards

³ Populate with data from the Project Document

⁴ If available

⁵ Colour code this column only

⁶ Use the 6-point Progress Towards Results Rating Scale: HS, S, MS, MU, U, HU

	Indicator 2:							
Output 1:	Indicator 1:							
	Indicator 2:							
Output 2:	Indicator 1:							
	Indicator 2:							
Output 3:	Indicator 1:							
	Indicator 2:							
Etc.								

Indicator Assessment Key

Green= Achieved	Yellow= On target to be achieved	Red= Not on target to be achieved
-----------------	----------------------------------	-----------------------------------

5.3.2 Remaining barriers to achieving the project objective

- i) Identify remaining barriers to achieving the project objective in the remainder of the project.

5.4 Project Implementation and Adaptive Management

5.4.1 Management Arrangements:

- i) Review overall effectiveness of project management as outlined in the FAA/Funding proposal. Have changes been made and have these been approved by GCF? Are responsibilities and reporting lines clear? Is decision-making transparent and undertaken in a timely manner? Recommend areas for improvement.
- ii) Review the quality of execution of the Executing Agency/Implementing Partner(s) and recommend areas for improvement.
- iii) Review the quality of support provided by UNDP and recommend areas for improvement.

5.4.2 Work Planning:

- i) Review any delays in project start-up and implementation, identify the causes and examine if they have been resolved.
- ii) Are work-planning processes results-based? If not, suggest ways to re-orientate work planning to focus on results?
- iii) Examine the use of the project's results framework/ log frame as a management tool and review any changes made to it since project start.

5.4.3 Financing

- i) Consider the financial management of the project, with specific reference to the cost-effectiveness of interventions.

- ii) Have project resources been utilized in the most economical, effective and equitable ways possible (considering value for money; absorption rate; commitments versus disbursements and projected commitments; co-financing; etc.)?
- iii) Does the project have the appropriate financial controls, including reporting and planning, that allow management to make informed decisions regarding the budget and allow for timely flow of funds?
- iv) Informed by the co-financing monitoring table to be filled out, provide commentary on co-financing: is co-financing being used strategically to help the objectives of the project? Comment on the use of different financial streams (parallel, leveraged, mobilized finance), as applicable in the context of the project – see GCF policy on co-finance⁷. Discuss whether co-finance related conditions and covenants, as listed in the FAA, have been fulfilled, as applicable.
- v) If co-finance is not materialising as planned, discuss the impact of that on the project and results on the ground.
- vi) Assess factors that contributed to low/high expenditure rate

5.4.4 Coherence in climate finance delivery with other multilateral entities

- i) Who are the partners of the project and how strategic are they in terms of capacities and commitment?
- ii) Is there coherence and complementarity by the project with other actors for local other climate change interventions?
- iii) To what extent has the project complimented other on-going local level initiatives (by stakeholders, donors, governments) on climate change adaptation or mitigation efforts?
- iv) How has the project contributed to achieving stronger and more coherent integration of shift to low emission sustainable development pathways and/or increased climate resilient sustainable development (GCF RMF/PMF Paradigm Shift objectives)? Please provide concrete examples and make specific suggestions on how to enhance these roles going forward.

5.4.5 Project-level Monitoring and Evaluation Systems:

- i) Review the monitoring tools currently being used: Do they provide the necessary information? Do they involve key partners? Do they use existing information? Are they efficient? Are they cost-effective? Are additional tools required? How could they be made more participatory and inclusive?
- ii) Is project reporting and information generated by the project linked to national SDGs, NDC and other national reporting systems?
- iii) Examine the financial management of the project monitoring and evaluation budget. Are sufficient resources being allocated to monitoring and evaluation? Are these resources being allocated effectively?

5.4.6 Stakeholder Engagement:

- i) Project management: Has the project developed and leveraged the necessary and appropriate partnerships with direct and tangential stakeholders?

⁷ <https://www.greenclimate.fund/sites/default/files/document/policy-cofinancing.pdf>

- ii) Participation and country-driven processes: Do local and national government stakeholders support the objectives of the project? Do they continue to have an active role in project decision-making that supports efficient and effective project implementation?
- iii) Participation and public awareness: To what extent has stakeholder involvement and public awareness contributed to the progress towards achievement of project objectives?
- iv) Is a grievance mechanism in place? If so, assess its effectiveness

5.4.7 Social and Environmental Standards (Safeguards)

- i) Validate the risks identified in the project's most current SESP/ESIA, and those risks' ratings; are any revisions needed?
- ii) Summarize and assess the revisions made since Board Approval (if any) to:
 - a. The project's overall safeguards risk categorization.
 - b. The identified types of risks⁸ (in the SESP).
 - c. The individual risk ratings (in the SESP).
- iii) Describe and assess progress made in the implementation of the project's social and environmental management measures as outlined in the SESP submitted at the Funding Proposal stage (and prepared during implementation, if any), including any revisions to those measures. Such management measures might include Environmental and Social Management Plans (ESMPs) or other management plans, though can also include aspects of a project's design; refer to Question 6 in the SESP template for a summary of the identified management measures.

A given project should be assessed against the version of UNDP's safeguards policy that was in effect at the time of the project's approval.

5.4.8 Reporting:

- i) Assess how adaptive management changes have been reported by the project management and shared with the Project Board.
- ii) Assess how well the Project Team and partners undertake and fulfil GCF reporting requirements (i.e., how have they addressed poorly rated APRs, if applicable?)
- iii) Assess how lessons derived from the adaptive management process have been documented, shared with key partners and internalized by partners.

5.4.9 Communications:

- i) Review internal project communication with stakeholders: Is communication regular and effective? Are there key stakeholders left out of communication? Are there feedback mechanisms when communication is received? Does this communication with stakeholders contribute to their awareness of project outcomes and activities and investment in the sustainability of project results?
- ii) Review external project communication: Are proper means of communication established or being established to express the project progress and intended impact to the public (is there a

⁸ Risks are to be labeled with both the UNDP SES Principles and Standards, and the GEF's "types of risks and potential impacts": Climate Change and Disaster; Disadvantaged or Vulnerable Individuals or Groups; Disability Inclusion; Adverse Gender-Related impact, including Gender-based Violence and Sexual Exploitation; Biodiversity Conservation and the Sustainable Management of Living Natural Resources; Restrictions on Land Use and Involuntary Resettlement; Indigenous Peoples; Cultural Heritage; Resource Efficiency and Pollution Prevention; Labor and Working Conditions; Community Health, Safety and Security.

web presence, for example? Or did the project implement appropriate outreach and public awareness campaigns?)

- iii) For reporting purposes, write one half-page paragraph that summarizes the project's progress towards results in terms of contribution to sustainable development benefits, as well as global environmental benefits.

5.5 Sustainability

Validate whether the risks identified in the FAA and Funding proposal, APRs and the ATLAS Risk Management Module are the most important and whether the risk ratings applied are appropriate and up to date. If not, explain why. In addition, assess the following risks to sustainability:

5.5.1 Financial risks to sustainability:

What is the likelihood of financial and economic resources not being available once the GCF assistance ends (consider potential resources can be from multiple sources, such as the public and private sectors, income generating activities, and other funding that will be adequate financial resources for sustaining project's outcomes)?

5.5.2 Socio-economic risks to sustainability:

Are there any social or political risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project outcomes? What is the risk 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 the project benefits continue to flow? Is there sufficient public / stakeholder awareness in support of the long-term objectives of the project? Are lessons learned being documented by the Project Team on a continual basis and shared/ transferred to appropriate parties who could learn from the project and potentially replicate and/or scale it in the future?

5.5.3 Institutional Framework and Governance risks to sustainability:

Do the legal frameworks, policies, governance structures and processes pose risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project benefits? While assessing this parameter, also consider if the required systems/ mechanisms for accountability, transparency, and technical knowledge transfer are in place.

5.5.4 Environmental risks to sustainability:

Are there any environmental risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project outcomes?

5.6 Country Ownership

- i) To what extent is the project aligned with national development plans, national plans of action on climate change, or sub-national policy as well as projects and priorities of the national partners?
- ii) How well is country ownership reflected in the project governance, coordination and consultation mechanisms or other consultations?
- iii) To what extent are country level systems for project management or M&E utilized in the project?

- iv) Is the project, as implemented, responsive to local challenges and relevant/appropriate/strategic in relation to SDG indicators, National indicators, GCF RMF/PMF indicators, AE indicators, or other goals?
- v) Were the modes of deliveries of the outputs appropriate to build essential/necessary capacities, promote national ownership and ensure sustainability of the result achieved?

5.7 Gender equity

- i) Does the project only rely on sex-disaggregated data per population statistics?
- ii) Are financial resources/project activities explicitly allocated to enable women to benefit from project interventions?
- iii) Does the project account in activities and planning for local gender dynamics and how project interventions affect women as beneficiaries?
- iv) Do women as beneficiaries know their rights and/or benefits from project activities/interventions?
- v) How do the results for women compare to those for men?
- vi) Is the decision-making process transparent and inclusive of both women and men?
- vii) To what extent are female stakeholders or beneficiaries satisfied with the project gender equality results?
- viii) Did the project sufficiently address cross cutting issues including gender?
- ix) How does the project incorporate gender in its governance or staffing?

5.8 Innovativeness in results areas

What are the lessons learned to enrich learning and knowledge generation in terms of how the project played in the provision of "thought leadership," "innovation," or "unlocked additional climate finance" for climate change adaptation/mitigation in the project and country context? Please provide concrete examples and make specific suggestions on how to enhance these roles going forward.

5.9 Unexpected results, both positive and negative

- i) What has been the project's ability to adapt and evolve based on continuous lessons learned and the changing development landscape? Please account for factors both within the **AE/EE** and external.
- ii) Can any unintended or unexpected positive or negative effects be observed as a consequence of the project's interventions?
- iii) What factors have contributed to the unintended outcomes, outputs, activities, results?
- iv) Do any of the unintended results constitute a major change?⁹

5.10 Replication and Scalability

- i) What are project lessons learned, failures/lost opportunities to date? What might have been done better or differently?
- ii) Assess the effectiveness of exit strategies and approaches to phase out assistance provided by the project including contributing factors and constraints? Is there a need for recalibration?

⁹ See Section "9.4 Major Changes and Restructuring" in the [GCF Programming Manual](#)

- iii) What factors of the project achievements are contingent on specific local context or enabling environment factors?
- iv) Are the actions and results from project interventions likely to be sustained, ideally through ownership by the local partners and stakeholders?
- v) What are the key factors that will require attention to improve prospects of sustainability, scalability, or replication of project outcomes/outputs/results?

5.11 Conclusions & Recommendations

The IE team will include a section of the report setting out the evaluation's evidence-based conclusions, considering the findings. Explain whether the project will be able to achieve planned development objective and outcomes by the end of implementation.

Recommendations should be succinct suggestions for critical intervention that are specific, measurable, achievable, and relevant. A recommendation table should be put in the report's executive summary.

The IE team should make no more than 10 recommendations total.

5.12 Ratings

The IE team will include its ratings of the project's results and brief descriptions of the associated achievements in an *Interim Evaluation Ratings & Achievement Summary Table* in the Executive Summary of the Interim Evaluation report. See Annex E for ratings scales. No rating on Project Strategy and no overall project rating is required.

Table. IE Ratings & Achievement Summary Table for *Strengthening Climate Resilience of Agricultural Livelihoods in Agro-Ecological Regions I and II in Zambia Project*.

Measure	IE Rating ¹⁰	Achievement Description
Project Strategy	N/A	
Progress Towards Results	Objective Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale)	
	Output 1 Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale)	
	Output 2 Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale)	
	Output 3 Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale)	
	Etc.	
Project Implementation & Adaptive Management	(rate 6 pt. scale)	

10 Ratings for Objective/Outcome Achievement and Project Implementation & Adaptive Management: 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

Ratings for Sustainability: 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

Sustainability	(rate 4 pt. scale)	
-----------------------	--------------------	--

6.0 TIMEFRAME (DURATION OF WORK)

The total duration of the IE will be approximately 45 working days over a period of 11.5 weeks. A National Consultant will complement the Lead/International Consultant for a period of 45 working days over the same period. The tentative IE timeframe is as follows:

ACTIVITY	NUMBER OF WORKING DAYS	TIME PERIOD
I. Desk Review and Inception Report		
Document review and preparation of IE Inception Report + Submission of IE Inception Report	5 days	7 th - 11 th March 2022
Comments, discussion (if needed) and approval of IE Inception Report	2 days	14 th – 16 th March 2022
II. Physical Mission and Data Collection		
IE physical mission: stakeholder meetings, interviews	12 days	21 st March – 1 st April 2022
Presentation of initial findings- last day of the IE physical mission	1 day	6 th April 2022
III. Report Writing		
Preparation + Submission of draft IE report #1	7 days	7 th – 15 th April 2022
Circulation of draft IE report #1 for review comments		18 th – 22 nd April 2022
Consolidation of comments by Commissioning Unit into audit trail + Preparation and submission of Draft IE report #2	3 days	25 th – 27 th April 2022
Circulation of draft IE report #2 for comments		28 th April – 20 th May 2022
Incorporation of comments on draft IE report #2 by IC + Submission of final IE report + completed Audit Trail by IC (report length should not exceed 50 pages, excluding annexes)	7days	23 rd – 31 st May 2022
Concluding Stakeholder Workshop (can be virtual/ in-person depending on the prevailing covid situation). This will also aid Management response.	1 day	1 st June 2022

7.0 IE DELIVERABLES

#	Deliverable	Description	Timing	Responsibilities
1	IE Inception Report	Proposed evaluation methodology, sample size, and data collection tools and strategies, work plan and structure of the IE report, and options for site visits	11 th March 2022	IC submits to Commissioning Unit and project management
2	Presentation	A power point presentation of Initial Findings and limitations of the IE, highlighting successes, challenges, and value of interventions to facilitate feedback for main report writing and help identify recommendations	6 th April 2022	IC presents to Project Management, project stakeholders and Commissioning Unit
3	Draft IE Report #1	Full report (using guidelines on content outlined in Annex B) with annexes	15 th April 2022	IC sends 1 st draft to Commissioning Unit
4	Draft IE Report #2	Updated full report (using guidelines on content outlined in Annex B) with annexes	27 th April 2022	IC sends 1 st draft to Commissioning Unit
5	Final IE Report*	Revised report with audit trail detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final report	31 st May 2022	IC sends final report to Commissioning Unit
6	Concluding Stakeholder dissemination Workshop	Meeting to present and discuss key findings and recommendations of the evaluation report, and key actions in response to the report. Stake holders include MOA,	Within 1-2 weeks of completion of final IE report	Led by IC or Project Team and Commissioning Unit

		WARMA, ZMD, WFP, FAO, RP, UNDP)		
--	--	---------------------------------------	--	--

*The final IE 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. The international and national consultants will be jointly responsible for entire evaluation processes and submission of the above-mentioned deliverables.

8.0 IE ARRANGEMENTS

The principal responsibility for managing this IE resides with the Commissioning Unit. The Commissioning Unit for this project's IE is the UNDP Country Office (CO) in Zambia. During this assignment, the IE team will report to the Monitoring and Evaluation Focal Point in Commissioning Unit who will provide guidance and ensure satisfactory completion of deliverables.

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

9.0 TEAM COMPOSITION

A team of two independent consultants will conduct the IE - one Team Leader (International with experience and exposure to projects and evaluations in other regions globally) and one National team expert, from the country of the project with expertise in the relevant area. The consultants 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 project's related activities.

10.0 EVALUATOR ETHICS

The evaluation team will be held to the highest ethical standards and is required to sign a code of conduct (see ToR Annex D) upon acceptance of the assignment. This evaluation will be conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the [UNEG Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation](#). The evaluation team 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 evaluation team 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.

11.0 PAYMENT MODALITIES AND SPECIFICATIONS

Instalment of Payment/ Period	Deliverables or Documents to be Delivered	Approval should be obtained	Percentage of Payment
1 st Instalment	Satisfactory delivery of the final IE Inception Report	UNDP CO	20%
2 nd Instalment	Satisfactory delivery of the draft IE report #1	UNDP CO	50%
3 rd Instalment	Satisfactory delivery of the Final IE report + completed Audit Trail	UNDP CO and UNDP Nature, Climate and Energy Regional Technical Advisor (RTA)	30%

Criteria for issuing the final payment of 30%¹¹:

- i) The final IE report includes all requirements outlined in the IE TOR and is in accordance with the IE guidance.
- ii) The final IE report is clearly written, logically organized, and is specific for this project (i.e., text has not been cut & pasted from other IE reports).
- iii) The Audit Trail includes responses to and justification for each comment listed.
- iv) RTA & M&E Focal point approvals are via signatures on the TE Report Clearance Form)

12.0 APPLICATION PROCESS

Proposals should be submitted at the following email address: procurement.zm@undp.org no later than October 31st, 2021. Any request for clarification must be sent in writing, or by standard electronic communication to the email indicated above. The procurement will respond in writing or by standard electronic mail and will send written copies of the response, including an explanation of the query without identifying the source of inquiry, to all consultants.

12.1 Documents to be included when submitting the Proposals.

Interested individual consultants must submit the following documents/information to demonstrate their qualifications in one single PDF document:

¹¹ The Commissioning Unit is obligated to issue payments to the IE team as soon as the terms under the ToR are fulfilled. If there is an ongoing discussion regarding the quality and completeness of the final deliverables that cannot be resolved between the Commissioning Unit and the IE team, the Regional M&E Advisor and Vertical Fund Directorate will be consulted. If needed, the Commissioning Unit's senior management, Procurement Services Unit and Legal Support Office will be notified as well so that a decision can be made about whether or not to withhold payment of any amounts that may be due to the evaluator(s), suspend or terminate the contract and/or remove the individual contractor from any applicable rosters. See the UNDP Individual Contract Policy for further details:

<https://popp.undp.org/layouts/15/WopiFrame.aspx?sourcedoc=/UNDP POPP DOCUMENT LIBRARY/Public/PSU Individual%20Contract Individual%20Contract%20Policy.docx&action=default>

- 1) Duly accomplished **Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability** using the template¹² provided by UNDP
- 2) **CV** and a **Personal History Form** (P11 form¹³); 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.
- 3) **Technical proposal:**
 - a. Brief description of why the individual considers him/herself as the most suitable for the assignment
 - b. A methodology, on how they will approach and complete the assignment.
- a) **Financial proposal** that indicates the all-inclusive fixed total contract price, and all other travel related costs (such as flight ticket, per diem, etc.), supported by a breakdown of costs, as per template attached to the Letter of Confirmation of Interest template. If an applicant is employed by an organization/company/institution, and he/she expects his/her employer to charge a management fee in the process of releasing him/her to UNDP under Reimbursable Loan Agreement (RLA), the applicant must indicate at this point, and ensure that all such costs are duly incorporated in the financial proposal submitted to UNDP.

13.0 CRITERIA FOR EVALUATION OF PROPOSAL:

This section indicates the criteria, which shall serve as the basis for evaluating offers. In this activity, Combined Scoring method will be applied where the qualifications will be weighted a maximum of 70% and combined with the price offer which will be weighted a max of 30%. This criterion is ideal for intellectual services where the methodology or approach to the work may differ from one candidate to another and directly affects the quality of the result.

13.1 Selection Criteria

Technical Criteria	Max score	Weight
General adherence to the Term of Reference (ToR)	5	7%
Proposed methodology, approach, and workplan (relevance, logic, rigor, practicality, creativity, realism of work plan etc.). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clarity and relevance of the proposed methodology, to the local context and to achieve the deliverables of the ToR. Realistic and complete work plan which reflects clear and comprehensive understanding of the scope of work in the ToR. Clarity about how gender considerations will be factored into the evaluation. Clarity on the quality assurance process that will be in place for this assignment 	35	50%
Quality of plan to ensure ethics of conducting evaluation with human subjects (methodological component that will be accorded special	10	14%

¹²

<https://intranet.undp.org/unit/bom/psa/Support%20documents%20on%20IC%20Guidelines/Template%20for%20Confirmation%20of%20Interest%20and%20Submission%20of%20Financial%20Proposal.docx>

¹³ http://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/corporate/Careers/P11_Personal_history_form.doc

attention given the project engagement of women, juvenile children, and other targeted groups).		
Technical capacity of the applicant (as outlined in section 14): qualifications, competencies, experience, and skills as per the ToR (also assessed against sample of evaluation work done)	20	29%
Total	70	100%

Financial Criteria (total score: 30 points)

Applicants who score at least 70% in the technical evaluation will be eligible for assessment of their financial proposal. Financial evaluation will account for 30% of the weighted score as indicated in the table below.

Evaluation Method	Score	Comments
Technical	70%	70% as part of the overall grading of 100%
Financial	30%	The lowest offer will be awarded 30% while the other offers will be weighed against the lowest offer
Overall	100%	Only Offers qualifying for the minimum technical criteria will be eligible for financial evaluation. The Offer having the highest combined score will be awarded the consultancy.

13.2 Recommended presentation of technical and financial proposals

For purposes of generating proposals whose contents are uniformly presented and to facilitate their comparative review, you are hereby given a template of the Table of Content. Accordingly, your Technical Proposal document must have at least the preferred content as outlined in the IC Standard Bid Document (SBD). The financial proposals should be ALL inclusive.

14.0 QUALIFICATIONS

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

14.1 Academic Qualifications:

Advanced University Degree (Masters or equivalent) in Agriculture or natural sciences; with a specialization in environment, biodiversity, climate change or any other closely related field.

14.2 Experience:

- i) Minimum 10 years of relevant professional experience in Agriculture, natural resource management and /or climate change.
- ii) Minimum of 4 years proven track record of application of results-based approaches to evaluation of projects focusing on Agriculture, Conservation Science, Natural Resource Management and Climate Change.
- iii) Highly knowledgeable of participatory monitoring and evaluation processes.
- iv) Experience of conducting Project evaluations within the United Nations system will be considered an asset.

- v) Familiarity with Zambia's development, environment, climate change and other relevant policy frameworks will be an added advantage.

14.3 Competencies:

- i) Recent experience with result-based management evaluation methodologies: (15%)
- ii) Experience applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios; (15%)
- iii) Competence in adaptive management, as applied to GCF Climate Change focal areas, (15%)
- iv) Experience working with project evaluations; (20%).
- v) Experience working in Zambia and/or Southern Africa will be an added advantage
- vi) Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender and Climate change, environment conservation, Livelihood, or food security experience in gender sensitive evaluation and analysis. (15%)
- vii) Excellent communication skills; (10%)
- viii) Demonstrable analytical skills; (10%)

14.4 Language and other skills:

Proficiency in both spoken and written English

14.5 Compliance of the UN Core Values:

- i) Demonstrates integrity by modelling the UN's values and ethical standards,
- ii) Promotes the vision, mission, and strategic goals of UNDP,
- iii) Displays cultural, gender, religion, race, nationality and age sensitivity and adaptability,
- iv) Treats all people fairly without favoritism,
- v) Fulfills all obligations to gender sensitivity and zero tolerance for sexual harassment.

15.0 CONFIDENTIALITY

The Individual Consultant shall not either during the term or after termination of the assignment, disclose any proprietary or confidential information related to the consultancy service without prior written consent. Proprietary interests on all materials and documents prepared by the consultants under the assignment shall become and remain properties of UNDP.

ANNEX A. LIST OF DOCUMENTS TO BE REVIEWED

1. Funding Proposal
2. Funded Activity Agreement (FAA)
3. UNDP Project Document
4. UNDP Environmental and Social Screening results
5. Project Inception Report
6. All Annual Performance Reports (APRs)
7. Progress reports and work plans of the various implementation task teams
8. Audit reports
9. Mission reports
10. All monitoring reports prepared by the project
11. Financial and Administration guidelines used by Project Team

The following documents will also be available:

12. Project operational guidelines, manuals and systems
13. UNDP country/countries programme document(s)
14. Minutes of the Project Board Meetings and other meetings (i.e., Project Appraisal Committee meetings)
15. Project site location maps

ANNEX B: Guidelines on Contents for the Interim Evaluation Report¹⁴

Basic Report Information (*for opening page or title page*)

- Title of UNDP-supported GCF-financed project
- UNDP PIMS# and GCF project ID#
- IE time frame and date of report
- Region and countries included in the project
- Executing Agency/Implementing Partner and other project partners
- IE team members

Acknowledgements

Table of Contents

Acronyms and Abbreviations

Project Information Table

Executive Summary (*2-3 pages*)

- Project Description (brief)
- Project Progress Summary
- IE Ratings & Achievement Summary Table
- Concise summary of conclusions
- Recommendations Summary Table

Introduction (*2-3 pages*)

- Purpose of the IE and objectives
- Scope & Methodology: principles of design and execution of the IE, IE approach and data collection methods, limitations
- Structure of the IE report

¹⁴ The Report length should not exceed 40 pages in total (not including annexes).

Project Description and Background Context (3-5 pages)

- 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
- Project Description and Strategy: objective, outcomes and expected results, description of field sites (if any)
- Project Implementation Arrangements: short description of the Project Board, key implementing partner arrangements, etc.
- Project timing and milestones
- Main stakeholders: summary list

Findings (12-14 pages)

4.1 Project Strategy

- Project Design
- Results Framework/Log frame

4.2 Relevance

4.3 Effectiveness and Efficiency

4.4 Progress Towards Results

- Progress towards outcomes analysis
- Remaining barriers to achieving the project objective

4.5 Project Implementation and Adaptive Management

- Management Arrangements
- Work planning
- Financing
- Coherence in climate finance delivery with other multilateral entities
- Project-level monitoring and evaluation systems
- Stakeholder engagement
- Reporting
- Communications

4.6 Sustainability

- Financial risks to sustainability
- Socio-economic to sustainability
- Institutional framework and governance risks to sustainability
- Environmental risks to sustainability

4.7 Country Ownership

4.8 Innovativeness in results areas

4.9 Unexpected results, both positive and negative

4.10 Replication and Scalability

4.11 Gender Equity

Conclusions and Recommendations (4-6 pages)

Conclusions

- 5.1
- Comprehensive and balanced statements (that are evidence-based and connected to the IE's findings) which highlight the strengths, weaknesses and results of the project

Recommendations

- 5.2**
- 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

Annexes

- IE ToR (excluding ToR annexes)
- IE evaluative matrix (evaluation criteria with key questions, indicators, sources of data, and methodology)
- Questionnaire or Interview Guide used for data collection
- Mission itinerary
- List of persons interviewed
- List of documents reviewed
- Co-financing table (if not previously included in the body of the report)
- Signed UNEG Code of Conduct form
- Signed IE final report clearance form
- *Annexed in a separate file:* Audit trail from received comments on draft IE report

ANNEX C: IE EVALUATIVE MATRIX (EVALUATION CRITERIA WITH KEY QUESTIONS, INDICATORS, SOURCES OF DATA, AND METHODOLOGY)

Evaluative Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
Relevance: Project Strategy: To what extent is the project strategy relevant to country priorities, country ownership, and the best route towards expected results?			
Do the project activities address the gaps in the policy, regulatory and capacity framework at the national level? To what extent is the project suited to local and national development priorities and policies?	Degree to which the project supports national environmental objectives. Addressing gaps and/or inconsistency with the national and local policies and priorities Addressing gaps in capacity framework.	National policies, Project Document	Document analysis

How relevant the project's intended outcomes? How relevant is the involvement of different partners in the Project implementation given the institutional and policy framework for environment and food security sectors in Zambia?	Degree to which the project supports national environmental and development objectives	Project documents	Document analysis
Were the project's objectives and components relevant, according to the social and political context?	Degree of coherence between the project and national priorities, policies and strategies	Government of the Republic of Zambia, UNDP, Project Management	Interviews
Are counterpart resources (funding, staff, and facilities), enabling legislation, and adequate project management arrangements in place at project entry? Are the stated assumptions and risks logical and robust? And did they help to determine activities and planned outputs? Is the project coherent with UNDP programming strategy for Zambia? To what extent is the project in line with GCF operational programs	Appreciation from national stakeholders with respect to adequacy of project design and implementation to national realities and existing capacities Coherence UNDP and GCF operational programming	Project partners and relevant stakeholders UNDP/GCF Programming statements	Interviews Document analysis
Effectiveness: Progress Towards Results: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved thus far?			
What expected outputs have been achieved thus far?	Degree of achievement vis a vis expected outcome indicators	APRs interviews	Document analyses Site Visits Interviews

<p>To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved thus far?</p> <p>What have the products, such as studies, policy recommendations, dissemination campaigns, etc., affected [keeping in mind that this is a midterm review and several if not many products are still in the implementation or planning process]</p>			
<p>Was the project effective in acquiring a policy guidance for future developments in the field of livelihoods, Climate Change and sustainable environment management in the project districts?</p> <p>How is the Project addressing fragmentation of environment management policies, and institutional scattering considering this fragmentation?</p> <p>How is the Project contributing to avoiding fragmentation across policies and cross-cutting mandates?</p> <p>What other partners can be involved in the Project in a meaningful way to streamline the issue and bypass or address the institutional and policy fragmentation of the environment and climate change in the project districts?</p>		<p>Project outcomes</p> <p>Norms, policies debated, adopted</p>	<p>Document analysis</p> <p>Stakeholders' interviews</p>

<p>How well has the project involved and empowered communities to implement management strategies as they relate to environment and climate change in the project districts?</p> <p>How has the project incorporated gender issues as they relate to environment and climate change in the project districts?</p>	<p>Involvement of (direct and indirect) beneficiaries in project development and implementation</p> <p>Incorporation of gender dimension</p> <p>Analysis of participation by stakeholders (communities, civil society, direct and indirect beneficiaries, etc.).</p> <p>Effect of project aspects implemented at sites</p>	<p>Project outputs and outcomes</p>	<p>Interviews</p> <p>Site visits</p>
<p>What is causing delays in implementation and delivery of outputs of the Project?</p>	<p>Discrepancies between expected outputs/outcome by the time of Interim and actual achievements</p>	<p>Findings in project documents, achievement indicators</p>	<p>Document analysis (minutes of meetings specially)</p> <p>Site visits observation</p>
<p>In what outputs? Where are the implementation 'bottlenecks'?</p> <p>How can these issues be solved?</p> <p>What changes need to be implemented?</p>			<p>Stakeholder interviews</p>
<p>Partnerships for implementation</p>	<p>Working relationship between PMU, UNDP, and other strategic partners as well as donors</p> <p>Steering Committee functions</p>	<p>Findings in project documents (APRs, minutes of meetings)</p> <p>Indications in interviews</p>	<p>Document analysis</p> <p>Stakeholder interviews</p>
<p>In what ways are long-term emerging effects to the project foreseen?</p>	<p>Level of coherence between project expected results and</p>	<p>MOA, ZMD, WARMA, WFP, FAO, Project team, UNDP</p>	<p>Interviews</p>

	project design internal logic		
Were the relevant representatives from government and civil society involved in project implementation, including as part of the project	<p>Level of coherence between project design and project implementation approach</p> <p>Role of committees in guidance</p> <p>Harness effectiveness by analysing how project's results were met vis-à-vis intended outcomes or objectives</p> <p>Draw lessons learned/good practices from the implementation and achievement of results</p>	Project partners and relevant stakeholders	Document analysis
Efficiency: Project Implementation and Adaptive Management: Has the project been implemented efficiently, cost-effectively, and could adapt to any changing conditions thus far? To what extent are project-level monitoring and evaluation systems, reporting, and project communications supporting the project's implementation?			
Was the project implemented efficiently, in line with international and national norms and standards?	<p>Policies adopted / enacted</p> <p>Policies implemented</p> <p>Budgetary / financial means to implement policies drawn</p>	<p>Policy documents contain sustainability factors (policy adopted, implemented)</p> <p>Budget arrangements (allocations, etc.) made to sustain project outputs and outcomes</p>	<p>Documentation analysis</p> <p>Stakeholder interviews</p>

	Was adaptive management used thus far and if so, how did these modifications to the project contribute to obtaining the objectives? Has the project been able to adapt to any changing conditions thus far? To what extent are project-level monitoring and evaluation systems, reporting, and project communications supporting the project's implementation?	Quality of existing information systems in place to identify emerging risks and other issues	Project documents
	How did institutional arrangements influence the project's achievement of results?	Quality of risk mitigations strategies developed and followed	MOA, WARMA, ZMD, WFP, FAO, Project team, UNDP
Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, socio-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long term project results?			
Sustainability possibilities Does the Project have an exit strategy? What components should an exit strategy have for this project?	In what way, may the benefits from the project are likely to be maintained or increased in the future?	See indicators in project document results framework and log frame	Project documents and reports
Social sustainability factors	Is there sufficient public/stakeholder awareness in support of the project's long-term objectives?	Evidence that particular partnerships/linkages will be sustained	MOA, WARMA, ZMD, WFP, FAO, Project team, UNDP
Political/financial sustainability	Do the legal frameworks, policies, and governance structures and processes within which the project	Evidence that particular practices will be sustained	MOA, WARMA, ZMD, WFP, FAO, Project team, UNDP

	operates pose risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project benefits?		
Replicability	Which of the project's aspects deserve to be replicated in future initiatives?	Evidence that particular practices will be sustained	MOA, WARMA, ZMD, WFP, FAO, Project team, UNDP

ANNEX D: UNEG CODE OF CONDUCT FOR EVALUATORS/INTERIM EVALUATION CONSULTANTS

Evaluators/Consultants:

- i) Must present information that is complete and fair in its assessment of strengths and weaknesses so that decisions or actions taken are well founded.
- ii) 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.
- iii) 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.
- iv) 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.
- v) 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 during 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.
- vi) 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 limitations, findings and recommendations.
- vii) Should reflect sound accounting procedures and be prudent in using the resources of the evaluation.
- viii) Must ensure that independence of judgement is maintained, and that evaluation findings and recommendations are independently presented.
- ix) Must confirm that they have not been involved in designing, executing or advising on the project being evaluated.

IE Consultant Agreement Form

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 _____

Signed at _____ *Date* _____

ANNEX E: IE RATING SCALE

Rating scale for performance

Rating	Explanation
Highly Satisfactory (HS)	No shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives in terms of relevance, effectiveness, and efficiency <u>and sustainability</u>
Satisfactory (S)	Minor shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives in terms of relevance, effectiveness, and efficiency <u>and sustainability</u>
Moderately Satisfactory (MS)	Moderate shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives in terms of relevance, effectiveness, and efficiency <u>and sustainability</u>
Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)	Significant shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives in terms of relevance, effectiveness and , efficiency <u>and sustainability</u>
Unsatisfactory (U)	Major shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives in terms of relevance, effectiveness, and efficiency <u>and sustainability</u>
Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)	Severe shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives in terms of relevance, effectiveness and , efficiency <u>and sustainability</u>

Rating Scale for Sustainability

Rating	Explanation
Likely (L)	Negligible risks to sustainability, with key outcomes expected to continue into the foreseeable future
Moderately Likely (ML)	Moderate risks, but expectations that at least some outcomes will be sustained
Moderately Unlikely (MU)	Substantial risk that key outcomes will not carry on after project closure, although some outputs and activities should carry on
Unlikely (U)	Severe risk that project outcomes as well as key outputs will not be sustained
Highly Unlikely (HU)	Expectation that few if any outputs or activities will continue after project closure

Progress Towards Results Rating Scale

Highly Satisfactory (HS)	The objective/outcome is expected to achieve or exceed all its end-of-project targets, without major shortcomings. The progress towards the objective/outcome can be presented as “good practice”.
Satisfactory (S)	The objective/outcome is expected to achieve most of its end-of-project targets, with only minor shortcomings.

Moderately Satisfactory (MS)	The objective/outcome is expected to achieve most of its end-of-project targets but with significant shortcomings.
Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)	The objective/outcome is expected to achieve its end-of-project targets with major shortcomings.
Unsatisfactory (U)	The objective/outcome is expected not to achieve most of its end-of-project targets.
Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)	The objective/outcome has failed to achieve its midterm targets and is not expected to achieve any of its end-of-project targets.

Ratings for Project Implementation & Adaptive Management: (one overall rating)	
Highly Satisfactory (HS)	Implementation of all seven components – management arrangements, work planning, finance and co-finance, project-level monitoring and evaluation systems, stakeholder engagement, reporting, and communications – is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management. The project can be presented as “good practice”.
Satisfactory (S)	Implementation of most of the seven components is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management except for only few that are subject to remedial action.
Moderately Satisfactory (MS)	Implementation of some of the seven components is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management, with some components requiring remedial action.
Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)	Implementation of some of the seven components is not leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive, with most components requiring remedial action.
Unsatisfactory (U)	Implementation of most of the seven components is not leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management.
Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)	Implementation of none of the seven components is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management.

ANNEX F: IE Report Clearance Form

(to be completed by the Commissioning Unit, NCE RTA and NCE PTA and included in the final document)

Interim Evaluation Report Reviewed and Cleared By:	
Commissioning Unit (M&E Focal Point)	
Name: _____	
Signature: _____	Date: _____
Regional Technical Advisor – Nature, Climate and Energy	
Name: _____	
Signature: _____	Date: _____
Principal Technical Advisor – Nature, Climate and Energy	
Name: _____	
Signature: _____	Date: _____

ANNEX F: Audit Trail Template

Note: The following is a template for the IE Team to show how the received comments on the draft IE report have (or have not) been incorporated into the final IE report. This audit trail should be included as an annex in the final IE report

To the comments received on (date) from the IE of *Strengthening Climate Resilience of Agricultural Livelihoods in Agro-Ecological Regions I and II in Zambia*) (UNDP Project ID-00099475#)

The following comments were provided in track changes to the draft Midterm Review report; they are referenced by institution (“Author” column) and not by the person’s name, and track change comment number (“#” column):

Author	#	Para No./ comment location	Comment/Feedback on the draft IE report	IE team response and actions taken
