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**Libya**

**Terms of Reference**

**UNDP-GEF Enabling Activities Project**

**National Capacity Self Assessment PIMS 2714**

**Final Evaluation**

1. **Background and context**

### The Environment General Authority (EGA), is the nodal national entity to coordinate and monitor environmental management in Libya. It was established in 2000 to replace the Technical Centre for Environmental Protection. EGA coordinates overall environmental issues, actions and policies, and is in charge of setting up environmental specifications and standards in the country. EGA is also responsible for the dissemination of environmental information, advocacy and public awareness.

### The following national sectors and agencies are also involved in the environmental management process: agriculture; irrigation; education; resources, urban planning; planning; economic production; economy and trade; national authority for oil; livestock; fisheries; industry; tourism; public information; farmers’ union; engineers’ union; and the medical doctors’ union.

### The Government of Libya has made significant efforts to implement environment conventions, creating new institutional structures for coordination. The institution structure was established, however so far has not been effectively applied. This may be due to inadequate coordination mechanisms, a lack of transparency, a lack of clear mandates between various entities of the government and convention focal points, as well as a shortage of information on international interaction, information exchange and working programmes.

*Project brief*

*The objective of the National Capacity Self Assessment (NCSA) project is to provide national stakeholders in Libya with the opportunity to articulate a thorough, participatory self-assessment and analysis of national capacity building needs, priorities and constraints delaying the achievement of global environmental objectives as set forth in the Rio Conventions and related international instruments.*

### *The NCSA will facilitate a cross-sectoral consultative process that is based on the finds of capacity building assessments, and that will order and prioritise capacity needs, in order to identify the bottlenecks impeding the country from fully meeting its obligations under relevant environmental conventions. Specific outputs to be accomplished through the NCSA process will include the identification of priority interventions within and across the GEF thematic areas of biodiversity, climate change and land degradation. This is intended to catalyze targeted and co-ordinated actions as well as requests for future funding to protect the global environment within the broader perspective of sustainable development.. The sustainable institutional system that will be created within the framework of the initial NCSA will ensure the continuation of the capacity building needs assessment in a comprehensive and systematic manner.*

*The project is being implemented by EGA using a National Execution Modality and with a total budget of US$200,000 GEF – (actual $148,000) / $50,000 Libyan Gov- (actual $25,000)*

1. **Evaluation Purpose**

* To assess overall performance against the project objectives as set out in Project Document and other related documents;
* To assess the effectiveness and efficiency of the project;
* To assess the sustainability of the project’s interventions;
* To list and document lessons concerning project design, implementation and management
* To assess the project’s relevance to national priorities, with special reference to the new Country Programme

The evaluation will assess the aspects as listed in the evaluation report outline attached in Annex 1.

Project performance will be measured based on the Project Strategic Results Framework which provides clear performance and impact indicators for project implementation along with their corresponding means of verification. The evaluation should assess:

* *Project concept and design*

*The evaluation will assess the project concept and design. It should review the problem addressed by the project and the project strategy, encompassing an assessment of the appropriateness of the objectives, planned outputs, activities and inputs as compared to cost-effective alternatives. The executing modality and managerial arrangements should also be judged. It will also assess the achievement of indicators and review the work plan, planned duration and budget of the project.*

* *Implementation*

*The evaluation will assess the implementation of the project in terms of quality and timeliness of inputs and efficiency and effectiveness of activities carried out. Also, the effectiveness of management as well as the quality and timeliness of monitoring and backstopping by all parties to the project should be evaluated. In particular, the evaluation is to assess the project team’s use of adaptive management in project implementation.*

* *Project outputs, outcomes and impact*

*The evaluation will assess the outputs, contribution to outcomes and impact achieved by the project as well as the likely sustainability of project results. This should encompass an assessment of the achievement of the immediate objectives and the contribution to attaining the overall objective of the project. The evaluation should also assess the extent to which the implementation of the project has been inclusive of relevant stakeholders and the degree to which it has been able to create collaboration between different partners. The evaluation will also examine if the project has had significant unexpected effects, whether of beneficial or detrimental character.*

In addition to a descriptive assessment, the evaluation will also provide **ratings** of project achievements according to the GEF Project Review Criteria, using the following divisions: Highly Satisfactory, Satisfactory, Marginally Satisfactory, Unsatisfactory.

Aspects of the project to be rated are:

1. Implementation approach
2. Management of globally significant species
3. Outcome/achievement of objectives (meaning the extent to which the project's environmental and development objectives were achieved).
4. Stakeholder participation/public involvement
5. Sustainability
6. Replication approach
7. Cost-effectiveness
8. Monitoring and evaluation
9. **Evaluation Scope and Objective**

* In accordance with UNDP/GEF M&E policies and procedures, all regular and medium-sized projects supported by the GEF should undergo a final evaluation upon completion of implementation.
* Final evaluations are intended to assess the relevance, performance and success of the project. It looks at early signs of potential impact and sustainability of results, including the contribution to capacity development and the achievement of global environmental goals. It will also identify/document lessons learned and make recommendations that might improve the design and implementation of other UNDP/GEF projects.
* This Final Evaluation is initiated by UNDP Libya as it aims to provide the Environment General Authority with a comprehensive overall assessment of the project and with a strategy for replicating the results. It also provides the basis for learning and accountability for the stakeholder.

1. **Evaluation questions** 
   1. Have measures been identified to support the implementation of global environmental conventions?
   2. Are coordination issues adequately addressed at the country level?
   3. Have there been improvements in stakeholder skills and knowledge?
   4. Have there been institutional changes that resulted in more effective planning in regard to environment management?
   5. Is there a distinct improvement in the information turnover and use in decision making regarding environment management?
   6. Has the stakeholders’ awareness increased as a result of the project?
   7. Are the project outputs relevant to UNDP and national priorities?;
   8. Are the administrative costs and timeliness of execution sufficient?;
2. **Methodology**

The evaluation methodology should be participatory and involve as many stakeholders as possible. Data collection methods may include: secondary information, general observations, interviewing key current and potential stakeholders. The detailed evaluation methodology will require the involvement of the evaluators.

1. **Evaluation Products (deliverables)**

* The key product expected from this final evaluation is a comprehensive analytical report in English that should, at least, include the contents as indicated in Annex 1 of this TOR.
* The report of the final evaluation will be a stand-alone document that substantiates its recommendations and conclusions. The report will have to provide the GEF Secretariat complete and convincing evidence to support its findings/ratings.
* The report will include a table of planned vs. actual project financial disbursements, and planned co-financing vs. actual co-financing in this project, according to the table attached in Annex 2 of this TOR
* The report will be supplemented by rating tables, attached in Annex 4 of this TOR.
* The length of the final evaluation report shall not exceed 30 pages in total (not including annexes).

1. **Evaluation team composition and required competencies**

The evaluation should be conducted by one international consultant who has overall responsibility for the whole assignment.

The consultant/evaluator should have the following competencies and experience:

* Advanced university degree in environment, international development or related field.
* At least eight years of work experience in the field of environment.
* Work experience in relevant areas for at least 10 years.
* Knowledge of UNDP’s results-based evaluation policies and procedures.
* Good knowledge of SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios.
* Good understanding of international conventions and processes.
* Good knowledge of the GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy.
* Ability to communicate in English and Arabic
* Familiar with UNDP or UN operations in the country.
* Good analytical thinking.

1. **Evaluation ethics**

The evaluation will be conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the “Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation”.

1. **Implementation arrangement**

To facilitate the Project evaluation process, UNDP Libya has set up an Evaluation Focal Point (EFP) to support the Portfolio Manager (PM) and the National Project Coordinator (NPC) in coordinating the evaluation process internally and externally However, the evaluation must be fully independent and the evaluation team will retain enough flexibility to determine the best approach in collecting and analyzing data for the outcome evaluation.

1. **Time-frame for the evaluation process**

The expected starting date of the evaluation is at the latest, and the expected submission of the final report date is .

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Phase** | **Key Activities** | **Time Frame\*** | **Responsibility** |
| Preparatory phase | Desk review of relevant documents and database sites (project documents with amendments made,  review reports – mid-term, final, donor-specific, audit and financial) |  | Consultant UNDP Programme Analyst and M & E Focal Point |
| Field work/ Data Collection | Field visits, interviews with partners and other key stakeholders |  | Consultant |
| Data Analysis | Finalize evaluation design and work-plan, preparing approach note and methodology |  | Consultant with the UNDP Programme Analyst and M & E Focal Point |
| Report preparation | Drafting of the evaluation report, share it with UNDP/GEF & national counterpart for comments |  | Consultant with UNDP Programme Analyst and M & E Focal Point |
| Dissemination | Finalization of the evaluation report–incorporating comments received on first draft |  | Consultant with UNDP Programme Analyst and M & E Focal Point |
| Final Report |  |  | Consultant with UNDP Programme Analyst and M & E Focal Point |

\* Tentative and to be finalized with the Evaluation Team/ Evaluator(s)

1. **Cost**

The daily rate for the evaluator will be determined according to qualifications and past experience and based on UNDP rates.

The evaluation fees will be paid in three equal installments (33.33% each).

* The first installment will be paid upon signing the consultancy contract;
* The second installment upon submission of the draft report; and
* The final one, upon acceptance of the final report.

1. **Reading Materials (Annexes)**

* Country Programme Document 2006-2010
* Project Document.
* Progress Reports
* MDG Reports
* Evaluation report template Quality Criteria for Evaluation Report
* Ethical Code of Conduct for Evaluation in UNDP

# Annex 1

**Evaluation Report: Sample Outline**

Minimum GEF requirements[[1]](#footnote-1)1

Executive summary

1. Brief description of project
2. Context and purpose of the evaluation
3. Main conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned

Introduction

1. Purpose of the evaluation
2. Key issues addressed
3. Methodology of the evaluation
4. Structure of the evaluation

The project(s) and its development context

1. Project start and its duration
2. Problems that the project seek to address
3. Immediate and development objectives of the project
4. Main stakeholders
5. Results expected

Findings and Conclusions

*(In addition to a descriptive assessment, all criteria marked with (\*) should be rated[[2]](#footnote-2))*

* Project formulation
* Implementation approach (\*)(i)
* Analysis of LFA (Project logic /strategy; Indicators)
* Lessons from other relevant projects (e.g., same focal area) incorporated into project implementation
* Country ownership/Driveness
* Stakeholder participation (\*)
* Replication approach
* Cost-effectiveness
* UNDP comparative advantage
* Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector
* Management arrangements
* Implementation
* Implementation approach (\*)(ii)
* The logical framework used during implementation as a management and M&E tool
* Effective partnerships arrangements established for implementation of the project with relevant stakeholders involved in the country/region
* Feedback from M&E activities used for adaptive management
* Financial Planning
* Monitoring and evaluation (\*)
* Execution and implementation modalities
* Management by the UNDP country office
* Coordination and operational issues
* Results
* Attainment of objectives (\*)
* Sustainability (\*)
* Contribution to upgrading skills of the national staff
* Challenges faced during the implementation?

Recommendations

1. Corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project
2. Actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the project
3. Proposals for future directions underlining main objectives

Lessons learned

1. Best and worst practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance and success

Annexes

1. TOR
2. Itinerary
3. List of persons interviewed
4. Summary of field visits
5. List of documents reviewed
6. Questionnaire used and summary of results

# Annex 2

**Explanation on Terminology Provided in the GEF Guidelines to Terminal Evaluations**

**Implementation Approach** includes an analysis of the project’s logical framework, adaptation to changing conditions (adaptive management), partnerships in implementation arrangements, changes in project design, and overall project management.

Some elements of an effective implementation approach may include:

* The logical framework used during implementation as a management and M&E tool
* Effective partnerships arrangements established for implementation of the project with relevant stakeholders involved in the country/region
* Lessons from other relevant projects (e.g., same focal area) incorporated into project implementation
* Feedback from M&E activities used for adaptive management.

**Country Ownership/Driveness** is the relevance of the project to national development and environmental agendas, recipient country commitment, and regional and international agreements where applicable. Project Concept has its origin within the national sectoral and development plans

Some elements of effective country ownership/driveness may include:

* Project Concept has its origin within the national sectoral and development plans
* Outcomes (or potential outcomes) from the project have been incorporated into the national sectoral and development plans
* Relevant country representatives (e.g., governmental official, civil society, etc.) are actively involved in project identification, planning and/or implementation
* The recipient government has maintained financial commitment to the project
* The government has approved policies and/or modified regulatory frameworksin line with the project’s objectives
* Project’s collaboration with industry associations

**Stakeholder Participation/Public Involvement** consists of three related and often overlapping processes: information dissemination, consultation, and “stakeholder” participation. Stakeholders are the individuals, groups, institutions, or other bodies thathave an interest orstake in the outcome of the GEF-financed project. The term also applies to those potentially adversely affected by a project.

Examples of effective public involvement include:

Information dissemination

* Implementation of appropriate outreach/public awareness campaigns

Consultation and stakeholder participation

* Consulting and making use of the skills, experiences and knowledge of NGOs, community and local groups, the private and public sectors, and academic institutions in the design, implementation, and evaluation of project activities

Stakeholder participation

* Project institutional networks well placed within the overall national or community organizational structures, for example, by building on the local decision making structures, incorporating local knowledge, and devolving project management responsibilities to the local organizations or communities as the project approaches closure
* Building partnerships among different project stakeholders
* Fulfilment of commitments to local stakeholders and stakeholders considered to be adequately involved.

**Sustainability** measures the extent to which benefits continue, within or outside the project domain, from a particular project or program after GEF assistance/external assistance has come to an end. Relevant factors to improve the sustainability of project outcomes include:

* Development and implementation of a sustainability strategy**.**
* Establishment of the financial and economic instruments and mechanisms to ensure the ongoing flow of benefits once the GEF assistance ends (from the public and private sectors, income generating activities, and market transformations to promote the project’s objectives).
* Development of suitable organizational arrangements by public and/or private sector**.**
* Development of policy and regulatory frameworks that further the project objectives**.**
* Incorporation of environmental and ecological factors affecting future flow of benefits.
* Development of appropriate institutional capacity (systems, structures, staff, expertise, etc.) **.**
* Identification and involvement of champions (i.e. individuals in government and civil society who can promote sustainability of project outcomes)**.**
* Achieving social sustainability, for example, by mainstreaming project activities into the economy or community production activities**.**
* Achieving stakeholders consensus regarding courses of action on project activities.

**Replication approach**, in the context of GEF projects, is defined as lessons and experiences coming out of the project that are replicated or scaled up in the design and implementation of other projects. Replication can have two aspects, replication proper (lessons and experiences are replicated in different geographic area) or scaling up (lessons and experiences are replicated within the same geographic area but funded by other sources). Examples of replication approaches include:

* Knowledge transfer (i.e., dissemination of lessons through project result documents, training workshops, information exchange, a national and regional forum, etc).
* Expansion of demonstration projects.
* Capacity building and training of individuals, and institutions to expand the project’s achievements in the country or other regions.
* Use of project-trained individuals, institutions or companies to replicate the project’s outcomes in other regions.

**Financial Planning** includes actual project cost by activity, financial management (including disbursement issues), and co-financing. If a financial audit has been conducted the major findings should be presented in the TE.

Effective financial plans include:

* Identification of potential sources of co-financing as well as leveraged and associated financing*[[3]](#footnote-3)*.
* Strong financial controls, including reporting, and planning that allow the project management to make informed decisions regarding the budget at any time, allows for a proper and timely flow of funds, and for the payment of satisfactory project deliverables
* Due diligence due diligence in the management of funds and financial audits.

*Co financing includes:* Grants, Loans/Concessional (compared to market rate), Credits, Equity investments, In-kind support, other contributions mobilized for the project from other multilateral agencies, bilateral development cooperation agencies, NGOs, the private sector and beneficiaries. Please refer to Council documents on co-financing for definitions, such as GEF/C.20/6.

*Leveraged resources* are additional resources—beyond those committed to the project itself at the time of approval—that are mobilized later as a direct result of the project. Leveraged resources can be financial or in-kind and they may be from other donors, NGO’s, foundations, governments, communities or the private sector. Please briefly describe the resources the project has leveraged since inception and indicate how these resources are contributing to the project’s ultimate objective.

**Cost-effectiveness** assesses the achievement of the environmental and developmental objectives as well as the project’s outputs in relation to the inputs, costs, and implementing time. It also examines the project’s compliance with the application of the incremental cost concept. Cost-effective factors include:

* Compliance with the incremental cost criteria (e.g. GEF funds are used to finance a component of a project that would not have taken place without GEF funding.) and securing co-funding and associated funding.
* The project completed the planned activities and met or exceeded the expected outcomes in terms of achievement of Global Environmental and Development Objectives according to schedule, and as cost-effective as initially planned.
* The project used either a benchmark approach or a comparison approach (did not exceed the costs levels of similar projects in similar contexts)

**Monitoring & Evaluation**. Monitoring is the periodic oversight of a process, or the implementation of an activity, which seeks to establish the extent to which inputs, work schedules, other required actions and outputs are proceeding according to plan, so that timely action can be taken to correct the deficiencies detected. Evaluation is a process by which program inputs, activities and results are analyzed and judged explicitly against benchmarks or baseline conditions using performance indicators. This will allow project managers and planners to make decisions based on the evidence of information on the project implementation stage, performance indicators, level of funding still available, etc, building on the project’s logical framework.

Monitoring and Evaluation includes activities to measure the project’s achievements such as identification of performance indicators, measurement procedures, and determination of baseline conditions. Projects are required to implement plans for monitoring and evaluation with adequate funding and appropriate staff and include activities such as description of data sources and methods for data collection, collection of baseline data, and stakeholder participation. Given the long-term nature of many GEF projects, projects are also encouraged to include long-term monitoring plans that are sustainable after project completion.

# 

# Annex 3

# Co-financing Table



* Other Sources refer to contributions mobilized for the project from other multilateral agencies, bilateral development cooperation agencies, NGOs, the private sector etc.
* “Proposed” co-financing refers to co-financing proposed at CEO endorsement.
* Describe “Non-grant Instruments” (such as guarantees, contingent grants, etc):
  + *Source/amount/in-kind or cash/purpose*.
* Explain “Other Sources of Co-financing”:
  + *Source/amount/in-kind or cash*
  + …
  + …

# Annex 4

**Rate tables**

**Table 1 : Status of objective / outcome delivery as per measurable indicators**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **OBJECTIVE** | **MEASURABLE INDICATORS FROM PROJECT LOGFRAME** | **END-OF-PROJECT TARGET** | **STATUS OF DELIVERY\*** | **RATING\*\*** |
| **Objective** : |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| **OUTCOMES** |  | **END-OF-PROJECT TARGET** | **STATUS OF DELIVERY** | **RATING** |
| **Outcome 1:** |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| **Outcome 2:** |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| **Outcome 3:** |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| **Outcome 4:** |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| **Outcome 5:** |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

###### *\* Status of delivery colouring codes:*

Green / completed – indicator shows successful achievement

Yellow – indicator shows expected completion by the end of the project

Red – Indicator show poor achievement - unlikely to be complete by end of Project

**\*\* Rating:**

Highly Satisfactory = HS

Satisfactory = S

Marginally Satisfactory = MS

Unsatisfactory = U

**Table 2: Project ratings**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **PROJECT COMPONENT OR OBJECTIVE** | **Rating scale** | | | | | | **RATING** |
|  | **HU** | **U** | **MU** | **MS** | **S** | **HS** |  |
| **Project Formulation** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Conceptualization/Design** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Stakeholder participation** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Project Implementation** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Implementation Approach** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| The use of the logical framework |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Adaptive management |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Use/establishment of information technologies |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Operational relationships between the institutions involved |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Technical capacities |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Monitoring and evaluation** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Stakeholder participation** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Production and dissemination of information |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Local resource users and NGOs participation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Establishment of partnerships |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Involvement and support of governmental institutions |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Project Results** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Attainment of Outcomes/ Achievement of objectives** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Achievement of objective |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Outcome 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Outcome 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Outcome 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Outcome 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Outcome 5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Outcome 6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Outcome 7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **OVERALL PROJECT ACHIEVEMENT & IMPACT** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

1. 1 Please refer to GEF guidelines for explanation of Terminology [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. The ratings will be: Highly Satisfactory, Satisfactory, Marginally Satisfactory, Unsatisfactory [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Please refer to Council documents on co-financing for definitions, such as GEF/C.20/6. The following page presents a table to be used for reporting co-financing. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)