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

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

1. **INTRODUCTION**

In accordance with UNDP and GEF M&E policies and procedures, all full- and medium-sized UNDP-supported GEF-financed projects are required to undergo a Terminal Evaluation (TE) at the end of the project. This Terms of Reference (ToR) sets out the expectations for the TE of the *medium-sized* project titled “*Strengthening national capacities for improved decision making and mainstreaming of global environmental obligations 5894”* implemented through the Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development. The project started on the July 2018 and is in its *4* years of implementation. The TE process must follow the guidance outlined in the document ‘Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects’ .

<http://web.undp.org/evaluation/guideline/documents/GEF/TE_GuidanceforUNDP-supportedGEF-financedProjects.pdf>

1. **PROJECT BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT**

This project strengthens targeted policy, institutional, and technical capacities within the existin baseline of current capacity development efforts. This project is in line with the GEF-6 CCCD Strategic Objectives 1, 2, 3, and 4. The goal of this project is that Djibouti will be better enabled to meet and sustain global environmental priorities within the framework of national socio-economic development priorities. The immediate objective of this project is to strengthen targeted national capacities to deliver and sustain global environmental outcomes by mainstreaming, monitoring, and decentralizing global environmental governance. This requires the country to have the capacity to coordinate efforts, as well as be able to adopt best practices for integrating global environmental priorities into decentralized planning, decision-making, and reporting processes..

The project began in 2018 and will end in December 2022. The total cost of the project is US$ 2,229,000. This is financed through a GEF grant of US$ 1,000,000 in cash, with an additional cash co-financing of US$ 100,000 from UNDP and US$ 1,129,000 as in-kind co-financing from the Government of Djibouti. UNDP, as the GEF Implementing Agency, is responsible for the execution of the GEF resources and the cash co-financing transferred to UNDP bank account only.

The project is carried out through 4 related components.

* **Component 1** calls for enhancing capacities to mainstream, develop, and apply policies and legislative frameworks for the cost-effective implementation of the three Rio Conventions.
* **Component 2** focuses on decentralization of global environment governance, specifically to strengthen targeted institutional arrangements for the cost-effective and streamlined application of better natural resource management practices that meet dual national socio-economic and global environmental objectives.
* **Component 3** will focus on setting up and initiating the early implementation of an environmental management information system for improving the country’s monitoring and assessment of global environmental impacts and trends.
* **Component 4** are a suite of knowledge management exercises that set out to improve environmental attitudes and values for the global environment. The project takes an adaptive collaborative management (ACM) approach to implementation, which calls for stakeholders to take an early and proactive role in the mainstreaming exercises, as well as to help identify and solve unexpected implementation barriers and challenges. By taking an ACM approach, project activities and outputs can be more legitimately modified and adapted to maintain timely and cost-effective project performance and delivery.

The CCCD project began in 2018 and will end in December 2022. It is implemented by the Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development in partnership with UNDP. A request for a 6-month extension of the project has been accepted. The implementation of the project was affected to some extent by the COVID-19 pandemic, as the country was placed under lockdown. Indeed, the project includes activities primarily related to workshops and trainings: this was not possible because of Covid, and with limited internet access throughout the country, the digital option was not feasible

At the end of the project, activities will have resulted in a set of improved capacities to meet and sustain Rio Convention objectives. This project will have strengthened and helped institutionalize commitments under the Rio Conventions by ensuring a flow of assistance and information between the local, national and global level. The expected outcome of the project is that Djibouti will be able to achieve global environmental benefits at a lower transactional cost as well as being able to respond faster and more appropriately to conservation needs. By the end of project implementation, it is expected that Djibouti will: a) improve access to best practices and best available knowledge, including innovative research; b) improve coordination, collaboration, and delegation of responsibilities among key agencies and other important organizations; c) enhance institutional and technical capacities; d) improve awareness of global environmental values; and e) improve decentralization. While the expected outcomes of the project from a GEF perspective are improved capacities to meet and sustain global environmental priorities, the expected outcomes from a national socio-economic development perspective are improved capacities to plan and make decisions that will meet and sustain sustainable development priorities. The project will achieve this by mainstreaming global environment into planning and decision-making process (i.e., integrating environmental-development best practice. Project activities will be carried out strategically so that they are both cost-effective and capture synergies. Project activities are a mix of efforts to strengthen targeted systemic, institutional, and individual capacities, and will be largely undertaken through learning-by-doing workshops. Representatives from numerous government agencies and departments will be invited to participate in all relevant project activities, paying close attention to ensure adequate gender representation and recognition of traditional and indigenous communities. Assessments will benefit from independent peer reviews, to control for quality products, as well as validation workshops to further validate their legitimacy and relevance. The Project Results Framework in Section F provides further details on the activities and target indicators.

1. **TE PURPOSE**

The TE report will assess the achievement of project results against what was expected to be achieved and draw lessons that can both improve the sustainability of benefits from this project, and aid in the overall enhancement of UNDP programming. The TE report promotes accountability and transparency and assesses the extent of project accomplishments. The final evaluation report will assess the progress and achievement of the project's objectives and outcomes as specified in the project document. The TE will also examine the project strategy and its risks to sustainability.

This evaluation is the first one, in this regard, the results and recommendations of the final review will be essential to know the achievements and main accomplishments of the project. The TE report will assess the achievement of the project results against what was planned and draw lessons that can both improve the sustainability and benefits of this project. This evaluation will also contribute to improving overall UNDP programming.

Completion of the final evaluation process is scheduled for **September 2022**.

1. **TE APPROACH & METHODOLOGY**

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

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

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

Engagement of stakeholders is vital to a successful TE. Stakeholder involvement should include interviews with stakeholders who have project responsibilities, including but not limited to the following list of executing agencies, senior officials and task team/component leaders, key experts and consultants in the subject area, Project Board, project beneficiaries, academia, local government and CSOs, etc. Additionally, the TE team is expected to conduct field missions to 5 regions in Djibouti, including the following project sites (Djibouti ville, Tadjourah, Dikhil, Ali-Sabieh, Arta).

***List 1: Stakeholders to be consulted/interviewed****:*

1. Directorate of Environment and Sustainable Development (DEDD) / MEDD.
2. Directorate of Fisheries / Ministry of Agriculture, Water, Fisheries, Livestock and Marine Resources (MAWFLMR) ;
3. Minister of Decentralization
4. Risk and Disaster Management Secretariat.
5. Expertise France.
6. National Scientific Research Institution: CERD / Ministry of Higher Education and Research.
7. Prefecture councils of Djibouti, Arta, Tadjourah, Ali-Sabieh, Dikhil ;
8. Cooperation international.
9. Minister of energy.

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

Suggested methodological tools and approaches may include:

* **Document review.** (see annex B Project Information Package to be reviewed by TE team)
* **Interviews and meetings** with key stakeholders (men and women) such as key government counterparts, donor community members, representatives of key civil society organizations, United Nations country team (UNCT) members and implementing partners:
  + **Semi-structured interviews,** based on questionsdesigned for different stakeholdersbased on evaluation questions around relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, and sustainability.
  + Key informant and **focus group discussions** with men and women, beneficiaries and stakeholders.
  + All interviews with men and women should be undertaken in full confidence and anonymity. The final evaluation report should not assign specific comments to individuals.
* **Surveys and questionnaires** including male and female participants in development programmes, UNCT members and/or surveys and questionnaires to other stakeholders at strategic and programmatic levels.
* **Field visits** and on-site validation of key tangible outputs and interventions as mentioned above.
* **Other methods** such as outcome mapping, observational visits, group discussions, etc.
* **Data review and analysis** of monitoring; financial and funding data, and other data sources and methods. To ensure maximum validity, reliability of data (quality) and promote use, the evaluator will ensure triangulation of the various data sources.

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

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

1. **DETAILED SCOPE OF THE TE**

The TE will assess project performance against expectations set out in the project’s Logical Framework/Results Framework (see ToR Annex A). The TE will assess results according to the criteria outlined in the Guidance for TEs of UNDP-supported GEF-financed Projects.

<http://web.undp.org/evaluation/guideline/documents/GEF/TE_GuidanceforUNDP-supportedGEF-financedProjects.pdf>.

The Findings section of the TE report will cover the topics listed below.

A full outline of the TE report’s content is provided in ToR Annex C.

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

Findings

1. Project Design/Formulation

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

1. Project Implementation

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

1. Project Results

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

Main Findings, Conclusions, Recommendations and Lessons Learned

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

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

**ToR Table 2: Evaluation Ratings Table for Strengthening national capacities for improved decision making and mainstreaming of global environmental obligations 5894**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Monitoring & Evaluation (M&E) | Rating[[1]](#footnote-1) |
| M&E design at entry |  |
| M&E Plan Implementation |  |
| Overall Quality of M&E |  |
| Implementation & Execution | Rating |
| Quality of UNDP Implementation/Oversight |  |
| Quality of Implementing Partner Execution |  |
| Overall quality of Implementation/Execution |  |
| Assessment of Outcomes | Rating |
| Relevance |  |
| Effectiveness |  |
| Efficiency |  |
| Overall Project Outcome Rating |  |
| Sustainability | Rating |
| Financial resources |  |
| Socio-political/economic |  |
| Institutional framework and governance |  |
| Environmental |  |
| Overall Likelihood of Sustainability |  |

1. **TIMEFRAME**

The total duration of the TE will be approximately 30 working days over a 3-month period beginning July 15, 2022. The tentative schedule for the EA is as follows:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Timeframe | Activity |
| *30 May 2022* | Application closes |
| *10 June 2022* | Selection of TE team |
| *20 June 2022* | Preparation period for TE team (handover of documentation) |
| *25 June 2022* | Document review and preparation of TE Inception Report |
| *05 July 2022* | Finalization and Validation of TE Inception Report; latest start of TE mission |
| *20 July 2022* | TE mission: stakeholder meetings, interviews, field visits, etc. |
| *30 July 2022* | Mission wrap-up meeting & presentation of initial findings; earliest end of TE mission |
| *05 September 2022* | Preparation of draft TE report |
| *10 - 25 September 2022* | Circulation of draft TE report for comments |
| *30 September 2022* | Incorporation of comments on draft TE report into Audit Trail & finalization of TE report |
| *30 October 2022* | Preparation and Issuance of Management Response |
| *05 November 2022* | Concluding Stakeholder Workshop (optional) |
| *10 November 2022* | Expected date of full TE completion |

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

1. **TE DELIVERABLES**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| # | Deliverable | Description | Timing | Responsibilities |
| 1 | TE Inception Report | TE team clarifies objectives, methodology and timing of the TE | 05 July 2022 | TE team submits Inception Report to Commissioning Unit and project management |
| 2 | Presentation | Initial Findings | 30 July 2022 | TE team presents to Commissioning Unit and project management |
| 3 | Draft TE Report | Full draft report *(using guidelines on report content in ToR Annex C)* with annexes | 05 September 2022 | TE team submits to Commissioning Unit; reviewed by RTA, Project Coordinating Unit, GEF OFP |
| 5 | Final TE Report\* + Audit Trail | Revised final report and TE Audit trail in which the TE details how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final TE report *(See template in ToR Annex H)* | 30 September 2022 | TE team submits both documents to the Commissioning Unit |

\*All final TE reports will be quality assessed by the UNDP Independent Evaluation Office (IEO). Details of the IEO’s quality assessment of decentralized evaluations can be found in Section 6 of the UNDP Evaluation Guidelines.[[2]](#footnote-2)

1. **TE ARRANGEMENTS**

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

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

The consultants will report directly to the designated evaluation manager and focal point and work closely with the project team. Project staff will not participate in the meetings between consultants and evaluands. Limited administrative and logistical support will be provided. The consultant will use his own laptop and cell phone.

 The evaluator is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach that ensures close engagement with the evaluation managers, implementing partners and the project stakeholders. The evaluation manager will convene an evaluation reference group comprising of technical experts from UNDP, donors, GEF RTA and implementing partners. This reference group will review the inception report and the draft evaluation report and provide detailed comments related to the quality of methodology, evidence collected, analysis and reporting. The reference group will also advise on the conformity of processes to the GEF, UNDP and UNEG standards. Comments and changes by the evaluator in response to the draft report should be retained by the evaluator to show how they have addressed comments (audit trail). The ERG will also provide input to the development of the management responses and key actions recommended by the evaluation.

1. **TE TEAM COMPOSITION**

A team of *two independent evaluators* will conduct the TE. The international consultant will be the team leader. He/She will be responsible for conducting interviews with stakeholders, conducting field visits, and preparing and finalizing the inception and final evaluation reports in English. The international consultant is responsible for the timely delivery of the report and will ensure the quality of the report as per GEF and UNDP Evaluation Guidelines.

The national consultant will be responsible for consolidating existing documentation, conducting interviews with stakeholders, participating in the field mission, and writing and finalizing the field mission analysis report. He/she will support the international consultant in the evaluation process.

The CO's office will assist in identifying stakeholders and organizing bilateral and group consultations with stakeholders.

The international consultant may not have been involved in the preparation, formulation and/or implementation of the project (including the drafting of the project document) and must not have any conflict of interest with the project activities. The international consultant will aim to maximize the overall qualities of the "team" in the following areas:

Education

* Master’s degree in natural resource management/environmental management/business/public administration, forestry/agriculture/or economy or other closely related field.

Experience

* Relevant experience with results-based management evaluation methodologies.
* Experience applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios.
* Competence in adaptive management, as applied to Climate Change, and Biodiversity ;
* Experience in evaluating GEF projects.
* Experience working in east Africa.
* Experience in relevant technical areas for at least *7 years.*
* Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender and environment, experience in gender responsive evaluation and analysis.
* Excellent communication skills.
* Demonstrable analytical skills.
* Project evaluation/review experience within United Nations system will be considered an asset.

Language

* Fluency in written and spoken English.
* *Proficiency in French*

1. **EVALUATOR ETHICS**

The TE team will be held to the highest ethical standards and is required to sign a code of conduct upon acceptance of the assignment. This evaluation will be conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG ‘Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation’. The evaluator must safeguard the rights and confidentiality of information providers, interviewees and stakeholders through measures to ensure compliance with legal and other relevant codes governing collection of data and reporting on data. The evaluator must also ensure security of collected information before and after the evaluation and protocols to ensure anonymity and confidentiality of sources of information where that is expected. The information knowledge and data gathered in the evaluation process must also be solely used for the evaluation and not for other uses without the express authorization of UNDP and partners.

1. **PAYMENT SCHEDULE**

* 20% payment upon satisfactory delivery of the final TE Inception Report and approval by the Commissioning Unit
* 40% payment upon satisfactory delivery of the draft TE report to the Commissioning Unit
* 40% payment upon satisfactory delivery of the final TE report and approval by the Commissioning Unit and RTA (via signatures on the TE Report Clearance Form) and delivery of completed TE Audit Trail

Criteria for issuing the final payment of 40%[[3]](#footnote-3):

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

1. **APPLICATION PROCESS[[4]](#footnote-4)**

Recommended Presentation of Proposal:

1. **Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability** using the [template](https://intranet.undp.org/unit/bom/pso/Support%20documents%20on%20IC%20Guidelines/Template%20for%20Confirmation%20of%20Interest%20and%20Submission%20of%20Financial%20Proposal.docx)[[5]](#footnote-5) provided by UNDP;
2. **CV** and a **Personal History Form** ([P11 form](http://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/corporate/Careers/P11_Personal_history_form.doc)[[6]](#footnote-6));
3. Brief description **of approach to work/technical proposal** of why the individual considers him/herself as the most suitable for the assignment, and a proposed methodology on how they will approach and complete the assignment; (max 1 page)
4. **Financial Proposal** that indicates the all-inclusive fixed total contract price and all other travel related costs (such as flight ticket, per diem, etc), supported by a breakdown of costs, as per template attached to the [Letter of Confirmation of Interest template](https://popp.undp.org/_layouts/15/WopiFrame.aspx?sourcedoc=/UNDP_POPP_DOCUMENT_LIBRARY/Public/PSU_%20Individual%20Contract_Offerors%20Letter%20to%20UNDP%20Confirming%20Interest%20and%20Availability.docx&action=default). If an applicant is employed by an organization/company/institution, and he/she expects his/her employer to charge a management fee in the process of releasing him/her to UNDP under Reimbursable Loan Agreement (RLA), the applicant must indicate at this point, and ensure that all such costs are duly incorporated in the financial proposal submitted to UNDP.

All application materials should be submitted to the address (insert mailing address) in a sealed envelope indicating the following reference “Consultant for Terminal Evaluation of *Strengthening national capacities for improved decision making and mainstreaming of global environmental obligations 5894”* or by email at the following address ONLY: [proc.dji@undp.org](mailto:proc.dji@undp.org) by **30 May 2022** **12:00 PM New York time**. Incomplete applications will be excluded from further consideration.

**Criteria for Evaluation of Proposal:** Only those applications which are responsive and compliant will be evaluated. Offers will be evaluated according to the Combined Scoring method – where the educational background and experience on similar assignments will be weighted at 70% and the price proposal will weigh as 30% of the total scoring. The applicant receiving the Highest Combined Score that has also accepted UNDP’s General Terms and Conditions will be awarded the contract.

1. **TOR ANNEXES**

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

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

|  | **Objective and Outcome Indicators** | **Baseline** | **End of Project Target[[7]](#footnote-7)** | **Data Collection Methods and Risks/Assumptions** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Project Objective:** | Indicator 1 (IRRF Output 1.3): Solutions developed at national and sub-national levels for sustainable management of natural resources, ecosystem services, chemicals and waste.  Indicator 1.3.1: Number of new partnership mechanisms with funding for sustainable management solutions of natural resources, ecosystem services, chemicals and waste at national and/or subnational level.  Indicator 1.3.2: a) Number of additional people benefitting from strengthened livelihoods through solutions for management of natural resources, ecosystems services, chemicals and waste b) Number of new jobs created through solutions for management of natural resources, ecosystem services, chemicals and waste. | * Capacities for managing the Rio Conventions is piecemeal * Requirements of the Rio Conventions are not adequately incorporated in sectoral development planning * Planners and decision-makers do not fully appreciate the value of the Rio Conventions, the result of which is that the global environment is heavily discounted | * Increased capacity within relevant stakeholder groups to address Rio Convention obligations * Gender equality targets per UNDP 2018-2022 Strategic Plan are met | Means of Verification:   * Meeting Minutes * Working Group meeting reports * UNDP quarterly progress reports * Independent final evaluation report * Rio Convention national reports and communications |
| Risks/Assumptions:   * The project will be executed in a transparent, holistic, adaptive, and collaborative manner * Government staff and non-state stakeholder representatives are actively engaged in the project |
| Indicator 2 (IRRF Output Indicator 2.5): Legal and regulatory frameworks, policies and institutions enabled to ensure the conservation, sustainable use, and access and benefit sharing of natural resources, biodiversity and ecosystems, in line with international conventions and national legislation.  Indicator 2.5.1: Extent to which legal or policy or institutional frameworks are in place for conservation, sustainable use, and access and benefit sharing of natural resources, biodiversity and ecosystems. | The baseline of this indicator is qualitatively measured as inadequate, reflected by the inadequacy of existing policy and legal instruments to guarantee the realization of Rio Convention obligations. While the baseline consists of various environmental and development policies and laws, their inadequacy lies in their sectoral and thematic construct, insufficient awareness and understanding of how to reconcile competing policies and laws, and inadequate guidance on the strategic operationalization of this policy framework. | * At least one by-law or legal instrument has been developed or strengthened * At least one sectoral plan effectively integrated with criteria and indicators that reinforce Rio Convention obligations achievements. * At least 75% of government technical staffs have actively engaged in the technical trainings on innovative approaches to implement Rio Convention obligations | Means of Verification:   * Meeting Minutes * Working Group meeting reports * UNDP quarterly progress reports * Independent final evaluation reports * Rio Convention national reports and communications |
| Risks/Assumptions:   * Policy and institutional reforms and modifications recommended by the project are politically, technically, and financially feasible |
| Indicator 3: Number of direct project beneficiaries | The baseline for this project is set at zero, to be compared with the number of unique stakeholders benefitting from the project’s activities. | At least 500 stakeholder representatives have benefitted by month 44 (or by the completion of the terminal evaluation) | Means of Verification:   * Meeting Minutes * Working group and workshop reports and products * UNDP quarterly progress reports * Independent final evaluation report * Rio Convention national reports and communications |
| Risks/Assumptions:  Project beneficiaries demonstrate a fundamental improvement in their understanding of the issues and are pre-disposed to adopt new and alternative approaches to meet their livelihood needs |
|  | Indicator 4:  Targeted national capacities to deliver and sustain global environmental outcomes within the framework of decentralized sustainable development priorities are strengthened | * There is no systematic approach or institutional procedures to integrate environmental conservation priorities and Rio Convention provisions into socio-economic development planning processes | * Capacities to mainstream, develop, and apply policies and legislative frameworks for the cost-effective implementation of the three Rio Conventions are enhanced * Global environment governance is decentralized * Environmental management information system for improved monitoring and assessment of global environmental impacts and trends in implemented * Environmental attitudes and values for the global environment are improved | Means of Verification:   * UNDP quarterly progress report * Independent final evaluation reports * Meeting Minutes * Working Group meeting reports * Rio Convention national reports and communications |
| Risks/Assumptions:   * Internal resistance to change * Political commitment to apply institutional reforms * The project will be executed in a transparent, holistic, adaptive, and collaborative manner * Government staff and non-state stakeholder representatives are actively engaged in the project * Frameworks developed by the project are politically, technically, and financially feasible |
| **Component/**  **Outcome 1**  **Enhanced capacities to mainstream, develop, and apply policies and legislative frameworks for the cost-effective implementation of the three Rio Conventions** | Indicator 5:  Consultative and decision-making processes for sector mainstreaming of Rio Convention obligations are strengthened | * There have been past efforts, some successful, some not so successful on how government agencies collaborate and consult with each other. * There is limited institutional capacity to manage, coordinate and follow-up on the national implementation of the Rio Conventions and other donor-funded projects | * Working group meetings negotiate best consultative and decision-making processes * Memoranda of agreements on consultative and decision-making processes. * Liaison protocols among partner agencies and memorandum of agreement with other non-state stakeholder organizations | Means of Verification:   * Meeting Minutes * Working Group meeting reports * UNDP quarterly progress reports * Independent final evaluation reports * Rio Convention national reports and communications Meeting minutes * Liaison protocols * Memoranda of agreement(s) |
| Risks/Assumptions:   * Lack of commitment of key stakeholders within institutions * Institutions and workings groups are open to proposed coordination agreements and there is no active institutional resistance |
| Indicator 6:  Institutional mandates and arrangements to facilitate and catalyze long-term action to meet global environmental obligations are strengthened | * Existing coordination and consultative arrangements are inadequate for the mainstreaming the three Rio Conventions * Decentralized environmental management and governance is limited. | * In-depth analysis (SWOT/Gap) of institutional arrangements Convention obligations. * Assessment of current data collection and generation methods of key agencies with attention to harmonization and metrics, relevance, validity, and quality completed * Guidelines for coordinated mainstreaming, monitoring and compliance validated. * Targeted updating and streamlining of institutional mandates that focus on recommended improvements | Means of Verification:   * SWOT and Gap Analysis * Meeting Minutes * Working Group meeting reports * UNDP quarterly progress reports * Independent final evaluation report * Rio Convention national reports and communications   Risks/Assumptions:   * Reports and analyses are deemed legitimate, relevant, and valid among all key stakeholder representatives * Members of the working group will be comprised of proactive experts and project champions * Institutions and working groups are open to proposed agreements and there is no active institutional resistance * Enabling policy and legislation in place to support the signing of an appropriate agreement * Institutions follow through on commitments under an appropriate agreement * Their preparation must include the active engagement of government and scientific stakeholders, as well as relevant social actors. |
|  | Indicator 7:  Integrated environmental-development best practices the reflect global environmental priorities and the Post-2015 Sustainable Development Goals are piloted | * Requirements of the Rio Conventions are not adequately incorporated in decentralized sectoral development planning | * In-depth analysis of policy, legislative, and institutional frameworks * Development sector by which to demonstrate the implementation of Rio Convention mainstreaming, monitoring, and compliance. * Three small sub-projects piloted with decentralized authorities * Institutional arrangements the demonstration and pilot activities and exercises selected are implemented within existing national agencies * Lessons learned from the demonstration and pilot activities culled | Means of Verification:   * One high value sectoral development plan piloted * Feasibility study * Lessons learned report * Photographs * In-depth analysis of policy, legislative, and institutional frameworks for mainstreaming and monitoring of Rio Convention implementation |
| Risks/Assumptions:   * Plan developed by the project is politically, technically, and financially feasible * Best practices and lessons learned from other countries are appropriately used |
| **Component/**  **Outcome 2**  **Decentralization of global environment governance** | Indicator :8  Guidelines for decentralized management of the global environment | * Existing policies currently have critical gaps and weaknesses to the extent that global environmental priorities are inadequately reflected | * In-depth analysis of decentralization policies. * Guidelines on decentralization and integrating the three Rio Conventions in national and sub-national strategies and plans developed. * Roadmap for decentralized decision-making to facilitate and catalyze mainstreaming, monitoring and compliance developed. | Means of Verification:   * Meetings and focus group discussions minutes * Set of recommendations * Roadmap * Meeting Minutes * Working Group meeting reports * UNDP quarterly progress reports * Independent final evaluation report * Rio Convention national reports and communications |
| Risks/Assumptions:   * Lack of commitment of key stakeholders within institutions * Institutions and workings groups are open to proposed coordination agreements and there is no active institutional resistance |
|  | Indicator 9: Decentralized government consultative mechanisms for improved monitoring and compliance on the global environment and sustainable development are strengthened | * Notwithstanding that regional government authorities carry out some monitoring and enforces compliance to environmental regulation to a certain extent, their capacities l remain relatively weak. This is particular the case in terms of monitoring and measuring progress towards meeting global environmental outcomes. | * Consultations at both the national and regional level to organize institutional arrangements to carry out the recommended reforms. * Learning-by-doing workshops to formulate improved institutional arrangements. * Demonstrations at the regional level of better approaches to integrate global environmental priorities within the framework of improved institutional arrangements for monitoring and compliance | Means of Verification:   * Signed agreements * Validation workshop reports * Meeting Minutes * Working Group meeting reports * UNDP quarterly progress reports * Independent final evaluation report * Rio Convention national reports and communications |
| Risks/Assumptions:   * Local and regional government stakeholders fully participate in negotiations to agree on improved collaboration on monitoring and compliance arrangements. * Government commitment remains sustained to ensure that agreed arrangements for decentralized environmental governance remains legitimate and valid. This risk will be monitored through indicator 11. |
| Indicator 10: Commitment to and decentralized capacities for managing the global environmental are improved | * The government has reorganized the ministry portfolios, raising the political commitment to decentralization through the creation of its own ministry. | * Learning-by-doing workshops to prepare targeted district regulatory instruments to implement the Rio Conventions through district development plans carried out. * Updated codes, laws and relevant texts pertaining to Rio Convention implementation distributed. * Training workshops for technical staff and other relevant social actors convened. * Decentralized global environmental management capacities strengthened * Technical capacities of regional public institutions and agencies to carry out decentralized governance of the global environment are assessed * Training programme and modules developed. * Learning-by-doing trainings for key stakeholders to understand best practices for decentralized global environmental governance carried out * Policy dialogues to exchange best practices to implement local development plans convened | Means of Verification:  • Meeting Minutes  • Working Group meeting reports  • UNDP quarterly progress reports  • Independent final evaluation report  • Rio Convention national reports and communications  Risks/Assumptions:   * Local and regional government stakeholders fully participate in negotiations to agree on improved collaboration on monitoring and compliance arrangements. * Government commitment remains sustained to ensure that agreed arrangements for decentralized environmental governance remains legitimate and valid. |
| **Component/**  **Outcome 3**  **Setting up and early implementation of an environmental management information system for improved monitoring and assessment of global environmental impacts and trends** | Indicator 11:  Institutional mapping and design of an optimal environmental data and information management system (EMIS) for the global environment | * Djibouti’s environmental information monitoring and management system is inadequate, with outdated technology and methods * There are insufficient technical trainings and transfer of technology needs, barriers to access new and best practice knowledge, and inadequate awareness and understanding of the public of the importance of sound environmental management | * SWOT and Gap analysis * Institutional analysis and mapping * Best practice technological structures for data collection, storage, and sharing designed. | Means of Verification:   * SWOT and Gap * Institutional analysis and mapping report * Meeting Minutes * Working Group meeting reports * UNDP quarterly progress reports * Independent final evaluation report * Rio Convention national reports and communications |
| Risks/Assumptions:   * Best practices and lessons learned from other countries are appropriately used |
| Indicator 12:  Integrated environmental data and information management system designed | * Bureaucratic procedures hinder the exchange of data and information | * Convene stakeholder workshops on the management of information and knowledge for planning and policy-making * Design the technological requirements for collecting, storing, and sharing data and information. * Undertake an independent peer review of the EMIS feasibility study, finalize, and secure stakeholder validation and the required official approvals | Means of Verification:   * Meeting Minutes * EMIS * Peer Review * Working Group meeting reports * UNDP quarterly progress reports * Independent final evaluation report * Rio Convention national reports and communications   Risks/Assumptions:  **•** Best practices from other countries are appropriately used  • Assessment is deemed legitimate, relevant, and valid among all key stakeholder representatives and project champions  • Expert peer reviewers follow through with quality reviews  • EMIS is politically, technically, and financially feasible  • The government remains politically committed to the EMIS and facilitates its development and approval |
| Indicator 13: Existing data and information management systems are networked and technology is updated | * Djibouti’s environmental information monitoring and management system is inadequate * Djibouti’s technology is outdated | * Networking cooperative agreements on information and knowledge management with key institutions are adopted. * New management arrangements for sharing information are approved * Technological hardware and software of the EMIS are installed | Means of Verification:   * Meeting minutes * Working Group meeting reports * UNDP quarterly progress reports * Independent final evaluation report * Rio Convention national reports and communications   Risks/Assumptions:   * Best practices and lessons learned from other countries are appropriately used |
| Indicator 14:  Improved global environmental indicators for select high priority sectoral development plan are developed | * Requirements of the Rio Conventions are not adequately incorporated in sectoral development planning * Local environmental management and decision-making is suffering from poor data collection, management, and analysis. | * Full set of data and other relevant indicators finalized * Technical guidance material for planners and other users of indicators relevant to the monitoring of the global environment developed. | Means of Verification:   * Meeting minutes * Feasibility study * Peer reviewer comments * Indicators * Technical guidance material |
| Risks/Assumptions:  • Indicators developed by the project are technically sound |
| Indicator 15:  Integrated environmental data and information management system is implemented through a select sectoral plan | * Requirements of the Rio Conventions are not adequately incorporated in sectoral development planning * Local environmental management and decision-making is suffering from poor data collection, management, and analysis. | * One high value sectoral development plan for early implementation and piloting selected * Learning-by-doing workshops to use the EMIS to demonstrate its value at improving a more holistic and resilient construct of the selected sectoral plan in keeping with Rio Convention obligations * Dialogues on the EMIS and its implementation with decision- and policy-makers to enhance their understanding and secure their support and championship. * Study of lessons learned from the use of the EMIS to mainstream Rio Convention obligations into sectoral plans and policies * Learning-by-doing workshops to use the EMIS to demonstrate its value at improving a more holistic and resilient construct of the selected sectoral plan in keeping with Rio Convention obligations. * Dialogues on the EMIS and its implementation with decision- and policy-makers to enhance their understanding and secure their support and championship. * Lessons learned from the use of the EMIS to mainstream Rio Convention obligations into sectoral plans and policies. | Means of Verification:   * Workshop attendance list * EMIS is modified as needed * Lessons learned report * Meeting Minutes * Working Group meeting reports * UNDP quarterly progress reports * Independent final evaluation report * Rio Convention national reports and communications   Risks/Assumptions:  **•** The various government authorities maintain commitment to the project and are open to change  • Best practices and lessons learned from other countries are appropriately used |
| Indicator 16:  Resource mobilization strategy | * The government agencies responsible for the Rio Conventions have limited budgetary funds * There is a lack of financial resources available for environmental monitoring, processing and exchange, and an inefficient use of limited resources for monitoring | * Pilot exercises are developed and demonstrated * Feasibility study is drafted and peer reviewed and endorsed by stakeholders at a validation * The draft is peer reviewed by at least 20 national experts, and validated by month 42 * At least 50 representatives from the main stakeholder constituencies actively consulted on the draft * Resource mobilization strategy is approved by Project Steering Committee and Rio Convention focal points meet at least twice a year, | Means of Verification:   * Feasibility study * Reviewer notes * Resource mobilization strategy |
| Risks/Assumptions:   * Analyses are deemed legitimate, relevant, and valid among all key stakeholder representatives and project champions * Expert peer reviewers follow through with quality reviews * Strategy and plan developed by the project are politically, technically, and financially feasible |
| **Component/**  **Outcome 4**  **Improved environmental attitudes and values for the global environment** | Indicator 17: Collectively and over the four years of project implementation, the awareness-raising workshops engage over 700 unique stakeholders | * The general public remains generally unaware or unconcerned about the contribution of the Rio Conventions to meeting and satisfying local and national socio-economic priorities | * One-day Kick-Off Conference is held within three (3) months of project initiation, over 100 participants attend * One-day Project Results Conference is held by month 44, over 100 participants attend * Two broad-based surveys are carried out by month 7 and by month 44(N>250 for each survey) * Baseline awareness report is prepared * Design of public awareness campaign is completed * National and sub-national awareness-raising workshops held * Three (3) public policy dialogues are held with at least 30 local representatives, the first by month 13 * At least five (5) media awareness workshops are held, each with at least 20 participating media representative * At least three (3) private sector sensitization panel discussions are held | Means of Verification:   * Meeting minutes * Tracking and progress reports * Baseline awareness report * Public policy dialogues * Media awareness workshops * Private sector sensitization panel discussions * Survey results * Working Group and workshop reports and products, including public awareness strategy and programme * Workshop and dialogue registration lists |
| Risks/Assumptions:   * Changes in awareness and understanding of Rio Convention mainstreaming can be attributed to project activities (survey questionnaire can address this issue) * Media awareness workshops increase reporting in the popular literature on social and economic values of conserving Djibouti’s environment as well as the important losses associated with environmental degradation. * Private sector representatives are open to learn about Rio Convention mainstreaming values and opportunities, and will actively work to support project objectives * Internal resistance to change * Non-state stakeholder representatives, in particular project champions, remain active participants in the project * Public dialogues attract people that are new to the concept of Rio Convention mainstreaming, as well as detractors, with the assumption that dialogues will help change attitudes in a positive way * The right representation from the various government ministries, departments, and agencies participate in project activities * There is sufficient commitment from policy-makers to maintain long-term support to public awareness raising activities * Development partners implementing parallel public awareness campaigns are willing to modify, as appropriate, their activities to supporting the awareness activities of the present project to create synergies and achieve cost-effectiveness * The various government authorities maintain commitment to the project * Survey respondents contribute their honest attitudes and values * Survey results will show an increased awareness and understanding of the Rio Conventions’ implementation through national environmental legislation over time |
| Indicator 18: Awareness is improved through brochures articles and education modules | * The population in rural areas do not have an adequate understanding of global environmental issues * At present, there is insufficient understanding of the value that the Rio Conventions can contribute to national socio-economic development by facilitating environmentally sound and sustainable development | * Education module is prepared and approved * At least three (3) high schools have implemented the education module * At least 12 articles on the relevancy of the Rio Conventions to Djibouti’s national socio-economic development published at least every two months * Each article is published as a brochure, at least 100 copies each and distributed to at least two high value special events for greatest impact | Means of Verification:   * Working Group and workshop reports and products, including education module * Meeting minutes * Tracking and progress reports * Participant registration lists * Brochures and articles * Education module |
| Risks/Assumptions:   * Awareness module will be popular with teachers, students, and their parents * Awareness modules will be effective * Awareness module will be popular with civil servants * Articles published in the popular media will be read and not skipped over * Brochures will be read and the content absorbed |
|  | Indicator 19:  Internet visibility of the value of protecting the global environment to socio-economic development priorities is improved | Awareness of Rio Convention mainstreaming is limited, and stakeholders do not fully appreciating the value of conserving the global environment. | * Website is regularly updated, at least once a month with new information, articles, and relevant links on Rio Convention mainstreaming. * Number of unique visits to the Rio Convention mainstreaming webpages increased by at least 10% between the launch of the website and the time of the terminal evaluation * Convene working group meetings among key agencies that have websites relevant to environmental governance and negotiate opportunities to improve the design and content of their respective webpages. * Create a Facebook page on environmental information and Rio Convention mainstreaming. | Means of Verification:   * Facebook page on environmental information * Meeting Minutes * Working Group meeting reports * UNDP quarterly progress reports * Independent final evaluation report * Rio Convention national reports and communications |
| Risks/Assumptions:   * Institutions and workings groups are open to reforms and there is no active institutional resistance |

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

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| # | Item (electronic versions preferred if available) |
| 1 | Project Identification Form (PIF) |
| 2 | UNDP Initiation Plan |
| 3 | Final UNDP-GEF Project Document with all annexes |
| 4 | CEO Endorsement Request |
| 5 | UNDP Social and Environmental Screening Procedure (SESP) and associated management plans (if any) |
| 6 | Inception Workshop Report |
| 7 | Mid-Term Review report and management response to MTR recommendations |
| 8 | All Project Implementation Reports (PIRs) |
| 9 | Progress reports (quarterly, semi-annual or annual, with associated workplans and financial reports) |
| 10 | Oversight mission reports |
| 11 | Minutes of Project Board Meetings and of other meetings (i.e. Project Appraisal Committee meetings) |
| 12 | GEF Tracking Tools (from CEO Endorsement, midterm and terminal stages) |
| 13 | GEF/LDCF/SCCF Core Indicators (from PIF, CEO Endorsement, midterm and terminal stages); for GEF-6 and GEF-7 projects only |
| 14 | Financial data, including actual expenditures by project outcome, including management costs, and including documentation of any significant budget revisions |
| 15 | Co-financing data with expected and actual contributions broken down by type of co-financing, source, and whether the contribution is considered as investment mobilized or recurring expenditures |
| 16 | Audit reports |
| 17 | Electronic copies of project outputs (booklets, manuals, technical reports, articles, etc.) |
| 18 | Sample of project communications materials |
| 19 | Summary list of formal meetings, workshops, etc. held, with date, location, topic, and number of participants |
| 20 | Any relevant socio-economic monitoring data, such as average incomes / employment levels of stakeholders in the target area, change in revenue related to project activities |
| 21 | List of contracts and procurement items over ~US$5,000 (i.e. organizations or companies contracted for project outputs, etc., except in cases of confidential information) |
| 22 | List of related projects/initiatives contributing to project objectives approved/started after GEF project approval (i.e. any leveraged or “catalytic” results) |
| 23 | Data on relevant project website activity – e.g. number of unique visitors per month, number of page views, etc. over relevant time period, if available |
| 24 | UNDP Country Programme Document (CPD) |
| 25 | List/map of project sites, highlighting suggested visits |
| 26 | List and contact details for project staff, key project stakeholders, including Project Board members, RTA, Project Team members, and other partners to be consulted |
| 27 | Project deliverables that provide documentary evidence of achievement towards project outcomes |
|  | *Additional documents, as required* |

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

1. Title page

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

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

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

1. Introduction (2-3 pages)

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

1. Project Description (3-5 pages)

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

1. Findings

(in addition to a descriptive assessment, all criteria marked with (\*) must be given a rating[[8]](#footnote-8))

4.1 Project Design/Formulation

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

1. Main Findings, Conclusions, Recommendations & Lessons

* Main Findings
* Conclusions
* Recommendations
* Lessons Learned

1. Annexes

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

**ToR Annex D: Evaluation Criteria Matrix template**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Evaluative Criteria Questions** | **Indicators** | **Sources** | **Methodology** |
| Relevance: How does the project relate to the main objectives of the GEF Focal area, and to the environment and development priorities a the local, regional and national level? | | | |
| *(include evaluative questions)* | *(i.e. relationships established, level of coherence between project design and implementation approach, specific activities conducted, quality of risk mitigation strategies, etc.)* | *(i.e. project documentation, national policies or strategies, websites, project staff, project partners, data collected throughout the TE mission, etc.)* | *(i.e. document analysis, data analysis, interviews with project staff, interviews with stakeholders, etc.)* |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved? | | | |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in line with international and national norms and standards? | | | |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, socio-political, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results? | | | |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Gender equality and women’s empowerment: How did the project contribute to gender equality and women’s empowerment? | | | |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status? | | | |
|  |  |  |  |
| *(Expand the table to include questions for all criteria being assessed: Monitoring & Evaluation, UNDP oversight/implementation, Implementing Partner Execution, cross-cutting issues, etc.)* | | | |

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

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

**Evaluators/Consultants:**

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

**Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form**

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

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

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

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

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

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

**ToR Annex F: TE Rating Scales**

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

**ToR Annex G: TE Report Clearance Form**

|  |
| --- |
| **Terminal Evaluation Report for** *(Project Title & UNDP PIMS ID*) **Reviewed and Cleared By:**  **Commissioning Unit (M&E Focal Point)**  Name: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Signature: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  **Regional Technical Advisor (Nature, Climate and Energy)**  Name: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Signature: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ |

**ToR Annex H: TE Audit Trail**

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

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

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

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

Annex I:

* [**Pledge of ethical conduct**](http://www.unevaluation.org/document/download/3683) **in evaluation.**UNDP programme units should request each member of the evaluation team to read carefully, understand and sign the ‘Pledge of Ethical Conduct in Evaluation of the United Nations system’.

1. Outcomes, Effectiveness, Efficiency, M&E, Implementation/Oversight & Execution, Relevance are rated on a 6-point scale: 6=Highly Satisfactory (HS), 5=Satisfactory (S), 4=Moderately Satisfactory (MS), 3=Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU), 2=Unsatisfactory (U), 1=Highly Unsatisfactory (HU). Sustainability is rated on a 4-point scale: 4=Likely (L), 3=Moderately Likely (ML), 2=Moderately Unlikely (MU), 1=Unlikely (U) [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Access at: <http://web.undp.org/evaluation/guideline/section-6.shtml> [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. The Commissioning Unit is obligated to issue payments to the TE 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 TE 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> [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. Engagement of evaluators should be done in line with guidelines for hiring consultants in the POPP <https://popp.undp.org/SitePages/POPPRoot.aspx> [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. <https://intranet.undp.org/unit/bom/pso/Support%20documents%20on%20IC%20Guidelines/Template%20for%20Confirmation%20of%20Interest%20and%20Submission%20of%20Financial%20Proposal.docx> [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. <http://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/corporate/Careers/P11_Personal_history_form.doc> [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. The Provisional Multi-Year Work Plan in Annex A provides information on the preliminary suggested timeframes to undertake project activities, included target milestones and output deadlines. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. See ToR Annex F for rating scales. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)