**TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR MIDTERM EVALUATION**

INCREASING CLIMATE CHANGE RESILIENCE OF MALDIVES THROUGH ADAPTATION IN THE TOURISM SECTOR (TAP)

1. **INTRODUCTION**

### In accordance with the UNDP and AF M&E policies and procedures, a mid-term evaluation of the medium-size project Increasing Climate Change Resilient of Maldives through the Adaptation in the Tourism Sector (TAP) implemented through the Ministry of Tourism, Arts and Culture is to be undertaken in 2013. The project started on the (project implementation start date) and is in its (X) year of implementation. This Terms of Reference (TOR) sets out the expectations for this mid-term evaluation.

The essentials of the project to be evaluated are as follows:

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Project Title: | **Increasing Climate Change Resilient of Maldives through the Adaptation in the Tourism Sector (TAP)** | | | |
| UNDP Project ID: | 76855 | **Project financing** | *at endorsement (Million US$)* | *at MTE (Million US$)* |
| ATLAS Project ID: | 76855 | GEF financing: | 1,650,438 |  |
| Country: | Maldives | IA/EA own: |  |  |
| Region: | Asia Pacific | Government: | 1,630,438 USD |  |
| Focal Area: | Climate Change Adaptation | Other (UNDP): | 20,000 |  |
|  |  | Total co-financing: | 1,630,438 USD |  |
| Executing Agency: | Ministry of Tourism, Arts and Culture | Total Project Cost **in cash**: | 3,300,876 USD |  |
| Other Partners involved: |  | ProDoc Signature (date project began): | | 17 August 2011 |
|  | Planned closing date: | Revised closing date:  17 August 2014 |

### PROJECT BACKGROUND INFORMATION AND OBJECTIVES

Apart from the significantly large contribution of the tourism sector to the annual Gross Domestic Product (GDP), the sector is also one of the most important providers of employment in the Maldives. The tourism sector also maintains critical economic linkages with remote and highly dispersed inhabited islands, and is linked to a diverse range of value chains and opportunities related to agriculture, fisheries, manufacturing, construction, transport, communication, energy, water and waste management.

The tourism sector’s vulnerability to climate change lie in the fact climate change undermines the resilience, viability and profitability of the industry as well as its value-chains both directly and indirectly. Major climate hazards to which tourism resorts in the Maldives are exposed regularly include windstorms, heavy rainfall, extreme temperatures and draught, sea swells and storm surges. Of these, the risks associated with swell waves, heavy rainfall and windstorms are believed to be the most serious, due to their high frequency occurrence and great potential for physical destruction and erosion. The combined effect of storm surges and tides, or storm tides, are perceived as especially destructive to the tourist resorts. The rising ocean water temperature, acidification and coral bleaching is expected to have a serious impact on snorkeling and diving – the two main tourist activities in Maldives. Male’ , Maldives In response to this nationally prioritized challenge, the government of Maldives, in partnership with UNDP, has developed the project tilted “Increasing Climate Change Resilience of Maldives through Adaptation in the Tourism Sector” (TAP) that is currently under implementation and financed from the GEF/LDCF.

The overall goal of the TAP is to support Maldives to become climate resilient by integrating adaptation measures in development policies, plans, programs, projects and actions, while the overall objective of the project is to increase the adaptive capacity of the tourism sector in Maldives to respond to the impacts of climate change and invest in appropriate, no-regrets adaptation measures.

1. Strengthened adaptive capacity of the tourism sector to reduce risks to climate-induced economic losses.
2. Reduced vulnerability of at least 10 tourism operations and 10 tourism-associated communities to the adverse effects of climate change.
3. Transfer of climate risk financing solutions to public and private sector tourism institutions**.**

*)*

***(X)* outcomes will contribute to this objective; the progress toward the objective and outcomes is measured through the following indicators:**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Objective / Outcomes** | **Indicators** | **Target by end of project, relativeto the baseline of 2009 (unless specified otherwise)** |
| **Project Objective:**  **Increase adaptive capacity of the tourism sector in Maldives to respond to the impacts of climate change and invest in appropriate, no-regrets adaptation measures**. | Number of tourism-related policies, strategies and action plans which stimulate investment by tourism operators in climate resilient water, waste, energy and infrastructure management  Number of tourism operators who invest in concrete initiatives that enhance their climate risk resilience, based on guidance provided by the project.  Number of tourism-associated communities which reduce their vulnerability to climate hazards, based on investment activities facilitated by the project | An Addendum to the Maldives National Building Code and its associated compliance documents is developed, disseminated and adopted by all tourism resorts.  At least 10 tourism resorts invest in new climate risk management initiatives which increase their resilience to climate-related risks and reduce economic losses from extreme events  At least 10 tourism-associated communities reduce the vulnerability of their water, waste, energy and infrastructure management systems, based on partnerships, guidance and private sector investment facilitated by the project. |
| **Outcome 1:** Strengthened adaptive capacity of the tourism sector to reduce risks to climate-induced economic losses | Number of island resorts and tourism operators with increased capacity to reduce risks of climate variability  Number of new investment projects in the tourism industry that are designed and implemented in accordance with revised tourism policies and planning frameworks | By the end of the project, 100% of relevant MTAC staff and at least 60% of all trained tourism operators recognize the economic impacts of climate change on tourism operations and know the cost/benefit aspects of different adaptation investments  By the end of the project, an Addendum to the Maldives National Building Code and its associated compliance documents is developed, disseminated and adopted by all new tourism development projects. |
| **Outcome 2:** Reduced vulnerability of at least 10 tourism operations and 10 tourism-associated communities to the adverse effects of climate change | Number of island resorts, tourism operators and tourism-associated communities who report reduced vulnerability to climate risks as a result of guidance provided by the project  Private sector investment in climate change adaptation measures which reduce economic losses in tourism operations and tourism-associated communities from extreme climate events (US$) | By the end of the project, at least 10 tourism-associated communities have planned and implemented concrete adaptation projects which reduce the vulnerability of their infrastructure, water, waste, land-use planning or energy management systems to climate-related hazards  By the end of the project, at least 10 tourism operators are adopting project guidance to invest in climate- resilient water, wastewater, solid waste and infrastructure management systems |
| **Outcome 3:** Transfer of climate risk financing solutions to public and private sector tourism institutions | Number of staff from government agencies and tourism operators who have increased knowledge of climate risk financing instruments  Type and number of climate risk financing products and services (such as index-based insurance) available to public and private sector entities | At project completion, all representatives in relevant MTAC and MHE departments and all representatives of different tourist facility groups (including resorts, safari boats and hotel operators)re aware of climate risk financing and –transfer instruments and their potential in the Maldivian context  By the end of the project, the Government of Maldives has access to at least one climate risk financing solution |

**3. OBJECTIVES OF THIS MID-TERM EVALUATION (MTE)**

The objective of the MTE is to provide an independent analysis of the progress of the project so far. The MTE will identify potential project design problems, evaluate progress towards the achievement of the project objective, identify and document lessons learned (including lessons that might improve design and implementation of other UNDP-GEF supported AF projects), and make recommendations regarding specific actions that should be taken to improve the project. The MTE will evaluate early signs of project success or failure and identify the necessary changes to be made. The project performance will be measured based on the indicators of the project’s logical framework (see Annex 1).

The MTE must provide evidence based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The evaluation team is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with government counterparts, UNDP Country Office, project team, UNDP-GEF Technical Adviser based in the region and key stakeholders. The evaluation team is expected to conduct field missions to Maldives including the following project sites *(list).* Interviews will be held with the following organizations and individuals at a minimum:

1. UNDP staff who have project responsibilities;
2. Executing agencies
3. The Chair of Project Board
4. The NPD and ANPD
5. Project stakeholders, to be determined at the inception meeting; including academia, local government and CBOs

The team will evaluate all relevant sources of information, such as the project document, project reports – including Annual PPRs, AF Tracking Tools, project budget revisions, progress reports, project files, national strategic and legal documents, and any other materials that the team considers useful for this evidence-based evaluation. A list of documents that the project team and UNDP Country Office will provide to the team for review is included in Annex 2 of this Terms of Reference.

# SCOPE OF THE MTE

The evaluation team will evaluate the following three categories of project progress. For each category, the evaluation team is required to rate overall progress using a six-point rating scale outlined in Annex 3.

* 1. **Progress towards Results**

Project design:

* Evaluate the problem addressed by the project and the underlying assumptions. Evaluate the effect of any incorrect assumptions made by the project. Identify new assumptions.
* Evaluate the relevance of the project strategy (and theory of change) and whether it provides the most effective route towards expected/intended results.
* Evaluate how the project addresses country priorities.
* Evaluate the baseline data included in the project results framework and suggest revisions as necessary.

Progress:

* Evaluate the outputs and progress toward outcomes achieved so far and the contribution to attaining the overall objective of the project.
* Examine if progress so far has led to, or could in the future catalyze, beneficial development effects (i.e. income generation, gender equality and women’s empowerment, improved governance etc...) that should be included in the project results framework and monitored on an annual basis. Suggest measures to improve the project’s development impact, including gender equality and women’s empowerment.
* Examine whether progress so far has led to, or could in the future lead to, potentially adverse environmental and/or social impacts/risks that could threaten the sustainability of the project outcomes. Are these risks being managed, mitigated, minimized or offset? Suggest mitigation measures as needed.
* Evaluate the extent to which the implementation of the project has been inclusive of relevant stakeholders and to which it has been able to create collaboration between different partners, and how the different needs of male and female stakeholders has been considered. Identify opportunities for stronger substantive partnerships.
  1. **Adaptive management**

Work Planning

1. Are work planning processes result-based? If not, suggest ways to re-orientate work planning to focus on results.
2. Examine the use of the project document logical/results framework as a management tool and evaluate any changes made to it since project start. Ensure any revisions meet UNDP-GEF requirements and evaluate the impact of the revised approach on project management.

Finance and co-finance:

1. Consider the financial management of the project, with specific reference to the cost-effectiveness of interventions.
2. Complete the co-financing monitoring table (see Annex 4).
3. Evaluate the changes to fund allocations as a result of budget revisions and the appropriateness and relevance of such revisions.

Monitoring Systems.

1. Evaluate the monitoring tools currently being used: Do they provide the necessary information? Do they involve key partners? Do they use existing information? Are they efficient? Are they cost-effective? Are additional tools required?
2. Ensure that the monitoring system, including performance indicators meet UNDP-GEF minimum requirements. Develop SMART indicators as necessary.
3. Ensure broader development and gender aspects of the project are being monitored effectively. Develop and recommend SMART indicators, including sex-disaggregated indicators as necessary.
4. Examine the financial management of the project monitoring and evaluation budget. Are sufficient resources being allocated to M&E? Are these resources being allocated effectively?

Risk Management

1. Validate whether the risks identified in the project document, PPRs and the ATLAS Risk Management Module are the most important and whether the risk ratings applied are appropriate and up to date. If not, explain why. Give particular attention to critical risks.
2. Describe any additional risks identified and suggest risk ratings and possible risk management strategies to be adopted.

Reporting

1. Evaluate how adaptive management changes have been reported by the project management, and shared with the Project Board.
2. Evaluate how lessons derived from the adaptive management process have been documented, shared with key partners and internalized by partners.
   1. **Management arrangements**
3. Evaluate overall effectiveness of project management as outlined in the project document. Have changes been made and are they effective? Are responsibilities and reporting lines clear? Is decision-making transparent and undertaken in a timely manner? Recommend areas for improvement.
4. Evaluate the quality of execution of the project Implementing Partners and recommend areas for improvement.
5. Evaluate the quality of support provided by UNDP and recommend areas for improvement.
6. ***MID TERM EVALUATION DELIVERABLES***

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Deliverable** | **Content** | **Timing** | **Responsibilities** |
| Inception Report | Evaluation team clarifies timing and method of evaluation | No later than 2 weeks before the evaluation mission | Evaluation team submits to UNDP Country Office |
| Presentation | Initial Findings | End of evaluation mission | To project management and UNDP Country Office |
| Draft Final Report | Full report (as template in annex 5) with annexes | Within 3 weeks of the evaluation mission | Sent to UNDP CO, reviewed by RTA, PCU, … |
| Final Report | Revised report with audit trail detailing how all received comment have (and have not) been addressed in the final evaluation report). | Within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft | Sent to UNDP CO |

1. ***IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS***

The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation resides with the UNDP Country Office (UNDP CO) in *Male’ , Maldives*. The UNDP CO will contract the consultants and ensure the timely provision of per diems and travel arrangements within the country for the evaluation team. The project team will be responsible for liaising with the evaluation team to set up stakeholder interviews, arrange field visits with missions to (*location)*.

1. ***TIMEFRAME***

The total duration of the evaluation will be 4 weeks starting ( April 2013 according to the following plan:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Activity** | **Timeframe** |
| Preparation | 1 day |
| Evaluation mission and debriefing | 10 days |
| Draft evaluation report | 5 days |
| Finalisation of final report | 4 days |

1. **TEAM COMPOSITION**

A team of two independent evaluators will conduct the evaluation - one international team leader and one national expert. The consultants will not have participated in the project preparation and/or implementation and should not have conflict of interest with project related activities. The team should have prior experience in reviewing or evaluating similar projects. Experience with AF financed projects is an advantage.

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

* Recent experience with result-based management evaluation methodologies;
* Experience applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios;
* Competence in Adaptive Management, as applied to conservation or natural resource management;
* Demonstrable analytical skills;
* Work experience in relevant technical areas for at least 10 years;
* Excellent English communication skills;
* Project evaluation/review experiences within United Nations system will be considered an asset;
* Experience working in *Asia Pacific* region.

1. **PAYMENT MODALITIES AND SPECIFICATIONS**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **%** | **Milestone** |
| 50 | Upon approval of 1st draft mid-term evaluation report |
| 50 | Upon approval of final mid-term evaluation report |

1. **APPLICATION PROCESS**

All applications including [P11 form](http://www.undptkm.org/files/vacancy/p11.doc), CV, and technical and financial proposals should be submitted to the UNDP Country Office in a sealed envelope indicating the following reference “International Consultant for Mid term Evaluation for Increasing Climate Change Resilient of Maldives through the Adaptation in the Tourism Sector (TAP))” or by email at following address ONLY: *Zeeniya.ahmed@undp.org/aminath.shooza@undp.org*  This email address is being protected from spam bots, you need Javascript enabled to view it by *(16:15& 28 October 2013***.** Incomplete applications will be excluded from further consideration.

**Recommended Presentation of Proposal:** Introduction about the consultant/CV; Proposed methodology and workplan (max 1 page); Financial proposal, including proposed fee and all other travel related costs (such as flight ticket, per diem, etc)..

**Criteria for Evaluation of Proposal:** The selection will be made based on the educational background and experience on similar assignments. The price proposal will weigh as 30% of the total scoring

**Annex 1:**

## Project Results Framework

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **This project will contribute to achieving the following Country Programme Outcome as defined in CPAP or CPD:**  OUTCOME 8: Communities have access to safe drinking water & adequate sanitation and sustainably manage the natural environment to enhance their livelihoods  OUTCOME 9: Enhanced capacities at national and local levels to support low carbon life-styles, climate change adaptation, and disaster risk reduction | | | | | | | |
| **Country Programme Outcome Indicators:** No. of sectors in which adaptive mechanisms are adopted to minimize losses from climate related impacts; No. of community level partnerships with private sector for sustainable environment management | | | | | | | |
| **Primary applicable Key Environment and Sustainable Development Key Result Area:** Promote climate change adaptation | | | | | | | |
| **Applicable SOF (e.g. GEF) Strategic Objective and Program:** Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF) | | | | | | | |
| **Applicable SOF Expected Outcomes (relating to the LDCF Results-Based Management Framework):**  **Outcome 1.1:** Mainstreamed adaptation in broader development frameworks at country level and in targeted vulnerable areas  **Outcome 2.2:** Strengthened adaptive capacity to reduce risks to climate-induced economic losses | | | | | | | |
| **Applicable SOF (e.g .GEF) Outcome Indicators (relating to the LDCF Results-Based Management Framework):**  **Indicator 1.1.3** % of development frameworks and sectoral strategies that reach adaptation targets  **Indicator 1.2.2** Economic losses through effective climate resilient infrastructure ($US)  **Indicator 2.2.1** No. of targeted institutions with increased adaptive capacity to reduce risks of and response to climate variability (Number) | | | | | | | |
|  | **Indicator** | | **Baseline** | | **Targets**  **End of Project** | **Source of verification** | **Risks and Assumptions** |
| **Project Objective[[1]](#footnote-2)**  **Increase adaptive capacity of the tourism sector in Maldives to respond to the impacts of climate change and invest in appropriate, no-regrets adaptation measures**. | Number of tourism-related policies, strategies and action plans which stimulate investment by tourism operators in climate resilient water, waste, energy and infrastructure management  Number of tourism operators who invest in concrete initiatives that enhance their climate risk resilience, based on guidance provided by the project.  Number of tourism-associated communities which reduce their vulnerability to climate hazards, based on investment activities facilitated by the project | | Existing tourism policies, laws and regulations do not integrate climate risk information and require/enforce private sector investments in climate change adaptation measures  Most tourism operators do not draw on, or comply with, consistent guidance for no-regrets adaptation measures to increase resilience to climate-related risks and extreme events  Limited examples of cooperation between tourism resorts and communities on joint risk management efforts. | | An Addendum to the Maldives National Building Code and its associated compliance documents is developed, disseminated and adopted by all tourism resorts.  At least 10 tourism resorts invest in new climate risk management initiatives which increase their resilience to climate-related risks and reduce economic losses from extreme events  At least 10 tourism-associated communities reduce the vulnerability of their water, waste, energy and infrastructure management systems, based on partnerships, guidance and private sector investment facilitated by the project. | Policy documents  Field survey with tourism operators  Field surveys;  Interviews with tourism resorts and associated communities | No contradictory incentives provided/compliance required by different sector policies  Government decision-makers continue to recognize the importance of climate change adaptation in the tourism sector and are committed to facilitate the necessary policy changes  Tourism operators recognize the economic benefits of adaptation measures and are willing to invest in changes to their current resource management practices  Tourism operators react to improved enforcement of environmental legislation in the tourism sector  Tourism resorts and associated communities are willing to undertake joint planning efforts to increase climate resilience and environmental sustainability of their shared value chain  Stable government/ governance structure throughout project lifetime |
| **Outcome 1**  Strengthened adaptive capacity of the tourism sector to reduce risks to climate-induced economic losses | Number of island resorts and tourism operators with increased capacity to reduce risks of climate variability  Number of new investment projects in the tourism industry that are designed and implemented in accordance with revised tourism policies and planning frameworks | | Most tourism operators are concerned about their increased vulnerability to climate change, but do not draw on, or comply with, consistent guidance for effective no-regrets adaptation measures to increase resilience  National policies and laws regulating tourism operations do not contain functional references to climate-proofing and fail to  incentivize private sector investment in climate risk management | | By the end of the project, 100% of relevant MTAC staff and at least 60% of all trained tourism operators recognize the economic impacts of climate change on tourism operations and know the cost/benefit aspects of different adaptation investments  By the end of the project, an Addendum to the Maldives National Building Code and its associated compliance documents is developed, disseminated and adopted by all new tourism development projects. | Training reports attendance lists  Training feedback  Building code addendum and associated compliance documents  Field observations | Key Government representatives and stakeholders from the Tourism industry recognize the value of project-related training initiatives  and are willing to engage in intensified and regular debate about climate risks in the tourism sector  Senior planners and decision-makers continue to recognize the importance of climate change adaptation and are committed to support necessary policy changes  MATI has appropriate leverage to represent the diversity of situations and interests in the tourism industry  Uncertainties pertaining to climate change modelling are within the acceptance range of decision-makers  Tourism operators are willing to engage in the review, revision and adoption of new building standards  Policy recommendations are actively endorsed and signed into law by national decision-making bodies |
| **Output 1.1.**  Inventory of adaptive and maladaptive practices on island resorts and safari boat operations in Maldives | | | | | | | |
| **Output 1.2.**  Policy recommendations developed to enable and incentivize private sector investment for climate change adaptation in the tourism industry | | | | | | | |
| **Output 1.3.**  Addendum to national building codes on the physical planning and construction of infrastructure in tourist resorts is developed and disseminated to all tourism operators | | | | | | | |
| **Output 1.4.**  Technical guidance provided to all tourism operators on how to climate-proof sensitive resource management systems and infrastructure (freshwater management; solid waste and wastewater management; physical and energy infrastructure) | | | | | | | |
| **Outcome 2**  Reduced vulnerability of at least 10 tourism operations and 10 tourism-associated communities to the adverse effects of climate change | Number of island resorts, tourism operators and tourism-associated communities who report reduced vulnerability to climate risks as a result of guidance provided by the project  Private sector investment in climate change adaptation measures which reduce economic losses in tourism operations and tourism-associated communities from extreme climate events (US$) | Most tourism operators are concerned about their increased vulnerability to climate change, but do not draw on, or comply with, consistent guidance for effective no-regrets adaptation measures by the government to increase resilience  Economic losses in tourism-related value chains from climate-induced hazards and extreme events are quantified only after catastrophic events | | By the end of the project, at least 10 tourism-associated communities have planned and implemented concrete adaptation projects which reduce the vulnerability of their infrastructure, water, waste, land-use planning or energy management systems to climate-related hazards  By the end of the project, at least 10 tourism operators are adopting project guidance to invest in climate- resilient water, wastewater, solid waste and infrastructure management systems | | Interviews with community representatives  Qualitative field surveys | Tourism operators find reduced costs associated with the proposed adaptation measures sufficiently attractive to invest in changes to existing setups and practices  Tourism operators react to improved enforcement of environmental legislation in the tourism sector.  New tourism projects have access to project information  Guidelines developed by the project are considered practical, locally appropriate, innovative, sustainable and cost effective  Key Government representatives and stakeholders from the Tourism industry recognize the value of project-related training initiatives  Communal plans can be systematically connected with new investment projects by tourism resorts |
| **Output 2.1**  National tourism adaptation platform created to establish and support effective public-private partnerships for climate change adaptation in the tourism sector | | | | | | | |
| **Output 2.2**  Development and implementation of at least 10 new investment projects on climate-proofing water supply/storage/distribution, solid waste management, wastewater management, energy management, and/or new physical infrastructure in island resort and/or safari boat operations | | | | | | | |
| **Output 2.3**  Development of at least 10 new investment partnerships between island resorts and tourism-associated communities which result in joint climate risk management activities | | | | | | | |
| **Output 2.4**  South-South transfer of tourism adaptation case studies between Maldives and other SIDS | | | | | | | |
| **Outcome 3**  Transfer of climate risk financing solutions to public and private sector tourism institutions | Number of staff from government agencies and tourism operators who have increased knowledge of climate risk financing instruments  Type and number of climate risk financing products and services (such as index-based insurance) available to public and private sector entities | Government entities and tourism sector operators in Maldives have limited knowledge of climate risk financing products and their potential application in the Maldivian context  No climate risk financing products and services are available on the Maldives market | | At project completion, all representatives in relevant MTAC and MHE departments and all representatives of different tourist facility groups (including resorts, safari boats and hotel operators)re aware of climate risk financing and –transfer instruments and their potential in the Maldivian context  By the end of the project, the Government of Maldives has access to at least one climate risk financing solution | | Qualitative surveys  Attendance lists  Awareness and training materials  Interview with risk financing service provider  Qualitative surveys | Tourism operators are interested in innovative insurance products to address the residual climate risk that cannot be addressed through other investments in risk reduction  Insurance service providers are willing to develop and offer innovative and affordable climate risk financing/transfer products for the Maldives market  Sufficient cooperation between relevant government agencies, the tourism industry and representatives of insurance providers in the sharing of relevant information.  Insurance and reinsurance service providers interested in engaging with the Maldivian market |
| **Output 3.1**  Training of tourism operators and government representatives on climate risk financing options and their potential application in the Maldivian context | | | | | | | |
| **Output 3.2**  Feasibility study on micro-insurance for tourism-associated communities to buffer climate-related shocks from extreme events. | | | | | | | |
| **Output 3.3.**  Feasibility study on index-based insurance and risk pooling options to address risk transfer priorities of the Maldivian government | | | | | | | |

## 

**Annex 2: List of Documents**

1. Project Document
2. AF Project Performance Reports (PPRs) & AF Tracking Tool
3. Quarterly progress reports and work plans of the various implementation task teams
4. Audit reports
5. Financial scorecards
6. The Mission Reports and Lessons learnt study
7. M & E Operational Guidelines, all monitoring reports prepared by the project; and
8. Financial and Administration guidelines.

The following documents will also be available:

1. Project operational guidelines, manuals and systems
2. Minutes of the Project Board Meetings
3. Maps
4. The AF Operations guidelines; and
5. UNDP Monitoring and Evaluation Frameworks.

**Annex 3: Mid-term Evaluation Rating Scale**

**Progress towards results: use the following rating scale**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Highly Satisfactory (HS)** | Project is expected to achieve or exceed all its major global environmental objectives, and yield substantial global environmental benefits, without major shortcomings. The project can be presented as “good practice”. |
| **Satisfactory (S)** | Project is expected to achieve most of its major global environmental objectives, and yield satisfactory global environmental benefits, with only minor shortcomings. |
| **Moderately Satisfactory (MS)** | Project is expected to achieve most of its major relevant objectives but with either significant shortcomings or modest overall relevance. Project is expected not to achieve some of its major global environmental objectives or yield some of the expected global environment benefits. |
| **Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)** | Project is expected to achieve its major global environmental objectives with major shortcomings or is expected to achieve only some of its major global environmental objectives. |
| **Unsatisfactory (U)** | Project is expected not to achieve most of its major global environment objectives or to yield any satisfactory global environmental benefits. |
| **Highly Unsatisfactory (U)** | The project has failed to achieve, and is not expected to achieve, any of its major global environment objectives with no worthwhile benefits. |

**Adaptive management AND Management Arrangements: use the following rating scale**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Highly Satisfactory (HS)** | The project has no shortcomings and can be presented as “good practice”. |
| **Satisfactory (S)** | The project has minor shortcomings. |
| **Moderately Satisfactory (MS)** | The project has moderate shortcomings. |
| **Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)** | The project has significant shortcomings. |
| **Unsatisfactory (U)** | The project has major shortcomings. |
| **Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)** | The project has severe shortcomings. |

**Annex 4: Co-financing table**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Sources of Co-financing[[2]](#footnote-3) | Name of Co-financer | Type of Co-financing[[3]](#footnote-4) | Amount Confirmed at CEO endorsement / approval in USD | Actual Amount Materialized at Midterm | Actual Amount Materialized at Closing |
|  | UNDP | In cash | 20,000 |  |  |
|  | Department of National Planning | In kind | 89,600 |  |  |
|  | Ministry of Tourism Arts and Culture | In kind | 543,690 |  |  |
|  | Ministry of Housing and Environment | In kind | 997,148.74 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | **TOTAL** | 1,650,439 |  |  |

Explain “Other Sources of Co-financing”:

**Annex 5: Table of Contents for the Mid-term Evaluation Report**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **i.** | Opening page:   * Title of UNDP supported AF financed project * UNDP and AF project ID#s. * Evaluation time frame and date of evaluation report * Region and countries included in the project * Implementing Partner and other project partners * Evaluation team members * Acknowledgements |
| **ii.** | Executive Summary   * Project Summary Table * Project Description (brief) * Evaluation Rating Table * Summary of conclusions, recommendations and lessons |
| **iii.** | Acronyms and Abbreviations |
| **1.** | Introduction   * Purpose of the evaluation * Scope & Methodology * Structure of the evaluation report |
| **2.** | Project description and development context   * Project start and duration * Problems that the project sought to address * Immediate and development objectives of the project * Baseline Indicators established * Main stakeholders * Expected Results |
| **3.** | Findings |
| **3.1** | Progress toward Results:   * Project Design * Progress |
| **3.2** | Adaptive Management:   * Work planning * Finance and co-finance * Monitoring systems * Risk management * Reporting |
| **3.3** | Management Arrangements:   * Overall project management * Quality of executive of Implementing Partners * Quality of support provided by UNDP |
| **4.** | Conclusions, Recommendations & Lessons   * Corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project * Actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the project * Proposals for future directions underlining main objectives * Best and worst practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance and success |
| **5.** | Annexes   * ToR * Itinerary * List of persons interviewed * Summary of field visits * List of documents reviewed * Questionnaire used and summary of results * Co-financing table |

1. *Objective (Atlas output) monitored quarterly ERBM and annually in APR/PIR* [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
2. Sources of Co-financing may include: Bilateral Aid Agency(ies), Foundation, GEF Agency, Local Government, National Government, Civil Society Organization, Other Multi-lateral Agency(ies), Private Sector, Other [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
3. Type of Co-financing may include: Grant, Soft Loan, Hard Loan, Guarantee, In-Kind, Other [↑](#footnote-ref-4)