Services/Work Description: International Consultant

Project/Programme Title: Climate Security Mechanism Joint Programme – Phase II "Strengthening Field Capacity to Address Climate-Related Security Risks"

Consultancy Title: Lead Evaluator for the evaluation of the Climate Security Mechanism Joint Programme – Phase II "Strengthening Field Capacity to Address Climate-Related Security Risks"

Duty Station: Home-based

Duration: Estimated total days for the evaluation: 40 working days (approximately 2 months)

Expected start date: 9 May 2022

1. BACKGROUND

BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT

The Climate Security Mechanism (CSM) was established in 2018 by the UN Department of Political and Peacebuilding Affairs (DPPA), the UN Development Programme (UNDP) and the UN Environment Programme (UNEP); the UN Department of Peace Operations (DPO) joined in 2021. The CSM aims to strengthen the capacity of the UN system to analyze and address the adverse impacts of climate change on peace and security. The CSM works towards cross-cutting solutions that recognize the interlinkages between climate change, peace and security, and leverage opportunities for synergies between climate action and sustaining peace. The CSM works with partners around the world to advance a gender-sensitive understanding of climate security and to support UN entities as well as regional and sub-regional organizations in the prevention and management of climate-related security risks.

Building on the initial phase of the CSM after its creation in 2018, the CSM Phase II launched in 2020 with the objective of advancing concrete results in the field by integrating climate-related security risk dimensions into the work of UN development, climate change, peace and security actors. The CSM Phase II priority areas of work are:
1. Supporting analysis and action in the field by providing technical advice to risk analysis and response strategies in frontline regions (mainly contributing to Outputs 3 and 4 of the CSM Joint Programme)
2. Strengthening partnerships and advocacy and convening relevant actors to promote appropriate action (mainly contributing to Output 5)
3. Enhancing knowledge co-generation and management for policy support (Output 2)
4. Capacity building (mainly contributing to Output 1)

The CSM is commissioning an evaluation of Phase II of the CSM Joint Programme (2020-2022) as described in the CSM Phase II Joint Programme document (Annex I) which includes a theory of change (Joint Programme document - Section 4: Theory of Change and Results Framework, Annex I) as well as a logical framework and indicators (Section 5: Results Framework). Further basic information about Phase II of the CSM Joint Programme is presented in the below table.

PROGRAMME INFORMATION	
Programme title	Climate Security Mechanism Joint Programme – Phase II "Strengthening Field Capacity to Address Climate-Related Security Risks"

MPTFO Joint Programme no.	00123493
Expected impact	The negative impacts of climate change on peace and security are recognized, understood and addressed effectively by relevant stakeholders at all levels to ensure that states and societies possess the necessary capacities to manage, absorb and – where possible – benefit from the transformative processes brought on by climate change in a peaceful manner.
Expected outcome	Climate-related security risk dimensions are integrated into the work of UN development, climate change, peace and security actors, including in political analysis and prevention strategies as well as policy, planning and programming decisions.
Expected outputs	1. Awareness raised among development, climate change, peace and security actors on approaches for climate-related security risks through outreach and engagement with relevant partners 2. Improved knowledge generation and management for policy support 3. Climate-related security risk assessments and related follow-up activities supported in focus regions, including with regional organizations and development partners 4. Climate-related security risk assessments and related follow-up activities supported in focus regions with UN field missions 5. Advocacy and convening relevant actors to promote appropriate action
Country / Region	Global
Date programme document signed	30 June 2020

Programme dates	Start	Planned end
	January 2020	Initial end date of Phase II: 31 March 2022 Planned end of Phase II: By the end of 2022 New end date of the CSM Joint Programme: December 2025 as per MoU Amendment no. 1 (27 September 2021) between MPTFO and Participating UN Organizations (DPPA, UNDP, UNEP)

Programme budget	Estimated Phase II budget: USD 10.64 million
Funding source	Multi-Partner Trust Fund Office (MPTFO) as administrative agent / pass-through modality: United Kingdom (GBP 3,000,000), Ireland (EUR 788,610[1]), Norway (NOK 3,000,000), Sweden (SEK 14,750,000) Parallel fund management modality: Sweden (SEK 21,500,000), Germany (USD 994,400), Norway (NOK 9,000,000)
Implementing parties[2]	United Nations Department of Political and Peacebuilding Affairs (DPPA) United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP)

The CSM Phase II combines a global scope (Outputs 1, 2 and 5) as well as a geographical focus as part of its priority area of work supporting analysis and action on climate-related security risk assessments and response strategies (Outputs 3 and 4) in ten focus field locations as part of Phase II: Andean States (Bolivia, Colombia, Ecuador, Peru), Arab States (League of Arab States), Central Africa (UN Regional Office for Central Africa), Horn of Africa (Office of

---

[1] The contribution from Ireland to the CSM will primarily support the deployment of a Climate and Security Advisor to the UN Mission in South Sudan (UNMISS) for two years. Only half of this funding contribution (rough estimate for one year) is considered here as part of the estimated Phase II budget.

[2] The United Nations Department of Peace Operations (DPO) has joined the CSM as decided by the CSM Joint Steering Committee in December 2021 but is not a programmatic implementing party of the CSM Joint Programme in the framework of the CSM Phase II Joint Programme document at the time of writing.

the Special Envoy for the Horn of Africa), Liptako Gourma (Liptako Gourma Authority), Northern Central America (El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras), Somalia, South Sudan, Sudan, West Africa and the Sahel (UN Office for West Africa and the Sahel).

The CSM is intended to benefit UN development, climate change, peace and security actors across the humanitarian-development-peace (HDP) spectrum, including UN Resident Coordinator's Offices (RCO) and UN Country Teams (UNCT), UN field missions, field offices of individual UN entities, regional and sub-regional organizations and other development partners. Key CSM Phase II partners include the UN Community of Practice (CoP) on Climate Security (300+ colleagues from 30+ UN entities), Member State partners including CSM donors (Sweden, Norway, Germany, the United Kingdom, Ireland) and in-kind contributors (The Netherlands, Belgium, and more recently France, Norway and Denmark have provided Junior Professional Officers to the CSM), the Group of Friends on Climate and Security (GoF), SIPRI, adelphi, the Climate Security Expert Network (CSEN) and other partners.

2.   SCOPE OF WORK, RESPONSIBILITIES AND DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSED WORK

EVALUATION PURPOSE, SCOPE AND OBJECTIVES

Purpose

The evaluation finds its justification in the following considerations:
- The memorandum of understanding (MoU) for the CSM Joint Programme established between MPTFO and Participating UN Organizations (PUNOs) provides that the "Steering Committee and/or Participating UN Organizations will recommend a joint evaluation if there is a need for a broad assessment of results at the level of the Programme or at the level of an outcome within the Programme" (MoU Section V, paragraph 3).
- In 2020 the CSM Joint Steering Committee (JSC) endorsed the proposal to conduct a joint evaluation of Phase II. At its 2021 principal-level meeting, the JSC decided to commission this evaluation during the year 2022.
- As per UNDP Programme and Operations Policies and Procedures, projects with a planned budget or actual expenditure of more than USD 5 million are subject to a mandatory project evaluation; the same applies to projects entering a second or subsequent phase before moving into the new phase. The CSM Joint Programme falls into both categories.
- Noting the new end date (December 2025) of the CSM Joint Programme as per the MoU Amendment no. 1 (27 September 2021) between MPTFO and PUNOs, and the updated Joint Programme document (27 September 2021) and its addendum no. 1 (17 December 2021), it should be noted that according to the UNDG Guidance Note on Joint Programmes, for joint programmes that last three years or longer, a mid-term evaluation is recommended.
- As per UNDP Evaluation Guidelines, to ensure learning and accountability, and that results are being achieved, projects representing a significant financial investment and/or extending over a longer period should be evaluated.

The relevance of this evaluation (the first since the CSM inception) also originates in a timely context. In the three years since the CSM was created, the field of climate security has changed significantly. It has moved from a relatively marginal issue to one that is now firmly established on the international policy and research agenda. Growing political attention and increasing demand for technical support have altered the strategic landscape and created new opportunities as well as expectations for the CSM. While the CSM strategy with its current priorities still appears as relevant, looking ahead the CSM thinking must be informed by these new realities to ensure that the CSM's ambition focuses where its value proposition is strongest. One of the challenges will be to translate words into action to foster integrated, gender-sensitive climate security risk assessments and turn findings into prevention and management approaches that strengthen the resilience of States and communities.

The impending conclusion of Phase II of the Climate Security Mechanism (CSM) in 2022 provides an opportune moment to reflect on the progress of the CSM to date, assess results, identify early achievements and challenges, and learn from good practices, as well as less successful activities. Findings and recommendations from this evaluation will inform the next phase of the CSM (Phase III 2023-2025, to be designed in Q3 2022) allowing for adjustments in working methods, processes and division of labour to reflect existing priorities as well as new realities and enhance efficiency, and ensuring that the CSM is able to capitalize on its experience and lessons learned.

Scope

The evaluation will cover Phase II of the CSM Joint Programme (2020-2022) and take a two-tiered approach across CSM priority areas of work. Tier 1 will focus on assessing the effectiveness and early impact of focus field initiatives. Tier 2 will cover CSM Phase II global workstreams.

Tiers	**Priority areas of work** shared with the JSC in 2020 and forming the baseline for the [CSM Progress Report (2021)](#)	**CSM Outputs** to which priority areas mainly contribute
Tier 1	1. Supporting analysis and action in the field by providing technical advice to risk analysis and response strategies in frontline regions	Outputs 3 and 4
Tier 2	2. Strengthening partnerships and advocacy and convening relevant actors to promote appropriate action	Output 5
	3. Enhancing knowledge co-generation and management for policy support	Output 2
	4. Capacity building	Output 1

Objectives

The overarching objective of the evaluation is to assess the performance of Phase II of the CSM Joint Programme in achieving its intended outputs, and its contribution to its expected outcome, impact and associated theory of change (ToC). Specific objectives are presented in the following table.

Objectives the evaluation must achieve (primary issues of concern to users)	**Users** (primary and secondary audience)	How users will **use or act** on results
• Provide an objective assessment of CSM Phase II to determine its relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability (and when feasible, its impact) • Generate actionable recommendations to improve and scale up the CSM • Promote dialogue on the role of the CSM in supporting integrated UN approaches in analyzing and addressing climate-related security risks • Provide recommendations on how the CSM could reformulate and measure its expected impact	- CSM - CSM partners in focus field locations - Regional organizations - UN CoP on Climate Security and the broader UN system - GoF on Climate and Security	The CSM and its partners will inform the design of Phase III with findings from the evaluation and reflect this in the updated CSM Joint Programme document including its results framework to 2025
• Communicate achievements to the CSM's direct stakeholders, particularly Member State partners, to inform future investment and programming	- Member State partners (contributors) - Member State partners (programme countries) and CSM partners in focus field locations	Partners will be able to use the evaluation as part of their own accountability and transparency policy, and benefit from findings to

	-Regional organizations	inform future investment and programming.
• Articulate ways in which the CSM has added value to UN's climate security work at HQ and in the focus field contexts; identify good practices and less successful activities, documenting lessons learned to contribute to the global knowledge base on climate security research and practice	-UN CoP on Climate Security and the broader UN system -GoF on Climate and Security -Research community, civil society, climate action and sustaining peace communities at large	The climate security community of research and practice will benefit from increased knowledge from findings of the evaluation which will be publicly and widely shared.

The evaluation will be undertaken in accordance with general guidance from OECD/DAC, the UN Evaluation Group (UNEG), DPPA, UNEP, UNDP (including the UNDP evaluation guidelines and other relevant guidance from the Independent Evaluation Office). In particular, the evaluation will follow UNEG Norms and Standards for Evaluation. Objectivity of the evaluation will be ensured by the selection of independent external evaluators (Lead Evaluator and Evaluator, independent from any organizations that have been involved in designing, executing, or advising any aspect of the CSM Phase II Joint Programme subject of the evaluation, as required under Section 6) who will conduct the evaluation according to the principles of ethics outlined in the UNEG Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation (see Section 7) and sign the "Pledge of Ethical Conduct in Evaluation of the United Nations system" (Annex VII).

EVALUATION CRITERIA AND KEY GUIDING QUESTIONS

This section proposes guiding evaluation questions grouped by OECD/DAC evaluation criteria. Questions will be asked across CSM priority areas of work according to the proposed two-tier approach, with an emphasis on qualitative and quantitative information on both results and process. Guiding questions will be further refined by the evaluators in the inception report and agreed with the CSM. The evaluation team will use a matrix (see Annex IV) to be included in the inception report as a map and reference in planning and conducting the evaluation. It will also serve as a useful tool for summarizing and visually presenting the evaluation design and methodology for discussions with stakeholders.

1) **Relevance:**
   • To what extent do the CSM's objectives and design respond to regional and national needs, policies and priorities as well as those of partners in focus field locations? Are the objectives and design responding to relevant analysis by the research community?
   • Has the CSM's coverage and support been appropriately distributed, based on partners' demand and assessed needs?
   • To what extent is the CSM Joint Programme in line with SDGs 13 and 16 and their interconnections with SDGs 1, 2, 5, 6, 14 and 15, priorities of the UN Secretary-General and wider UN system, and corporate strategies of CSM entities?

2) **Coherence:**
   • To what extent were lessons learned from other initiatives considered in the design of Phase II?
   • What is the compatibility of CSM Phase II with other UN system-wide work across environmental protection, climate action, conflict prevention and peacebuilding, and with climate security-related initiatives of other UN entities?
   • To what extent are focus field initiatives coherent with the climate action and sustaining peace work of other entities (including regional organizations, governments, UNCTs, civil society organizations and other HDP partners) in focus field locations?

3) Effectiveness:

- *Theory of change (ToC) and results framework:* Has the CSM Phase II ToC articulated clear, practical and feasible expected outputs and outcome, and to what extent has the ToC proven valid and effective? To what extent has CSM Phase II achieved its expected outputs and outcome against the ToC and results framework? How could the ToC be improved?

- *Achievements:* In which areas (results, processes, thematic areas and focus field locations) does CSM Phase II have the greatest achievements? Why and what have been the supporting factors? What can be scaled up and how can the CSM build on or expand these achievements? In which areas does CSM Phase II have the fewest achievements? What have been the constraining factors and why? How can or could they be overcome in the future?

- *Comparison between initiatives:* What are differential results as well as similarities and differences in approaches across CSM focus field initiatives? Which approaches/models have worked best and what synergies can be identified?

- *Gender and vulnerable and marginalized groups*: To what extent has the CSM mainstreamed gender considerations, including opportunities to promote gender equality, and contributed to the empowerment of women, youth, minorities and marginalized groups, as well as the realization of human rights? Did any (possible) unintended effects emerge for specific groups?

- *Coordination*: To what extent are current collaboration and coordination modalities between CSM entities effective (including in terms of geographic and thematic division of labour), and how can they be further optimized? How has the CSM fostered coordination between CSM entities and within the broader UN system?

4) Efficiency:

- To what extent has programme management been efficient in generating the expected results?
- To what extent have resources been used efficiently, including in focus field locations, and to what extent have activities been cost-effective and delivered in a timely manner?
- To what extent has there been an economical use of financial and human resources? Have resources (funds, staff, time, expertise, etc.) been allocated strategically?
- How has the CSM monitored progress and documented lessons learned from focus field initiatives, and how could it be improved in the future?

5) Sustainability:

- *Overall sustainability:* In the medium to long term, to what extent will CSM partners benefit from the CSM Phase II efforts and results in addressing climate-related security risks? To what extent is the CSM expected to be sustainable as a mechanism and joint programme?

- *Dedicated capacity:* To what extent has the CSM contributed to the development of global, regional, national, and local dedicated capacity to bridge gaps in analyzing and addressing climate-related security risks? To what extent will resources remain available to sustain such capacity, including the deployment of embedded experts in focus field initiatives?

- *Replicability, upscaling and exit:* In CSM Phase II focus field initiatives, how replicable are results, processes and approaches to other locations? To what extent do focus field initiatives have development, upscaling or exit strategies?

- *Risks:* Are there any social, political and financial risks, or risks associated with the legal frameworks, policies and governance structures and processes within which the CSM Joint Programme operates, that may jeopardize the sustainability of CSM Phase II results?

6) Impact: While the evaluation is not intended to be an impact assessment as such, evaluators will aim to determine, where feasible, the contribution of Phase II to the CSM's expected outcome and impact according to the following indicative guiding questions.

Expected CSM (medium-term) outcome and (long-term) impact:
- To what extent has the CSM Phase II contributed to achieve its expected outcome and impact?
- Moving forward, how could the CSM's expected impact be reformulated and better measured through relevant indicators and metrics in the framework of the next phase of the CSM?

Impact of the CSM as a joint programme:
- How have CSM outputs across priority areas (including knowledge products and tools) been useful to CSM stakeholders and strengthened the capacity of the UN system to systematically analyze and address climate-related security risks?
- To what extent have climate-related security risk assessments undertaken as part of focus field initiatives (as appropriate) informed related response strategies and follow-up activities?
- How has dedicated capacity in focus field initiatives contributed to more concerted analysis and action, new or strengthened partnerships with key stakeholders, and mainstreaming of climate security into the work of UN missions and (sub-)regional organizations?
- To what extent has the UN CoP on Climate Security enabled awareness raising, exchange of experiences and lessons learned and become a UN "hub" for climate security practice, and generated joint work beyond traditional policy silos? How could the CoP be strengthened?

Impact of the CSM as a catalyst:
- To what extent has the CSM helped grow attention to and foster a common understanding of climate security, shape and inform the climate security policy agenda? Has this contributed to the mobilization of increasing and more sustainable resources for climate security as an integrated policy area (particularly in fragile and conflict-affected contexts)?
- Has the CSM helped bring coherence in the way the UN system addresses this agenda, from building awareness to developing integrated approaches to climate action and sustaining peace?
- To what extent has the CSM contributed to catalyze partnerships within the UN, including through the UN CoP on Climate Security, and beyond the UN system?
- To what extent has the CSM helped catalyze integrated policy and programming work on climate security by UN entities, Member States and non-UN actors, including in regional or country contexts not directly supported by the CSM?

METHODOLOGY

The evaluation is expected to follow a participatory and consultative bottom-up approach that is informed by, and ensures close engagement with, CSM partners and stakeholders from focus field initiatives. It will endeavor to present diverse and gender-balanced perspectives, with particular attention paid to bringing perspectives from Global South representatives and experts. The evaluation will rely on both secondary research (desk review) and primary data collection (interviews) to be conducted remotely.

Desk review: To inform the inception report, the Lead Evaluator will work with the CSM and the Evaluator to conduct a desk review of all relevant documentation, including key documents listed in Annex III.

Data collection and analysis through interviews, meetings and other methods: Evaluators will collect and analyze data from key stakeholders and other relevant parties using a combination of some or all the following methods:
- **Semi-structured interviews**, based on evaluation guiding questions and/or **key informant interviews** (qualitative in-depth interviews with people who have first-hand knowledge)
- **Focus group discussions** (online meetings) as appropriate/feasible
- **Surveys and questionnaires** as appropriate/feasible
- **Other methods** such as outcome mapping, etc.

- **Data review and analysis of monitoring and other data sources and methods.** To ensure maximum validity, reliability and quality of data and promote use, the evaluation team will ensure triangulation of the various data sources.

Partners and stakeholders at strategic and programmatic levels to be interviewed and/or surveyed by evaluators are listed in Annex II. As the evaluation will be conducted remotely, evaluators will triangulate information between desk review, interviews and additional administrative records. Evaluators will ensure that proposed tools, methodologies, and data analysis methods be human rights based and gender sensitive, and that evaluation data be disaggregated by sex, ethnicity, age, disability, etc. as appropriate. The evaluation methodology will explicitly and clearly state the limitations of the chosen methods. The latter should adopt a "do no harm" approach and take into consideration COVID-19 limitations. All interviews should be undertaken in full confidence and anonymity. The final evaluation report should not assign specific comments to individuals. The final methodological approach including interview schedule and data to be used in the evaluation should be clearly outlined in the inception report and fully discussed and agreed with the CSM.

3. **Expected Outputs and deliverables**

- **Evaluation inception report** (10 pages max.) based on preliminary discussions and desk review. The inception report will be carried out based and preliminary discussions with the CSM and after the desk review and will be produced before the start of formal evaluation interviews. It will include an indication of preliminary insights from initial document review and will outline the proposed methodology, including refined guiding questions and proposed approach for data collection (using the evaluation matrix suggested in Annex IV). The inception report will also propose an updated workplan including the list of stakeholders to be interviewed, anticipated timelines and expected level of effort for each phase of the work. The CSM will then provide comments and approve the inception report.
- **Evaluation debriefing on preliminary findings (meeting and presentation).** Immediately following the evaluation, a debriefing on preliminary findings will be organized with the CSM.
- **Draft evaluation report** (40 pages max.) including an executive summary (3-5 pages) to promote dissemination of finding and recommendations. The report will include "boxes" that will zoom in on select best practices and related lessons learned.
- **Evaluation report audit trail**. The CSM and stakeholders will review the draft evaluation report and provide an amalgamated set of comments to the evaluators. Comments and changes by the evaluators in response to the draft report should be retained by the evaluators in the form of an audit trail to show how they have addressed comments.
- **Evaluation debriefing (meeting and presentation).** After processing comments, an evaluation debriefing will be organized with the CSM (and stakeholders as appropriate).
- **Final evaluation report**. Evaluators will finalize the evaluation report incorporating additions and comments provided, and submit a final evaluation report (report, executive summary and annexes) and final audit trail. The CSM (and stakeholders as appropriate) will then review the final evaluation report for approval by the CSM Joint Steering Committee.
- **Strategic workshop with key partners and stakeholders** to present and discuss key findings and recommendations and conduct a short strategic planning exercise to ensure that lessons learned are adequately reflected in the next phase of the CSM Joint Programme until 2025. This workshop will be designed in collaboration with the CSM as a knowledge-sharing and strategic event aiming to deliver a draft joint plan for evaluation users to act on the evaluation results. It will feed into the design of Phase III of the CSM and its renewed Joint Programme document.
- **Evaluation briefs.** Evaluators will produce three to four briefs (2-pagers) to be designed as knowledge products for wider dissemination of findings: two to three briefs on select focus field initiatives to document successes focusing on early impacts of the CSM, and one brief unpacking key recommendations for Phase III, including on

future CSM and partnership configuration. The focus, format and number of briefs will be discussed and agreed with the CSM. The CSM will review and approve briefs for wide dissemination.
- Upon completion of the assignment, the evaluators will submit the **raw data** collected as part of this evaluation's interviews, meetings, etc.

Evaluators will refer to Annex V for required format for key deliverables. The final evaluation report will be widely shared and made public, including on the MPTFO gateway and on donors' relevant platforms.

4. Institutional arrangements/reporting lines

EVALUATION ETHICS

This evaluation will be conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation. The consultant(s) 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 consultant(s) 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 with the express authorization of the CSM.

IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS

Role	Person / Organization	Roles and key responsibilities
Evaluation commissioner	Climate Security Mechanism (CSM)	Be accountable for the quality and approval of TOR, final deliverables and management responses, and safeguard the independence of the evaluation
Evaluation team (independent evaluators)	Lead Evaluator and Evaluator	Fulfil the contractual arrangements under the TOR. Evaluators will describe their respective, well-delineated responsibilities as part of the proposed methodological approach.
Evaluation management	CSM Secretariat/group of CSM core team colleagues and/or non-CSM colleagues from CSM entities with expertise/experience in M&E (TBC)	Lead and coordinate the evaluation process and participate in all its stages (preparation, implementation, management and use), with primary responsibility for quality assurance, timeliness of deliverables, regular communication with evaluators, and update of CSM JSC and stakeholders on the evaluation process
CSM managers	CSM focal points	Provide inputs/advice and support to evaluation management and partners throughout the process
CSM Joint Steering Committee	CSM JSC members at technical level (representatives from Member State funding partners, MPTFO and CSM entities, and the CSM core team)	Perform oversight and advisory role throughout the evaluation process, including by reviewing the TOR; participating in debriefings as appropriate; participating in the review of the draft evaluation report; approving the final evaluation report; participating in the development and oversight of the management responses and key actions; and assisting with wide dissemination of the final products and findings of the evaluation

Evaluation stakeholders	Key CSM stakeholders, including the CSM JSC, representatives from CSM partners in focus field locations as appropriate, climate security research and practice community experts (TBC)	Participate in debriefings as applicable, participate in the strategic workshop to discuss key findings and recommendations from the evaluation, make use of evaluation results and assist with wide dissemination of the final products and findings of the evaluation
Evaluation technical support and quality assurance	M&E focal points, specialists, advisors or officers (at global, regional and/or country level) in CSM entities (including UNDP Evaluation Resource Centre (ERC))	Support evaluation management and provide quality assurance as needed; ensure compliance with corporate standards; resolve disputes when issues arise; ensure management response tracking (including through the UNDP ERC); support M&E capacity development and knowledge sharing

TENTATIVE TIMEFRAME FOR THE EVALUATION PROCESS

Below is a tentative working day allocation and schedule:

ACTIVITY	ESTIMATED NUMBER OF DAYS	DATE OF COMPLETION	PLACE	RESPONSIBLE PARTY
Phase 1: Desk review and inception report				
Evaluators' briefing meeting with the CSM (kick-off meeting to discuss the evaluation assignment)	-	At the time of contract signing	Remotely	Evaluation management
Sharing of the relevant documentation with the evaluation team	-	At the time of contract signing	Via email	Evaluation management
Desk review, evaluation design, methodology and updated workplan including the list of stakeholders to be interviewed	6 days	Within two weeks of contract signing	Remotely	Evaluation team
Submission of the inception report	-	Within two weeks of contract signing	Via email	Evaluation team
Comments and approval of inception report	-	Within one week of submission of the inception report	Remotely	Evaluation management
Phase 2: Data collection and analysis				
Data collection and analysis through interviews, meetings and other methods	14 days	Within four weeks of contract signing	Remotely	Evaluation team CSM to support organization with CSM partners and stakeholders
Evaluation debriefing meeting on preliminary findings	1 day	Within four weeks of contract signing	Remotely	Evaluation team
Phase 3: Evaluation report, briefs, workshop				
Preparation of draft evaluation report	8 days	Within two weeks of the completion of	Remotely	Evaluation team

		data collection and analysis		
Submission of draft evaluation report	-	Within two weeks of the completion of data collection and analysis	Via email	Evaluation team
Comments and approval of evaluation report	-	Within two weeks of submission of the draft evaluation report	Remotely	Evaluation management, JSC
Evaluation debriefing meeting	1 day	Within one week of receipt of comments	Remotely	CSM, evaluation management, and evaluation team
Finalization of the evaluation report incorporating additions and comments provided	4 days	Within one week of debriefing meeting	Remotely	Evaluation team
Submission of the final evaluation report, final evaluation report audit trail and raw data	-	Within one week of debriefing meeting	Via email	Evaluation team
Strategic workshop	1 day	Upon submission of the final evaluation report	Remotely	CSM, evaluation management and stakeholders as appropriate, and evaluation team
Preparation of evaluation briefs	5 days	Within one week of submission of the draft evaluation report	Remotely	Evaluation team
Submission of evaluation briefs	-	Within one week of submission of draft evaluation report	Via email	Evaluation team
Comments and approval of evaluation briefs	-	Within one week of submission of evaluation briefs	Remotely	Evaluation management
Estimated total days for the evaluation	**40 days**			

Based on the proposed time frame, the evaluators will present the detailed schedule of tasks, milestones, and deliverables as part of the inception report.

5. Experience and qualifications

The evaluation team will consist of two independent experts with complementary competencies: a Lead Evaluator with a dominant background in conflict prevention and peacebuilding, supported by an Evaluator with a dominant climate change background. Ideally, both experts should also have some competence in both conflict prevention and climate change.

The **Lead Evaluator** will have the experience and qualifications described below.

I. Academic Qualifications:
- Advanced university degree (Master's degree or equivalent) in social sciences, political science, international relations, public administration, peace and conflict studies, sustainable development, monitoring and evaluation (M&E), or related field.

II. Years of experience:
- A minimum of eight years of relevant experience in conducting/managing programme/project evaluations
- A minimum of five years of relevant experience in the area of sustaining peace (research/policy/programming)

III. Language:
- English and French are the working languages of the United Nations Secretariat. For this evaluation, fluency in oral and written English is required.
- Working knowledge of Spanish, French or Arabic is an advantage.

IV. Competencies:
- Knowledge and proven track record in M&E, operational research, data collection and analysis, evaluation report writing and knowledge management and generation
- Experience working in and/or on fragile and conflict-affected settings; specific country/regional experience in/on one or several of the CSM Phase II focus field locations
- Team leadership and/or coordination skills and experience
- Track record of remote data collection and analysis, including remote evaluation interviews and meetings, combined with extensive desk review experience
- Gender equality and human rights expertise/competencies; technical knowledge and experience in other cross-cutting areas such as disability inclusion, equality, rights-based approach, and capacity development are strongly desired
- Familiarity and previous work experience with the UN system, specifically the CSM or its implementing entities, is an advantage
- Experience in designing, managing or evaluating climate security/climate action and/or sustaining peace policies, programmes or projects is an advantage
- A gender balanced and culturally diverse team that makes use of national/regional evaluation expertise will be considered a strong advantage

The Lead Evaluator must be independent from any organizations that have been involved in designing, executing, or advising any aspect of the CSM Phase II Joint Programme subject of the evaluation. The Lead Evaluator may be asked to provide evidence (resume and at least three work samples and three references) to support claims of knowledge, skills and experience.

6. Payment Modality

Payment to the individual contractor will be made based on the actual number of days worked, deliverables accepted and upon certification of satisfactory completion by the manager.

ANNEXES

Annex I: CSM Phase II Joint Programme document (including Section 4: Theory of Change and Results Framework)

Annex II: Partners and stakeholders

Below is an indicative list of partners and stakeholders who should be consulted as part of the evaluation:
- CSM partners in focus field locations: Andean States (Resident Coordinator's Offices (RCOs) and UN Country Teams (UNCTs), including Peace and Development Advisors (PDAs)), League of Arab States, UN Regional Office for Central

Africa (UNOCA), Office of the Special Envoy for the Horn of Africa, Liptako Gourma Authority, Northern Central America, Somalia, Sudan, UN Mission in South Sudan (UNMISS), UN Office for West Africa and the Sahel (UNOWAS)

- UN Community of Practice on Climate Security
- Member State partners (CSM donors and in-kind contributors) and MPTFO
- Members of the Group of Friends on Climate and Security
- Members of the informal expert group of members of the UN Security Council on climate and security
- Experts from the research community and civil society organizations working on climate security
- UN Resident Coordinators, Peace and Development Advisors, and other UN officials including in select peacekeeping operations who have not received CSM support

Evaluators will also conduct a desk review and to the extent possible consult resource persons to identify M&E lessons learned from other global UN (joint) initiatives related to climate action and/or sustaining peace (including but not limited to PBSO/PBF, the UNDP-DPPA Joint Programme on Building National Capacities for Conflict Prevention, UN-REDD) with a view to informing CSM upscaling and sustainability.

Annex III: Documents to be consulted

Below is an indicative list of important documents and web pages that the evaluators should read at the outset of the evaluation and before finalizing the evaluation design and inception report:

- **Project document and agreements:**
  - CSM Phase II Joint Programme document (including ToC, results framework) (Annex I)
  - Sweden:
    - Pledging letter (November 2019)
    - UNDP-DPPA UN to UN agreement (and Amendment no. 1 - June 2020)
    - UNDP-UNEP UN to UN agreement (and Amendment no. 1 - May 2020)
  - Norway:
    - Specific agreement no. QZA-19/0217 "Strengthening the UN's Capacity to Address Climate-Related Security Risks – Phase II 2020 – 21" (2019), as amended by the Addendum no. 1 (2020) between Norway and UNDP
    - UNDP-UNOWAS UN to UN agreement (November 2020)
    - West Africa and the Sahel detailed work plan and revised budget breakdown, January 2020 – March 2022 (July 2020)
    - No-cost extension (February 2022) and draft implementation plan January-June 2022
  - Germany:
    - Germany-UNEP agreement (January 2020) and Horn of Africa proposal (focus field initiative)
    - No cost extension (December 2021) and revised Horn of Africa work plan
  - United Kingdom:
    - UK-MPFTO Standard Administrative Arrangement (August 2020) and Addendum no. 1 (October 2021)
  - Ireland:
    - Ireland-MPFTO Standard Administrative Arrangement (September 2021)
    - South Sudan Climate Placeholder Proposal (UNMISS-UNDP-DPO-CSM)
  - MPTFO: MoU between MPTFO and PUNOs (DPPA, UNDP, UNEP) (August 2020) and Amendment no. 1 (September 2021)
- **Workplans:**
  - CSM Phase II Joint Programme document (including results framework with timeline)
  - CSM work plan update 2022
- **Activity designs** (as applicable)
- **Consolidated quarterly and annual reports:**
  - CSM Progress Report (May 2021)
  - Biweekly/monthly/quarterly digests
- **Results-oriented monitoring report:**
  - Annual update to FCDO on progress against results framework (2020, 2021)

- **Highlights of project board meetings:**
  - Minutes from Joint Steering Committee meetings (JSC) and Steering Committee/Directors' meetings (DM)
- **Technical/financial monitoring reports:**
  - CSM M&E Results framework (monitoring)
  - CSM briefings and webinars_no. of participants (monitoring)
  - CSM progress update (August 2021 – on progress since end of 2019) in the context of follow-up to the UN Secretary-General's 2019 Climate Action Summit (where the CSM is listed as a "cooperative initiative") in the enhanced Global Climate Action Portal (GCAP - NAZCA)
  - 2020 Annual Financial Report ("Consolidated Annual Financial Report of the Administrative Agent for the Joint Programme Climate Security Mechanism for the period 1 January to 31 December 2020", MPTFO)
- **Other website and social media links:**
  - Interview of the CSM by the UN System Staff College (UNSSC): "Joint efforts for Sustaining Peace: Meet the UN Climate Security Mechanism" (UNSSC, 23 August 2021)
  - Overview of the CSM on the DPPA website
  - Climate Security Board (Trello) facilitated by the CSM, primarily for the UN Community of Practice on Climate Security
  - CSM Joint Programme Factsheet on the MPTFO Gateway
- **Relevant UN evaluation guidance** including from the UN Evaluation Group (UNEG), including UNEG Norms and Standards for Evaluation, UNEG Resource Pack on Joint Evaluations, UNEG Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation, UNDP evaluation guidelines, guidance from the UNEP Evaluation Office and from DPPA.

Annex IV: Evaluation matrix template

As indicated in Section 3 (Evaluation criteria and key guiding questions), the evaluation team will use an evaluation matrix (to be included in the inception report) based on the following indicative template as a map and reference in planning and conducting the evaluation. It will also serve as a useful tool for summarizing and visually presenting the evaluation design and methodology for discussions with stakeholders.

Relevant evaluation criteria	Key questions	Specific sub-questions	Data sources	Data collection methods / tools	Indicators / success standards	Methods for data analysts

Annex V: Required format for the evaluation reports

The evaluation will be undertaken in accordance with general guidance from OECD/DAC, the UN Evaluation Group (UNEG), DPPA, UNEP, UNDP (including the UNDP evaluation guidelines and other relevant guidance from the Independent Evaluation Office). The evaluation will follow UNEG Norms and Standards for Evaluation and UNEG Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation. In particular, evaluators should refer to UNDP evaluation guidelines to prepare:
- The inception report: see Section 4.4.3 (Evaluation inception report);
- The evaluation report: see Section 4.4.5 (Draft report and review process) and Annex 4 (UNDP evaluation report template and quality standards). The final report must include, but not necessarily be limited to, the elements outlined in the template for evaluation reports.

Evaluators should also familiarize themselves with the quality assessment process (Section 6) used by the UNDP Independent Evaluation Office (IEO) for decentralized evaluations.

Annex VI: Complaints and dispute settlement, and reporting wrongdoing process

Complaints and dispute settlement

Should you or a member of the evaluation team have material concerns about the implementation of an evaluation or finalization of an evaluation report, you are freely able to raise your concerns with the management within UNDP. You may submit your concerns anonymously at any stage of the evaluation process, including after an evaluation's completion, though UNDP encourages prompt reporting to ensure issues can be addressed in a timely manner.

For example, you may decide to alert UNDP management if:
- You feel unduly pressured to change the findings, conclusions or/and recommendations of an evaluation you have been contracted to undertake
- Payment for the evaluation is being withheld until it is adjusted to accommodate the requests of the evaluation commissioner (other than to address quality concerns in relation to the report)
- You have not been provided with information that you consider to be material to the evaluation report
- The scope or depth of the evaluation has been adversely affected because you have not been provided with adequate access to interview or make connections with stakeholders

Please raise any material concerns with the Deputy Director of the relevant Regional Bureau who will ensure a timely response, and act fairly to address your concerns and seek to settle any disputes. Please also include the Independent Evaluation Office, in your correspondence (evaluation.office@undp.org).

Reporting wrongdoing

UNDP takes all reports of alleged wrongdoing seriously. In accordance with the UNDP Legal Framework for Addressing Non-Compliance with UN Standards of Conduct, the Office of Audit and Investigation (OAI) is the principal channel to receive allegations.
Anyone with information regarding fraud, waste, abuse or other wrongdoing against UNDP programmes or involving UNDP staff is strongly encouraged to report this information through the Investigations Hotline (+1-844-595-5206).
People reporting wrongdoing to the Investigations Hotline have the option to leave relevant contact information or to remain anonymous. However, allegations of workplace harassment and abuse of authority cannot be reported anonymously.
When reporting to the Investigations Hotline, people are encouraged to be as specific as possible, including the basic details of who, what, where, when and how any of these incidents occurred. Specific information will allow OAI to properly investigate the alleged wrongdoing.

The investigations hotline, managed by an independent service provider on behalf of UNDP to protect confidentiality, can be directly accessed worldwide and free of charge in different ways:
ONLINE REFERRAL FORM *(You will be redirected to an independent third-party site.)*
PHONE - REVERSED CHARGES Click here for worldwide numbers (interpreters available 24 hours/day) Call +1-844-595-5206 in the USA
EMAIL directly to OAI at: reportmisconduct@undp.org
REGULAR MAIL
Deputy Director (Investigations)
Office of Audit and Investigations
United Nations Development Programme
One UN Plaza, DC1, 4th Floor
New York, NY 10017 USA

Annex VII: Pledge of ethical conduct in evaluation

Each member of the evaluation team must read carefully, understand and sign the 'Pledge of Ethical Conduct in Evaluation of the United Nations system' which can be downloaded at this link.