Terminal Evaluation Terms of Reference

INTRODUCTION

In accordance with UNDP and GEF M&E policies and procedures, all full and medium-sized UNDP support GEF financed projects are required to undergo a terminal evaluation upon completion of implementation. These terms of reference (TOR) sets out the expectations for a Terminal Evaluation (TE) of the***Adaptation to Climate Variability and Change in Agro Ecological Regions I and II*** (PIMS # **3942**)

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

Project Summary Table

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Project Title: | Adaptation to Climate Variability and Change in Agro Ecological Regions I and II | | | | | |
| GEF Project ID: | | PIMS # **3942** |  | *at endorsement (Million US$)* | | *at completion (Million US$)* |
| UNDP Project ID: | | ZMB10/00072197 | GEF financing: | 3,795,000 | | 3,795,000 |
| Country: | | Zambia | IA/EA own: |  | |  |
| Region: | | Africa | Government: |  | |  |
| Focal Area: | | Environment & Sustainable Development | Other: |  | |  |
| FA Objectives, (OP/SP): | | Environment & Sustainable Development | Total co-financing: |  | |  |
| Executing Agency: | | Ministry of Agriculture & Livestock | Total Project Cost: |  | |  |
| Other Partners involved: | | Forestry Department | ProDoc Signature (date project began): | | | 21st January 2010 |
| (Operational) Closing Date: | | Proposed:  30th June 2015 | Actual: |

Objective and Scope

The project was designed to: The Government of the Republic of Zambia through the Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock (MAL) has been implementing a project titled “Adaptation to Climate Variability and Change in Agro Ecological Regions I and II” to adapt to the negative effects of climate change with financial and technical assistance from the Global Environmental Facility (GEF) and the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). This four year programme whose implementation commenced in 2010 is within the framework of priorities of Zambia and has a total budget of USD 3,795,000.

Most communities in Zambia are vulnerable to the adverse effects of climate change ranging from floods, droughts, and prolonged dry spells. The result of these Impacts is crop failure, food and water insecurity and unsustainable livelihoods. The project goal is to improve food security through enhanced adaptive capacity to respond to the risks posed by the effects of climate change (including variability) in AER I and II of Zambia while its objective is to develop adaptive capacity of the Small Scale Farmers and Rural Communities to withstand climate change in Zambia. This involves integration of adaptation considerations into agricultural planning at national, district and community levels in order to protect and improve agricultural incomes from the adverse effects of climate change. Specifically, the project will contribute to the achievement of the following outcomes:

1. Climate change risks integrated into critical decision making processes for agricultural management at the local, sub-national and national levels.
2. Agricultural productivity in the pilot sites made resilient to the anticipated impacts of climate change.
3. National fiscal, regulatory and development policy revised to promote adaptation responses in the agricultural sector.
4. Knowledge and lessons learned to support implementation of adaptation measures compiled and disseminated.

This programme has been implemented by the Department of Agriculture under the Ministry of Agriculture & Livestock (MAL). The programme has been implemented by a dedicated Programme Management Unit (PMU) that comprises staff recruited by UNDP on behalf of the government and a Government representative as National Project Coordinator.

The TE will be conducted according to the guidance, rules and procedures established by UNDP and GEF as reflected in the [UNDP Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-supported GEF-financed Projects](http://web.undp.org/evaluation/documents/guidance/GEF/UNDP-GEF-TE-Guide.pdf).

The objectives of the evaluation are to assess the achievement of the project goal, objectives and results, and to draw lessons that can both improve the sustainability of benefits from this project, and aid in the overall enhancement of UNDP programming. The evaluation will also assess the strategies used, including partnerships established to achieve the project’s goal, objectives and results

Evaluation approach and method

An overall approach and method[[1]](#footnote-1) for conducting project terminal evaluations of UNDP supported GEF financed projects has developed over time. The evaluator is expected to frame the evaluation effort using the criteria of **relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and impact,** as defined and explained in the [UNDP Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-supported, GEF-financed Projects.](http://web.undp.org/evaluation/documents/guidance/GEF/UNDP-GEF-TE-Guide.pdf)  A set of questions covering each of these criteria have been drafted and are included with this TOR (*see* [*Annex C*](#_TOR_Annex_C:)) The evaluator is expected to amend, complete and submit this matrix as part of an evaluation inception report, and shall include it as an annex to the final report.

The evaluation must provide evidence‐based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The evaluator is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with government counterparts, in particular the GEF operational focal point, UNDP Country Office, project team, UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based in the region and key stakeholders. The evaluator is expected to conduct a field mission to Lusaka- Zambia, including the following project sites *(Chongwe, Luangwa, Mambwe, Chama, Siavonga, Kazungula, Sioma and Senanga).* Interviews will be held with the following organizations and individuals at a minimum: Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock, Forestry Department, members of the District Development Coordinating Committee, Beneficiaries, District Commissioners, village headmen and other stakeholders.

The evaluator will review all relevant sources of information, such as the project document, project reports – including Annual APR/PIR, project budget revisions, midterm review, progress reports, and GEF focal area tracking tools, project files, national strategic and legal documents, and any other materials that the evaluator considers useful for this evidence-based assessment. A list of documents that the project team will provide to the evaluator for review is included in [Annex B](#_TOR_Annex_B:) of this Terms of Reference.

Other methods to be used by the evaluator provided they are agreed with the Project Team and the Quality Assurance team could include In-depth Interviews and Focused Groups Discussions with beneficiaries and key informants, as well as beneficiary surveys and case studies.

Evaluation Criteria & Ratings

An assessment of project performance will be carried out, based against expectations set out in the Project Logical Framework/Results Framework (see  [Annex A](#_TOR_Annex_A:)), which provides performance and impact indicators for project implementation along with their corresponding means of verification. The evaluation will at a minimum cover the criteria of: **relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact.** Ratings must be provided on the following performance criteria. The completed table must be included in the evaluation executive summary. The obligatory rating scales are included in  [Annex D](#_TOR_Annex_D:).

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Evaluation Ratings:** | | | |
| **1. Monitoring and Evaluation** | ***rating*** | **2. IA & EA Execution** | ***rating*** |
| M&E design at entry |  | Quality of UNDP Implementation – Implementing Agency (IA) |  |
| M&E Plan Implementation |  | Quality of Execution - Executing Agency (EA) |  |
| Overall quality of M&E |  | Overall quality of Implementation / Execution |  |
| **3. Assessment of Outcomes** | **rating** | **4. Sustainability** | **rating** |
| Relevance |  | Financial resources: |  |
| Effectiveness |  | Socio-political: |  |
| Efficiency |  | Institutional framework and governance: |  |
| Overall Project Outcome Rating |  | Environmental: |  |
|  |  | Overall likelihood of sustainability: |  |

Project finance / cofinance

The Evaluation will assess the key financial aspects of the project, including the extent of co-financing planned and realized. Project cost and funding data will be required, including annual expenditures. Variances between planned and actual expenditures will need to be assessed and explained. Results from recent financial audits, as available, should be taken into consideration. The evaluator(s) will receive assistance from the Country Office (CO) and Project Team to obtain financial data in order to complete the co-financing table below, which will be included in the terminal evaluation report.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Co-financing  (type/source) | UNDP own financing (mill. US$) | | Government  (mill. US$) | | Partner Agency  (mill. US$) | | Total  (mill. US$) | |
| Planned | Actual | Planned | Actual | Planned | Actual | Actual | Actual |
| Grants |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Loans/Concessions |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| * In-kind support |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| * Other |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Totals |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Mainstreaming

UNDP supported GEF financed projects are key components in UNDP country programming, as well as regional and global programmes. The evaluation will assess the extent to which the project was successfully mainstreamed with other UNDP priorities, including poverty alleviation, improved governance, the prevention and recovery from natural disasters, and gender.

Impact

The evaluators will assess the extent to which the project is achieving impacts or progressing towards the achievement of impacts. Key findings that should be brought out in the evaluations include whether the project has demonstrated: a) verifiable improvements in ecological status, b) verifiable reductions in stress on ecological systems, and/or c) demonstrated progress towards these impact achievements.[[2]](#footnote-2)

Conclusions, recommendations & lessons

The evaluation report must include a chapter providing a set of **conclusions**, **recommendations** and **lessons**.

Implementation arrangements

The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation resides with the UNDP CO in Zambia.The UNDP CO will contract the evaluators 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 Evaluators team to set up stakeholder interviews, arrange field visits, coordinate with the Government etc.

The Project Team will be supported by a quality assurance team comprising of evaluation and natural resource management experts in UNDP and key stakeholder organisations, including UNDP’s and GEF’s regional natural resource management and evaluation teams. The quality assurance team will guide the consultants during the entry meeting, review and approve the inception report, interim, draft and final evaluation reports. Quality assurance in this regard also extends to upholding both GEF and UNDP evaluation principles.

Evaluation timeframe

The total duration of the evaluation will be 29 days over a time period of 13 weeks according to the following plan:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Activity** | Timing | Completion Date |
| **Preparation** | 3 days | 23rd April 2015 |
| **Evaluation Mission** | 19 days | 27th May 2015 |
| **Draft Evaluation Report** | 5 days | 24th June 2015 |
| **Final Report** | 2 days | 14th July 2015 |

Evaluation deliverables

The evaluation team is expected to deliver the following:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Deliverable | Content | Timing | Responsibilities |
| **Inception Report** | Evaluator provides clarifications on timing and method | No later than 2 weeks before the evaluation mission: 23rd April 2015 | Evaluator submits to UNDP CO |
| **Presentation** | Initial Findings | End of evaluation mission: 15th June 2015 | To project management, UNDP CO |
| **Draft Final Report** | Full report, (per annexed template) with annexes | Within 3 weeks of the evaluation mission: 24th June 2015 | Sent to CO, reviewed by RTA, PCU, GEF OFPs |
| **Final Report\*** | Revised report | Within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft: 14th July 2015 | Sent to CO for uploading to UNDP ERC. |

\*When submitting the final evaluation report, the evaluator is required also to provide an 'audit trail', detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final evaluation report.

Team Composition

The evaluation team will be composed of 1 international or national evaluator. The consultant shall have prior experience in evaluating similar projects. Experience with GEF financed projects is an advantage. The evaluator selected should not have participated in the project preparation and/or implementation and should not have conflict of interest with project related activities.

The evaluator must present the following qualifications:

* Minimum 10 years of relevant professional experience
* Knowledge of UNDP and GEF
* Previous experience with results‐based monitoring and evaluation methodologies;
* Technical knowledge in the targeted focal areas climate change adaptation, agricultural planning, food security, climate resilience, rural sustainable development planning, etc.
* Demonstrated ability to assess complex situations in order to concisely and clearly distil critical issues and draw well-supported conclusions.

Evaluator Ethics

Evaluation consultants will be held to the highest ethical standards and are required to sign a Code of Conduct (Annex E) upon acceptance of the assignment. UNDP evaluations are conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the [UNEG 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluations'](http://www.unevaluation.org/ethicalguidelines)

Payment modalities and specifications

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| % | Milestone |
| *20%* | At submission and approval of inception report |
| *30%* | Following submission and approval of the 1st draft terminal evaluation report |
| *50%* | Following submission and approval (UNDP-CO and UNDP RTA) of the final terminal evaluation report |

Application process

Applicants are requested to apply online jobs.undp.org by 10th April 2015. Individual consultants are invited to submit applications together with their CV for these positions. The application should contain a current and complete C.V. in English with indication of the e‐mail and phone contact. Shortlisted candidates will be requested to submit a price offer indicating the total cost of the assignment (including daily fee, per diem and travel costs).

UNDP applies a fair and transparent selection process that will take into account the competencies/skills of the applicants as well as their financial proposals. Qualified women and members of social minorities are encouraged to apply.

Annex A: Project Logical Framework

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Goal:** to improve food security through enhanced adaptive capacity to respond to the risks posed by the effects of climate change (including variability) in AER I and II of Zambia | | | | | |
| **Objective: to develop adaptive capacity of subsistence farmers and rural communities to withstand climate change in Zambia** | | | | | |
| **Project Strategy** | **Indicators** | **Baseline Value** | **Targets and benchmarks** | **Sources of verification** | **Risks and Assumptions** |
| **Outcome 1:**  **Climate change risks integrated into decision-making processes for agricultural management at the local, sub-national and national levels** | | | | | |
| **Output 1.1**.  **Number of government planners and private sector trained on climate risk management for improved agricultural productivity.** | Number of ZMD staff trained to provide short-term and seasonal forecasts, from downscaling of available data, in a format that is suitable for use by small-scale farmers, agricultural sector planners and water managers.  Number of farmers, agro-business dealers, extension staff, and Agricultural and Natural Resources subcommittees of the DDCC/PDCC trained on how to access, apply and interpret forecasts for planning purposes.  Number of local weather stations installed. | At present, very few ZMD staff members are capable of conducting forecasts from downscaling of international data.  To date, few people have undergone training on how to apply forecasts to decision-making. Farmers, in particular, are not exposed to accurate forecast data.  At present, only two districts targeted by the project have their own weather stations. | By year 2, at least 30% of the ZMD staff are able to provide forecasts by downscaling available international data  By year 2, at least 250 people trained on how to access, apply and interpret forecasts for planning purposes, by the end of the project.  By year 4, all 8 pilot sites have their own functioning weather stations developed to collected and monitor weather data. | Consultants reports, Field surveys, Reports and training reports. | Availability of technical expertise and equipment for downscaling international climate data to AER level. |
| **Output 1.2 Effective EWS(s) developed to enhance preparedness and reduce climate-related risks.** | Number of pilot sites where their EWS needs have been documented and assessed.  EWS(s) developed based on the needs assessment undertaken in activity. | At present, EWS needs of the pilot sites have not been documented and assessed.  Zambia’s National Disaster Management Policy identifies gaps affecting its functionality and measures that need to be undertaken to improve disaster risk management. Improved EWS is central to this. | By year 1, the early warning needs of the pilot sites assessed and documented  By year 3, at least 1 EWS is developed and applied in at least 3 pilot sites. | Experts reports on assessments, Field surveys against baseline targets, Revised policies | Availability of technical expertise and equipment, Political will by policy makers to revise the policies, Sufficient awareness on climate change by farmers |
| **Output 1.3**  **Economic impact assessment on the adaptation value of climate risk information to protect agricultural incomes from climate change effects.** | Economic impact assessment on the adaptation value of climate risk information to protect agricultural incomes from climate change effects. | At present, no economic impact assessment on the adaptation value using climate risk information have been undertaken for AER I and II. | By year 3, a report of the adaptation value of using climate risk information. | Consultant report, farmer surveys against baseline information. |  |
| **Outcome 2: Agricultural productivity in the pilot sites made resilient to the anticipated impacts of climate change** | | | | | |
| **Output 2.1. Soil and water conservation and soil improvement techniques tested for their ability to improve the productivity of small-scale agriculture.** | Percentage increase in agricultural incomes in the pilot sites.  Number of agricultural extension staff and community development staff from the eight pilot sites trained on soil and water conservation techniques.  Number of farmers trained on soil and water conservation techniques.  Number of farmers who adopt techniques.  Number of management committees at each pilot site trained to oversee and encourage sustainable soil and water conservation techniques. | Poor land productivity. Land degraded by water erosion and poor farming practices. Gully erosion channels water away from field as surface run-off, preventing infiltration. Soils are depleted of nutrients.  Most of the extension staff in the pilot areas need refresher training on water and soil management techniques  At present, farmers in the pilot sites are not exposed to soil and water conservation techniques.  At present, the communities do not have management committees to oversee and encourage sustainable soil and water management techniques. | 10% increase in agricultural incomes  By year 1, all agricultural extension workers covering the 8 pilot sites are trained on improved water management practices.  By year 2, 900 farmers are trained on soil and water conservation techniques.  By year 3, 900 farmers have adopted soil and water conservation techniques.  By year 2, 80 people, including 40 women, have been trained to form 8 management committees (one at each site). | Farmer surveys  Physical inspections  Field reports  Annual reports | Refer to risks listed under Outcome 2. |
| **Output 2.2 Crop diversification practices tested to improve the resilience of farmers to drought** | Percentage increase in agricultural incomes in the pilot sites.  Number of farmers trained on crop diversification  Number of farm trials undertaken in the pilot sites.  Number of local cooperatives and farmers trained on seed production methods so that they can produce seed for sale to the community as an additional source of income.  Number of management committees established and trained at each site to facilitate the adoption of drought-resistant and alternative crops by the wider community. | Poor crop productivity. Maize farming has been promoted at the expense of cassava, sorghum and millet – crops that are better suited to drier conditions and higher temperatures.  At present, most farmers are not trained on climate resilient crop diversification practices.  At present, one of the major impediments to increased agricultural productivity has been inaccessibility of suitable seeds/ inputs in remote communities | 10% increase in agricultural incomes  By year 2 1000 farmers at the 8 pilot sites are trained on crop diversification.  By year 3, 2 farm trials have been undertaken at each of the 8 pilot sites.  By year 2, 300 people are trained on how to produce and market drought resistant seed locally.  By year 2, 80 people, including 40 women, have been trained to form 8 management committees (one at each site). | Farmer surveys  Technical reports from experts.  Annual reports  Field surveys | Refer to risks listed under Outcome 2. |
| **Output 2.3: Alternative livelihoods tested for their ability to diversify livelihoods away from maize production.** | | | | | |
| **Output 2.3a. Bee keeping tested for its ability to diversify incomes away from maize production.** | Percentage increase in agricultural incomes in the pilot sites.  Number of “bee keeping groups” established and trained at each of the pilot sites that identified bee keeping as a priority.  Number of bee hives manufactured from sustainable sources. | Traditional bee keeping practices, where they exist, are unsustainable as they involve the ad hoc cutting down of trees where honey combs are sighted. | 10% increase in agricultural incomes  3 bee-keeping groups established.  By year 2, 30 people, including 15 women, have been trained to form 3 management committees at each of the site where this was identified as a priority.  By year 3, each farmer in the bee-keeping groups has at least four bee hives manufactured from sustainable sources. | Technical reports from experts.  Annual reports  Field surveys | Refer to risks listed under Outcome 2. |
| **Output 2.3b. Fish farming tested for its ability to diversity incomes away from maize production.** | Percentage increase in agricultural incomes in the pilot sites.  Number of “fish farming groups” established and trained at each of the pilot sites that identified fish farming as a priority intervention.  Total area dedicated to fish farming.  Number of breeding ponds constructed, with appropriate management (including cost recovery) plans in place, agreed by all stakeholders.  Number of growing ponds constructed, with appropriate management (including cost recovery) plans in place, agreed by all stakeholders.  Number of production ponds constructed, with appropriate management (including cost recovery) plans in place, agreed by all stakeholders. | Fish farming was initiated in Kataba once before, with numerous problems, the key problems being:  i) poor cost recovery  ii) poor technical design and construction so that floods were poorly managed  iii) limited technical backstopping  The project has since failed (details are contained within Annex I). | 10% increase in agricultural incomes  By year 1, establish a fish farming group at Kataba pilot site.  By year 2, 20 people, including 10 women, have been trained to form a management committee at Kataba.  By year 3, at least 18 000 m2 is dedicated to fishing farming.  By year 2, 1 breeding pond is constructed.  At year 2, 9 growing ponds are constructed. | Field Surveys  Annual Reports.  Evaluation reports.  Training protocols. | Refer to risks listed under Outcome 2. |
| **Output 2.3c. Rice farming tested for its ability to diversify incomes away from maize production.** | Percentage increase in agricultural incomes in the pilot sites.  Number of “rice farming groups” established and trained at each of the pilot sites that identified rice farming as a priority.  Number of farmers who undertake rice farming.  Number of dehullers in operation within the pilot sites that identified rice farming as a priority. | Flood waters can be harnessed for rice farming, diversifying away from maze which will become less viable with climate change.  Although rice farming is underway in parts of Zambia, productivity is low and upscaling of the activity is prevented by a lack of inputs (i.e. fertilizer and improved seed), insufficient knowledge on rice farming and the lack of specialised equipment (i.e. dehullers) (see paragraph 114).  Demand for rice in Zambia exceeds supply and deficits are met by imports. | 10% increase in agricultural incomes  By year 1, establish 2 rice farming groups in 2 pilot sites.  By year 2, 80 people, including 40 women, have been trained to form management committees at each of the pilot sites that identified rice farming as a priority.  By year 3, 400 farmers are partaking in rice farming, with the help from inputs (e.g. seed and fertilizer) provided by the project.  By year 2, Kasaya and Sioma will be equipped with two dehullers each and the farmers will have undergone training on the operation of these machines. | Field Surveys  Annual Reports.  Evaluation reports.  Training protocols. | Refer to risks listed under Outcome 2. |
| **Output 2.3d Integrated fish and rice farming activities tested for its ability to diversify incomes away from maize production.** | Percentage increase in agricultural incomes in the pilot sites.  Number of “integrated fish and rice farming groups” established and trained at each of the pilot sites that identified this as a priority intervention.  Number of farmers who undertake integrated fish and rice farming. | To date, integrated fish and rice farming has not been implemented in AER I or II. | 10% increase in agricultural incomes  By year 1, 1 integrated fish and rice farming group established at 1 pilot site.  By year 2, 20 people, including 10 women, have been trained to form management committees at each of the pilot sites that identified integrated fish and rice farming as a priority.  By year 3, 60 farmers have undertaken integrated fish and rice farming. | Field Surveys  Annual Reports.  Evaluation reports.  Training protocols. | Refer to risks listed under Outcome 2. |
| **Output 2.3e. Additional Non-Timber Forest Products (NTFPs) tested for its ability to diversify incomes away from maize production.** | Percentage increase in agricultural incomes in the pilot sites.  Number of suitable NTFPs identified  Number of feasibility assessments on extraction methods undertaken.  Number of people trained on NTFP for use as an alternative livelihood.  Improved market linkages established.  Potential to access carbon finance assessed. | Zambia has one of the largest annual deforestation rates in the world, mainly because of timber extraction and clearing for agriculture.  Community members within Kasaya do partake in the harvesting of NTFPs but these are currently practiced on a small scale and market linkages are lacking. Constraints exist that prevent the upscaling of NTFP production (see paragraph 118). | 10% increase in agricultural incomes  By year 2, 3 NTFPs have been identified.  By Year 2, 3 feasibility assessments have been undertaken  By year 2, 60 people have been trained on the benefits, uses and sustainable exploitation methods of NTFPs.  By year 3, all identified NTFPs are linked to marketing mediums such as COMACO.  Report that recommends action to access carbon finance. | Field Surveys  Annual Reports.  Evaluation reports.  Training protocols.  Report. | Refer to risks listed under Outcome 2. |
| **Output 2.4: Community-based water storage and irrigation systems improved or developed to test their ability to raise agricultural productivity,** | | | | | |
| **Output 2.4a. Community-level, multipurpose dams in Kasaya, Sioma, Zalapango and Kabeleka constructed and irrigation systems tested for their ability to improve agricultural productivity.** | Percentage increase in agricultural incomes in the pilot sites.  Number of management committees established and trained.  Number of farmers trained on water management, irrigation techniques (such as scheduling), appropriate water extraction methods, irrigated crop production, fish farming, livestock production as well as usage of communal water resources.  Number of dams constructed, with appropriate management (including cost recovery) plans in place, agreed by all stakeholders, for sustainability beyond the project grant.  Extent of area under irrigation as a result of project. | Zambia holds c. 40% of water in Southern Africa, but less than 5% of land is irrigated. Agriculture in AER I and II is largely rain-fed and therefore susceptible to drought, which climate change is expected to worsen.  Water storage facilities in the pilot sites are in poor condition or lacking altogether, mostly as a result of a lack of ownership and insufficient knowledge on the management of facilities (see paragraph 125).  Irrigation facilities are most often in disrepair and require rehabilitation, as a result of poor management arrangements, including cost recovery, improper water extraction methods and a lack of ownership (see paragraph 125). | 10% increase in agricultural incomes  By year 1, establish 4 management committees in 4 pilot sites.  By year 2, 40 people, including 20 women, have been trained to form 4 management committees (one at each site).  By year 2, 1000 farmers trained.  By year 3, 4 dams are constructed.  By year 3, at least 227 ha are under irrigation. | Field Surveys  Annual Reports.  Evaluation reports.  Training protocols. | Refer to risks listed under Outcome 2. |
| **Output 2.4b: A community-level earth dam in Chikowa constructed and irrigation system tested for its ability improve agricultural productivity.** | Percentage increase in agricultural incomes in the pilot sites.  Number of management committees established and trained.  Number of farmers trained on water management, irrigation techniques (such as scheduling), appropriate water extraction methods, irrigated crop production, fish farming, livestock production as well as usage of communal water resources.  Number of dams constructed, with appropriate management (including cost recovery) plans in place, agreed by all stakeholders, for sustainability beyond the project grant.  Extent of area under irrigation as a result of project. | Zambia holds c. 40% of water in Southern Africa, but less than 5% of land is irrigated. Agriculture in AER I and II is largely rain-fed and therefore susceptible to drought, which climate change is expected to worsen.  Water storage facilities in the pilot sites are in poor condition or lacking altogether, mostly as a result of a lack of ownership and insufficient knowledge on the management of facilities (see paragraph 125).  Irrigation facilities are most often in disrepair and require rehabilitation, as a result of poor management arrangements, including cost recovery, improper water extraction methods and a lack of ownership (see paragraph 125). | 10% increase in agricultural incomes  By year 1, establish one management committee at the Chikowa pilot site.  By year 2, 10 people, including 5 women, have been trained to form 1 management committee at Chikowa.  By year 2, XX farmers have been trained.  By year 3, 1 earth dam has been constructed.  By year 3, 80 ha are under irrigation. | Field Surveys  Annual Reports.  Evaluation reports.  Training protocols. | Refer to risks listed under Outcome 2. |
| **Output 2.4.c. A community-level storm water dam in Kasaya constructed and irrigation system tested for its ability to improve agricultural productivity.** | Percentage increase in agricultural incomes in the pilot sites.  Number of management committees established and trained.  Number of farmers trained on water management, irrigation techniques (such as scheduling), appropriate water extraction methods, irrigated crop production, fish farming, livestock production as well as usage of communal water resources.  Number of storm water dams constructed, with appropriate management (including cost recovery) plans in place, agreed by all stakeholders, for sustainability beyond the project grant.  Extent of area under irrigation as a result of project. | Zambia holds c. 40% of water in Southern Africa, but less than 5% of land is irrigated. Agriculture in AER I and II is largely rain-fed and therefore susceptible to drought, which climate change is expected to worsen.  Water storage facilities in the pilot sites are in poor condition or lacking altogether, mostly as a result of a lack of ownership and insufficient knowledge on the management of facilities (see paragraph 125).  Irrigation facilities are most often in disrepair and require rehabilitation, as a result of poor management arrangements, including cost recovery, improper water extraction methods and a lack of ownership (see paragraph 125). | 10% increase in agricultural incomes  By year 1, establish one management committee at the Kasaya pilot site.  By year 2, 10 people, including 5 women, have been trained to form 1 management committee at Kasaya.  By year 2, 150 farmers have been trained.  By year 3, 6 storm water dams have been constructed.  By year 3, 28 ha are under irrigation. | Field Surveys  Annual Reports.  Evaluation reports.  Training protocols. | Refer to risks listed under Outcome 2. |
| **Output 2.4d: A community-level reservoir in Lusitu constructed and irrigation system tested for its ability to improve agricultural productivity.** | Percentage increase in agricultural incomes in the pilot sites.  Number of management committees established and trained.  Number of farmers trained on water management, irrigation techniques (such as scheduling), appropriate water extraction methods, irrigated crop production, fish farming, livestock production as well as usage of communal water resources.  Number of reservoirs constructed, with appropriate management (including cost recovery) plans in place, agreed by all stakeholders, for sustainability beyond the project grant.  Extent of area under irrigation as a result of project. | Zambia holds c. 40% of water in Southern Africa, but less than 5% of land is irrigated. Agriculture in AER I and II is largely rain-fed and therefore susceptible to drought, which climate change is expected to worsen.  Water storage facilities in the pilot sites are in poor condition or lacking altogether, mostly as a result of a lack of ownership and insufficient knowledge on the management of facilities (see paragraph 125).  Irrigation facilities are most often in disrepair and require rehabilitation, as a result of poor management arrangements, including cost recovery, improper water extraction methods and a lack of ownership (see paragraph 125). | 10% increase in agricultural incomes  By year 1, establish a management committee at the Lisutu pilot site.  By year 2, 10 people, including 5 women, have been trained to form 1 management committee at Lusitu.  By year 2, 150 farmers have been trained.  By year 3, 2 reservoirs have been constructed.  By year 3, 52 ha are under irrigation. | Field Surveys  Annual Reports.  Evaluation reports.  Training protocols. | Refer to risks listed under Outcome 2. |
| **Output 2.4e:**  **A community-level weir in Kasaya constructed and irrigation system tested for its ability to improve agricultural productivity.** | Percentage increase in agricultural incomes in the pilot sites.  Number of management committees established and trained.  Number of farmers trained on water management, irrigation techniques (such as scheduling), appropriate water extraction methods, irrigated crop production, fish farming, livestock production as well as usage of communal water resources.  Number of weirs constructed, with appropriate management (including cost recovery) plans in place, agreed by all stakeholders, for sustainability beyond the project grant.  Extent of area under irrigation as a result of project. | Zambia holds c. 40% of water in Southern Africa, but less than 5% of land is irrigated. Agriculture in AER I and II is largely rain-fed and therefore susceptible to drought, which climate change is expected to worsen.  Water storage facilities in the pilot sites are in poor condition or lacking altogether, mostly as a result of a lack of ownership and insufficient knowledge on the management of facilities (see paragraph 125).  Irrigation facilities are most often in disrepair and require rehabilitation, as a result of poor management arrangements, including cost recovery, improper water extraction methods and a lack of ownership (see paragraph 125). | 10% increase in agricultural incomes  By year 1, establish a management committee at the Kasaya pilot site.  By year 2, 10 people, including 5 women, have been trained to form 1 management committee at Kasaya.  By year 2, 200 farmers have been trained.  By year 3, 3 weirs have been constructed.  By year 3, 39 ha are under irrigation. | Field Surveys  Annual Reports.  Evaluation reports.  Training protocols. | Refer to risks listed under Outcome 2. |
| **Output 2.4f:**  **A community level irrigation system in Lusitu rehabilitated and tested for its ability to improve agricultural productivity.** | Percentage increase in agricultural incomes in the pilot sites.  Number of management committees established and trained.  Number of farmers trained on water management, irrigation techniques (such as scheduling), appropriate water extraction methods, irrigated crop production, fish farming, livestock production as well as usage of communal water resources.  Number of irrigation systems rehabilitated, with appropriate management (including cost recovery) plans in place, agreed by all stakeholders, for sustainability beyond the project grant.  Extent of area under irrigation as a result of project. | Agriculture in AER I and II is largely rain-fed and therefore susceptible to drought.  Irrigation facilities are most often in disrepair and require rehabilitation, as a result of poor management arrangements, including cost recovery, improper water extraction methods and a lack of ownership (see paragraph 125). | 10% increase in agricultural incomes  By year 1, establish a management committee at the Lisutu pilot site.  By year 2, 10 people, including 5 women, have been trained to form 1 management committee at Lusitu.  By year 2, 150 farmers have been trained.  By year 3, 2 irrigation systems have been rehabilitated.  By year 3, 22 ha are under irrigation. | Field Surveys  Annual Reports.  Evaluation reports.  Training protocols. | Refer to risks listed under Outcome 2. |
| **Outcome 3: National fiscal, regulatory and development policy revised to promote adaptation responses in the agricultural sector.** | | | | | |
| **Output 3.1. Awareness of climate change risks and to the economic value of adaptation responses raised among policy- and decision-makers.** | Number of awareness and training materials (such as briefing notes, fact sheets and cross-sectoral guides) developed for sectoral planners on the need to incorporate climate change considerations into agricultural planning, including the economic benefits thereof.  Number of training seminars on climate resilient agricultural planning developed and conducted for MACO, ZMD, DWA, DMMU and MTENR  Number of training workshops designed and conducted in each of the eight pilot districts for agricultural and natural resources subcommittees of the district development coordinating committee (DDCC), the Non-Governmental Coordinating Committees (NGOCC) and other relevant district level stakeholders.  Functional climate resource and support centres in the eight pilot districts. | At present, the different sectors and institutions have been addressing climate change issues in an ad hoc manner  At present, there are no awareness and training materials that are developed based on actual adaptation practices in Zambia  At present, only a few senior staff have attended seminars or trainings on climate resilient agricultural planning in the government departments.  Only a few of the members of the Agricultural and Natural Resources Subcommittees of the PDCC and DDCC are trained on climate change considerations for planning purposes | By year 4, at least 1 national workshop is conducted to discuss the project findings and recommendations  By year 4, the PDCC and the DDCC are able to coordinate climate change activities to ensure coordinated approach  By year 4, at least 3 briefing notes, 3 fact sheets and one cross sectoral guide produced.  By year 4, at least 3 national training seminars on climate resilient agriculture planning developed and conducted for planners from the MACO, ZMD, DWA, DMMU and MTENR  By year 4, at least 60 government officials working in the planning section of the relevant ministries/department, including the ministries mentioned above trained.  By year 1, all the members of the PDCC and 50% of the members of the DDCC Agriculture and Natural Resources subcommittees are trained on incorporating climate change considerations in planning processes. | Number of workshops conducted  Field surveys  Field reports | The project interventions are able to generate convincing benefits.  The current interest in climate change issues among planners in the ministries is sustained. |
| **Output 3.2. National policy dialogues conducted to discuss project findings in relation to cost-effectiveness of piloted adaptation options.** | Number of meetings or workshops conducted between the members of the DDCC, PDCC and the District NGOCC to enable coordinated and climate-resilient development planning in the vulnerable provinces. | At present, there is a lack of coordination and dialogue processes on climate change adaptation. | By year 4, at least 4 meetings/workshops have been conducted. | Project reports  Project reports | The project interventions are able to generate convincing benefits.  Support and coordination from other key stakeholders  Policy stakeholders are willing to make changes in policy based on emerging issues and community needs |
| **Output 3.3. Policies that require adjustments to promote adaptation identified and reviewed.** | Number of sectoral policies that promote or impede the resilience of communities within AER I and II to climate change analysed.  Number of policy notes developed for each sectoral policy analysed outlining and demonstrating the impacts, costs and benefits of a particular sectoral policy on the resilience of livelihoods in AER I and II.  Number of gaps in the existing policies, relating to climate change identified. | The current policies and provincial/ district plans do not exclusively address climate change | By year 4, 2 provincial plans and district plans and 5 key national policies are revised to promote sustainable climate resilient development.  By year 2, recommendations developed for at least 5 sectoral policies.  By year 3, at least 5 policy notes developed. | Project reports. |  |
| **Outcome 4. Lessons learned and knowledge management component established** | | | | | |
| **Output 4.1. Knowledge and lessons learned to support implementation of adaptation measures compiled and disseminated.** | Number of lessons systemized.  Number of lessons included in the ALM.  Number of lessons included on wikiADAPT.  Number of project documents included on the CCFU website.  Number of briefing papers documenting lessons learned developed and published in peer-review journals.  Number of regional and national workshops conducted for dissemination of project lessons.  Number of radio and television programmes developed to convey project lessons.  Number of newsletters produced.  Number of community workshops conducted.  The number of awareness campaigns conducted on the need to incorporate adaptation needs in policy. | Development projects at present, do not systematically benefit from learning practices and project lessons on community-based adaptation  Zambia, is at present, not contributing to the ALM  At present, there is no systematic knowledge transfer on climate change adaptation in Zambia | By Year 3, at least 1 good practice fact sheet produced for each pilot intervention and distributed.  All monitoring and evaluation reports are screened for inclusion in the ALM by six months after end of the project.  By year 4, at least 20 key project lessons are captured and disseminated in the ALM and on wikiADAPT.  By year 4, all project documents are available on the CCFU website, on a page dedicated to the project.  By year 4, at least 1 national and 1 international workshop on adaptation to effects of drought and climate change is conducted.  By year 4, at least 2 radio and 2 television programmes have been developed and aired.  By year 4, at least 1 work for each of the 8 pilots has been held.  By year 4, at least 2 campaigns have been conducted | Project documents, proposals, research papers, ALM platform, and Workshop proceedings | The ALM is functional to facilitate learning  The communities and regional actors are interested in knowledge sharing.  Other regions and countries believe experiences from the project are applicable to their situations. |

Annex B: List of Documents to be reviewed by the evaluators

1. GEF Project Information Form (PIF), Project Document, and Log Frame Analysis (LFA)
2. Project Implementation Plan
3. Implementing/Executing partner arrangements
4. List and contact details for project staff, key project stakeholders, including Project Boards, and other partners to be consulted
5. Project sites, highlighting suggested visits
6. Mid Term Review (MTR) Report
7. Annual Project Implementation (APR/PIR) Reports
8. Project budget and financial data
9. Project Tracking Tool, at the baseline and at the mid-term
10. UNDP Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF)
11. UNDP Country Programme Document (CPD)
12. UNDP Country Programme Action Plan (CPAP)
13. GEF focal area strategic program objectives

Annex C: Evaluation Questions

This Evaluation Criteria Matrix must be fully completed by the consultant and included in the TE Inception report and as an Annex to the TE report.

| **Evaluative Criteria Questions** | | **Indicators** | **Sources** | **Methodology** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Relevance: How does the project relate to the main objectives of the GEF focal area, and to the environment and development priorities at the local, regional and national levels? Was the project appropriate solution to the problem? | | | | |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved? To what extent were the appropriateness, evaluability and measurability of the results framework and its associated indicators and the M&E system that was put in place? What were the factors beyond the control of executing and implementing agencies that may have affected the attainment of results and how the risks have been managed during programme implementation? | | | | | |
|  |  |  |  |  | |
|  |  |  |  |  | |
|  |  |  |  |  | |
| Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards? Was implementation of the programme and its achievements been done in the most cost effective way? | | | | | |
|  |  |  |  |  | |
|  |  |  |  |  | |
|  |  |  |  |  | |
| Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, social-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results? Attention should be placed on the sustainability of stakeholder collaboration and management committees, the pass on mechanism and a sustainable scale-up of the newly adopted farming practices and alternative livelihoods | | | | | |
|  |  |  |  |  | |
|  |  |  |  |  | |
|  |  |  |  |  | |
| Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward, reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status? What are the manifestations or early indications of long term changes in the living conditions, resilience and environmental considerations of the targeted communities that can be attributed to the project or those the project has contributed to? | | | | | |
|  |  |  |  |  | |
|  |  |  |  |  | |

Annex D: Rating Scales

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| ***Ratings for Effectiveness, Efficiency, M&E, IA & EA Execution*** | ***Sustainability ratings:*** | ***Relevance ratings*** |
| 6: Highly Satisfactory (HS): no shortcomings  5: Satisfactory (S): minor shortcomings  4: Moderately Satisfactory (MS)  3. Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): significant shortcomings  2. Unsatisfactory (U): major problems  1. Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): severe problems | 4. Likely (L): negligible risks to sustainability | 2. Relevant (R) |
| 3. Moderately Likely (ML):moderate risks | 1.. Not relevant (NR) |
| 2. Moderately Unlikely (MU): significant risks  1. Unlikely (U): severe risks |  |
| *Additional ratings where relevant:*  Not Applicable (N/A)  Unable to Assess (U/A | | |

Annex E: Evaluation Consultant Code of Conduct and Agreement Form

**Evaluators:**

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

**Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form[[3]](#footnote-3)**

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

**Name of Consultant:** \_\_     \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

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

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

Signed at *place* on *date*

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

Annex F: Evaluation Report Outline[[4]](#footnote-4)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **i.** | Opening page:   * Title of UNDP supported GEF financed project * UNDP and GEF project ID#s. * Evaluation time frame and date of evaluation report * Region and countries included in the project * GEF Operational Program/Strategic Program * 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  (See: UNDP Editorial Manual[[5]](#footnote-5)) |
| **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  (In addition to a descriptive assessment, all criteria marked with (\*) must be rated[[6]](#footnote-6)) |
| **3.1** | Project Design / Formulation   * Analysis of LFA/Results Framework (Project logic /strategy; Indicators) * Assumptions and Risks * Lessons from other relevant projects (e.g., same focal area) incorporated into project design * Planned stakeholder participation * Replication approach * UNDP comparative advantage * Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector * Management arrangements |
| **3.2** | Project Implementation   * Adaptive management (changes to the project design and project outputs during implementation) * Partnership arrangements (with relevant stakeholders involved in the country/region) * Feedback from M&E activities used for adaptive management * Project Finance * Monitoring and evaluation: design at entry (\*), implementation (\*) and overall assessment (\*) * Implementing Agency (UNDP) execution (\*) and Executing Agency execution (\*), overall project implementation/ execution (\*), coordination, and operational issues |
| **3.3** | Project Results   * Overall results (attainment of objectives) (\*) * Relevance(\*) * Effectiveness (\*) * Efficiency (\*) * Country ownership * Mainstreaming * Sustainability: financial resources (\*), socio-economic (\*), institutional framework and governance (\*), environmental (\*), and overall likelihood (\*) * Impact |
| **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 * Evaluation Question Matrix * Questionnaire used and summary of results * Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form |

Annex G: Evaluation Report Clearance Form

*(to be completed by CO and UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based in the region and included in the final document)*

Evaluation Report Reviewed and Cleared by

UNDP Country Office

Name: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

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

UNDP GEF RTA

Name: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

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

1. For additional information on methods, see the [Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results](http://www.undp.org/evaluation/handbook), Chapter 7, pg. 163 [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. A useful tool for gauging progress to impact is the Review of Outcomes to Impacts (ROtI) method developed by the GEF Evaluation Office:  [ROTI Handbook 2009](http://www.thegef.org/gef/sites/thegef.org/files/documents/M2_ROtI%20Handbook.pdf) [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. The Report length should not exceed *40* pages in total (not including annexes). [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. UNDP Style Manual, Office of Communications, Partnerships Bureau, updated November 2008 [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. Using the mandatory rating scale as given in Annex D of this ToR. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)