

## TERMINAL EVALUATION TERMS OF REFERENCE

### BASIC INFORMATION

---

<b>Location:</b>	Maldives
<b>Application Deadline:</b>	22 <sup>nd</sup> October 2015
<b>Type of Contract:</b>	Individual Contract
<b>Post Level:</b>	<i>International Consultant</i>
<b>Languages Required:</b>	<i>English</i>
<b>Starting Date:</b> (date when the selected candidate is expected to start)	10 <sup>th</sup> November 2015
<b>Duration of Initial Contract:</b>	10 <sup>th</sup> November 2015 to 28 <sup>th</sup> December 2015
<b>Expected Duration of Assignment:</b>	<i>35 Days</i>

### BACKGROUND

---

In accordance with United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and Adaptation Fund (AF) M&E policies and procedures, all regular UNDP supported 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 project titled Integrating Climate Change Risks into Resilient Island Planning in the Maldives programme (PIMS #4093).

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

Project Title: Integrating Climate Change Risks into Resilient Island Planning

ICCRRIP Project ID: 00072423

UNDP Project ID (PIMS#): 4093

Executing Agency: Ministry of Environment and Energy

Other Partners involved: Ministry of Housing, Environment and Transport

LDCF financing at endorsement (Million US\$): \$4,485,000

Total co-financing financing at endorsement (Million US\$): \$4,851,211

ProDoc Signature (date project began): 03 December 2009

(Operational) Closing Date (proposed): 31 December 2015

#### OBJECTIVE AND SCOPE:

The project was designed to: contribute to the government's goal of mainstreaming climate risk planning and climate change adaptation into the country's development policy and planning frameworks across all sectors. The project was expecting to achieve this by overcoming the key barriers to such mainstreaming in the areas of land use planning, coastal protection and coastal development, which have been identified as areas needing urgent and immediate attention in the country's National Adaptation Plan of Action. Thus, under Outcome 1, the project was expected to strengthen institutional and individual capacity for climate risk planning at the national, atoll and island levels. Outcome 2 of the project was expected to addresses key policy and intersectoral coordination gaps, and seeks to strengthen the enabling environment for future decentralized planning, by integrating climate risk reduction measures into key national policies on environment, land use, decentralization, privatization and disaster risk reduction. Additionally, detailed

technical guidelines on climate resilient coastal protection, coastal development and land-use planning relevant to the Maldivian context was expected to be developed to assist planners, decision-makers and technical specialists evaluate climate risks when making development and investment decisions. Outcome 3 was expected to focus on developing the adaptation capacity of island communities and local authorities. Under this Outcome, the project is expected to demonstrate practical, locally prioritized adaptation options for flooding and erosion control on at least four islands in four different atolls, focusing on “soft” adaptation measures. However The project board has decided to reduce the number of demonstration islands from 4 to 2 based on fund availability as coastal protection interventions cannot be done for just one portion of a shoreline. Under Outcome 4, lessons learned and adaptation knowledge generated through the project is expected to be systematically compiled, analyzed and disseminated nationally and internationally, thereby supporting further up-scaling and replication.

The TE will be conducted according to the guidance, rules and procedures reflected in the ‘UNDP Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-supported, GEF-financed Projects’ (2012), henceforth referred to as ‘TE Guidance’.<sup>1</sup>

The objectives of the evaluation are to assess the achievement of project 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.

#### **EVALUATION APPROACH AND METHOD:**

An overall approach and method for conducting project terminal evaluations of UNDP supported AF 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 TE Guidance. A set of questions covering each of these criteria will be provided to the selected evaluator. 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 AF operational focal point, UNDP Country Office, project team, UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based in the region and key stakeholders.

#### **DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES**

---

The evaluator is expected to conduct a field mission to **Maldives** including the following project sites G.Dh Thinadhoo and H.Dh Kulhudhuffushi. Interviews will be held with the following organizations and individuals at a minimum:

Ministry of Environment and Energy

Ministry of Fisheries and Agriculture

Ministry of Tourism

Ministry of Finance and Treasury (Economic Development Policy Department (EDPD))

Ministry of Economic Development

National Disaster Management Center

Ministry of Education

Private Sector

Provincial Utility Companies

---

<sup>1</sup> The guidance document for UNDP-supported GEF financed projects can be used for AF financed projects as well. The document is available via this [link](#).

Members of Island Council and Atoll Council, island authorities  
Environmental NGOs  
Relevant UN Agencies

The evaluator will review all relevant sources of information, such as the project document, project reports – including Annual PPRs, project budget revisions, midterm review, progress reports, ICCR tracking tools, project files, national strategic and legal documents, and any other materials that the evaluator considers useful for this evidence-based assessment. The project team will provide these documents to the selected evaluator.

#### **EVALUATION CRITERIA & RATINGS:**

An assessment of project performance will be carried out, based against expectations set out in the Project Logical Framework/Results Framework, 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:

- Monitoring and Evaluation design at entry
- Monitoring and Evaluation Plan Implementation
- Overall quality of M&E
- Relevance
- Effectiveness
- Efficiency
- Overall Project Outcome Rating
- Quality of UNDP Implementation – Implementing Agency (IA)
- Quality of Execution - Executing Agency (EA)
- Overall quality of Implementation / Execution
- Sustainability of Financial resources
- Socio-political Sustainability
- Institutional framework and governance sustainability
- Environmental sustainability
- Overall likelihood of sustainability

The completed Required Ratings table (as found in the TE Guidance) must be included in the evaluation executive summary. The obligatory rating scales can be found in the TE Guidance.

A full recommended report outline can be found in the TE Guidance.

#### **PROJECT FINANCE AND CO-FINANCE:**

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 Required Co-financing Table (as found in the TE Guidance), which will be included in the terminal evaluation report.

#### **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 [a useful tool for gauging progress to impact is the 2009 Review of Outcomes to Impacts (ROtI) method developed by the GEF Evaluation Office].

#### **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 **Maldives**. 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.

#### **EVALUATION TIMEFRAME:**

The total duration of the evaluation will be 35 working days .

- Start date: 10<sup>th</sup> November
- Mission: 10 days
- 1<sup>st</sup> draft for review: 10<sup>th</sup> December 2015
- Final report: 27<sup>th</sup> December 2015

#### **DELIVERABLES:**

The evaluation team is expected to deliver the following:

- Inception Report: Evaluator provides clarifications on timing and method, Evaluator submits to UNDP CO no later than 2 weeks before the evaluation mission
- Presentation of Initial Findings: Evaluator submits to project management and UNDP CO at the end of evaluation mission
- Draft Final Report: Full report (per template provided in TE Guidance) with annexes, Evaluator submits to CO within 3 weeks of the evaluation mission, reviewed by RTA, PCU, AF OFPs
- Final Report: Revised report, Evaluator submits to CO within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft

\*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.

#### **PAYMENT MODALITIES AND SPECIFICATIONS:**

- 10%- at submission and approval of inception report
- 40%- 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

## COMPETENCIES

---

### CORPORATE COMPETENCIES:

- Demonstrates integrity by modelling the UN's values and ethical standards;
- Promotes the vision, mission and strategic goals of UN/UNDP;
- Displays cultural, gender, religion, race, nationality and age sensitivity and adaptability;

### FUNCTIONAL COMPETENCIES:

- Ability to lead strategic planning, results-based management and reporting;
- Builds strong relationships with clients, focuses on impact and result for the client and responds positively to feedback;
- Consistently approaches work with energy and a positive, constructive attitude;
- Demonstrates good oral and written communication skills;
- Demonstrates ability to manage complexities and work under pressure, as well as conflict resolution skills.
- Capability to work effectively under deadline pressure and to take on a range of responsibilities;
- Ability to work in a team, good decision-making skills, communication and writing skills.

Evaluation consultants will be held to the highest ethical standards and are required to sign a Code of Conduct upon acceptance of the assignment. UNDP evaluations are conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG 'Ethical Guideline for Evaluations.'

## REQUIRED SKILLS AND EXPERIENCE

---

The evaluation team will be composed of *(1international)*. *(If the team has more than 1 evaluator, one will be designated as the team leader and will be responsible for finalizing the report)*. The evaluators selected should not have participated in the project preparation and/or implementation and should not have conflict of interest with project related activities.

### EDUCATION:

- An advanced degree in relevant field: Climate Change Adaptation

### EXPERIENCE:

- Minimum 5 years of relevant professional experience in area of integrated water resource management, with particular focus on water production and distribution technologies
- Knowledge of and experience with UNDP and/or AF (10%);
- Previous experience with results-based monitoring and evaluation methodologies (25%);
- Technical knowledge and experience in the area of integrated water resource management, with particular focus on water production and distribution technologies (20%);
- Evidence in providing technical assistance to and / or in evaluating water sector related projects (10%);
- Experience with evaluating similar projects is an advantage;

### LANGUAGE:

- Fluency in written and spoken English is required.

### APPLICATION REQUIREMENTS:

Qualified candidates are requested to apply online via this website. The application should contain:

- CV In English
- Financial Proposal\*- (using the standard template) Costs related to missions will be paid separately as per UNDP rules and regulations;
- Incomplete applications will not be considered. Please make sure you have provided all requested materials.
- **Please note that UNDP jobsite system allows only one uploading of application document, so please make sure that you merge all your documents into one single file.**

\*Please note that the financial proposal is all-inclusive and shall take into account various expenses incurred by the consultant/contractor during the contract period (e.g. fee, health insurance, vaccination and any other relevant expenses related to the performance of services...).

Payments will be made only upon confirmation of UNDP on delivering on the contract obligations in a satisfactory manner.

Individual Consultants are responsible for ensuring they have vaccinations/inoculations when travelling to certain countries, as designated by the UN Medical Director. Consultants are also required to comply with the UN security directives set forth under [dss.un.org](http://dss.un.org)

General Terms and conditions as well as other related documents can be found under: <http://on.undp.org/t7fJs>.  
**Qualified women and members of minorities are encouraged to apply.**

Due to large number of applications we receive, we are able to inform only the successful candidates about the outcome or status of the selection process.

#### **EVALUATION OF APPLICANTS:**

Individual consultants will be evaluated based on a cumulative analysis taking into consideration the combination of the applicants' qualifications and financial proposal.

The award of the contract should be made to the individual consultant whose offer has been evaluated and determined as:

- Responsive/compliant/acceptable; and
- Having received the highest score out of a pre-determined set of weighted technical (desk reviews based on cv) and financial criteria specific to the solicitation.

Only the highest ranked candidates who would be found qualified for the job will be considered for the Financial Evaluation.

Technical Criteria - 70% of total evaluation

Financial Criteria - 30% of total evaluation

## ANNEX A: PROJECT LOGICAL FRAMEWORK

---

*(to be added)*

## ANNEX B: LIST OF DOCUMENTS TO BE REVIEWED BY THE EVALUATORS

---

*(to be added, for example:)*

*ICCRRIP Concept and/or Proposal, Project Document, and Log Frame Analysis (LFA)*

*Project Implementation Plan*

*Implementing/Executing partner arrangements*

*List and contact details for project staff, key project stakeholders, including Project Boards, and other partners to be consulted*

*Project sites, highlighting suggested visits*

*Mid Term Review (MTR) Report*

*Annual Project Performance Reports (PPR)*

*Project budget and financial data*

*Project Tracking Tool, at the baseline and at the mid-term*

*UNDP Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF)*

*UNDP Country Programme Document (CPD)*

*UNDP Country Programme Action Plan (CPAP)*

## ANNEX C: EVALUATION QUESTIONS

This Evaluation Criteria Matrix must be amended and fully completed by the consultant and included in the TE Inception Report and as an Annex to the TE report. Some sample evaluation questions have been inserted into the Matrix.

Evaluative Criteria Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
<b>Relevance: How does the project relate to the main objectives of the ICCRRIP, and to the environment and development priorities at the local, regional and national levels?</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Has the project enabled coastal adaptation into the planning and development stage of the two target islands?</li> </ul>	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
<b>Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved?</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Has the project used adequate technology and durable equipment to ensure the adaptability of the two islands focused in for the climate change adaptation</li> </ul>	•	•	•
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Are all Standards of Operations (SOPs) fully in place for safety and quality assurance of the installed infrastructure?</li> </ul>	•	•	•
•		•	•
<b>Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards?</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Are operations and maintenance procedures detailed for adaptation structures? Has the O&amp;M budget secured and if yes how (source/s) and if not why?</li> </ul>	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
	•	•	•



•			
<b>Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, social-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?</b>			
• How much public consultancy was undertaken during the scoping studies of the project and how much support was received during the project?	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
<b>Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward, reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status?</b>			
• Has capacity development work completed, including associated trainings to ensure maintenance of the structures used in the project?	•	•	•
•			
•	•	•	•

## ANNEX D: REQUIRED RATING TABLE AND RATING SCALES

<b>Evaluation Ratings:</b>			
<b>1. Monitoring and Evaluation</b>	<i>rating</i>	<b>2. IA &amp; EA Execution</b>	<i>rating</i>
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	
<b>3. Assessment of Outcomes</b>	<i>rating</i>	<b>4. Sustainability</b>	<i>rating</i>
Relevance		Financial resources:	
Effectiveness		Socio-political:	
Efficiency		Institutional framework and governance:	
Overall Project Outcome Rating		Environmental:	
		Overall likelihood of sustainability:	

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

## 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<sup>2</sup>

#### 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: \_\_\_\_\_

---

<sup>2</sup>[www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct](http://www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct)

## ANNEX F: EVALUATION REPORT OUTLINE<sup>3</sup>

---

- i. Opening page:
  - Title of UNDP supported financed project
  - UNDP and 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  
(See: UNDP Editorial Manual<sup>4</sup>)
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<sup>5</sup>)
- 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

---

<sup>3</sup>The Report length should not exceed 40 pages in total (not including annexes).

<sup>4</sup> UNDP Style Manual, Office of Communications, Partnerships Bureau, updated November 2008

<sup>5</sup> Using a six-point rating scale: 6: Highly Satisfactory, 5: Satisfactory, 4: Marginally Satisfactory, 3: Marginally Unsatisfactory, 2: Unsatisfactory and 1: Highly Unsatisfactory, see section 3.5, page 37 for ratings explanations.

- 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
- *Annexed in a separate file:* TE audit trail
- *Annexed in a separate file:* Terminal AF Tracking Tool, if applicable

**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: \_\_\_\_\_

## ANNEX H: TE REPORT AUDIT TRAIL

The following is a template for the evaluator to show how the received comments on the draft TE report have (or have not) been incorporated into the final TE report. This audit trail should be included as an annex in the final TE report.

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

*The following comments were provided in track changes to the draft Terminal Evaluation report; they are referenced by institution ("Author" column) and track change comment number ("#" column):*

Author	#	Para No./ comment location	Comment/Feedback on the draft TE report	TE team response and actions taken