

construction, M&E and subsequent follow-up of final beneficiaries and benefits. As for the final beneficiaries, participation was at least adequate in most project sites but CR knowledge remained limited (possibly because of disjoint implementation of components 2 and 3).

4.1.1 Major achievements and strengths

- The CRVA approach is an effective tool for involving the population into the project and providing a bird’s view on the local issues that are translated into land use plans, some relevant components of which can be funded by a climate proofing project; in this particular intervention, it came up too late for many sites that had already moved on with infrastructures that did not take into consideration EbA measures (hence, no stakeholder had an overview of the issues so as to optimise CR responses).
- Higher construction standards were used, resulting in longer lifetime (estimate 2-3X as previously); these are however not on par with international standards.
- The project produced updated CR guidelines / EbA guidelines, the earlier being approved officially by Government; however, this is only for use through the DDFF mechanism and there are no prospects to adapt the technical aspects of these specific guidelines into the national code of construction or into a generic approach CR constructions.
- The project was successful in developing inter-sectoral collaboration at district level with sector-wide staff benefitting from trainings and workshops; hence a good understanding of the issues and potential solutions for CR at district authorities’ level.
- The project adopted a successful participatory approach that resulted in enhanced ownership (but actually little empowerment): communities were invited to participate in the selection of sites, design solutions and on ownership / maintenance.
- The project managed to develop an exit strategy – but just short - following the MTR’s recommendations: this will ensure that the project’s benefit will be mainstreamed into the next generation of decentralised DDF project (GPAR ‘phase II’). Should this not have been successful, there would have been a real risk of project’s achievement collapse as interviews showed that the subnational level is not in a position to unilaterally implement customised / specific approaches to development (like adapting these guidelines to the local context for other funds or donor/government sponsored interventions).

4.1.2 Key shortcomings and weaknesses

- The project sustainability model is no different from other interventions: it is expected from the final beneficiaries that they will contribute to maintenance and they expect Government contribution in case of repairs, which costs are not to be borne by the communities for lack of resources. This has to do with the project ‘pro-poor’ approach under which economic and income aspects are only second to poverty reduction aspects.
The project lacked a value chain approach and did not view in a comprehensive manner the economic value of the infrastructures and the additional support required to use them to their full potential.
- While no efforts were spared to involve communities, local community stakeholders’ engagement (to take advantage of the added value of these upgraded infrastructures) remained weak from the start : interviews showed that Government is still viewed as the primary carer of

rural infrastructures; this may have to do with the absence of combined economic support to the communities ; while these infrastructures do raise their living standard, they do not generate enough (financial) benefit to the point that it becomes unacceptable to let them degrade and have their economic situation reverse back.

- The project lacked a communication strategy: after the MTR, a lot of activities were carried out for this purpose; these however did not fit in a project communication plan (i) towards the general public to ensure empathy and create provincial / nation-wide discussion on CR, that in turn would leverage any effort by the project by influence policy making (should there have been project component on creating an enabling environment at government level to take advantage of projects’ technical / methodological / policy making benefits – which there was not) and (ii) towards the Government for the same as above mentioned (advocacy / influencing policy making).
- Project staff retention has been particularly low: delayed recruitment processes and changes of staff are the norm both at project level and within Government institutions; this, however, can have dire consequences in project context and should be taken into account at formulation stage; this may have exacerbated coordination difficulties between the two executing agencies (MoNRE, MoHA) resulting in disjointed implementation of activities at district level. An issue that is often overlooked is the need to adjust the job description to the level of remuneration (with complementary training/accompanying measures if necessary) and avoid selecting overqualified staff for the sake of value for money as it inevitably leads to staff migration.
- While in operational terms, the project has been very successful in taking advantage of all the available resources to ensure project results to the best extent possible, the question remains how the benefits will survive the project’s closure: interviews showed that there was no appropriation at central level of the key results of the project and that eventually, the project’s results would be integrated into a new GPAR programme; this does not resolve the issue of actually mainstreaming the project’s benefits (CR guidelines, changes in construction code, new policy on EbA...) into the relevant institutions for their own use and adaptation to the national institutional context ; financial support of DCC/Disaster management to divulge project benefits to MoNRE other departments and other ministries might be an approach to explore in the future.

4.2 Recommendations and lessons to be learned

The chapter was structured in (i) lessons learned in terms of design, implementation and M&E, (ii) potential actions to follow-up and reinforce the initial results of the project and (iii) proposals for future actions / interventions.

4.2.1 *Lessons learned for the design, implementation, monitoring, and evaluation of the project*

Design:

- In order to avoid severe coordination issues, the implementation approach should be similar for all executing parties; an hybrid implementation mechanism (decentralised DDF and centralised technical support) is not an option; should decentralised implementation be the model to follow, other critical implementation activities should be decentralised as well (technical advice,

technical design approval, staff/consultant recruitment...), meaning that the central level role should no longer be involved in technical decision making and its technical role be subordinated to clear requests from the subnational level (and no longer the other way around) ; central level’s contribution should be limited to an overall supervisory role ensuring adequate coordination between all stakeholders, provisioning the required expertise on demand to the subnational level.

- In the same vein, a more simple delivery mechanism should be considered: one ministry in charge and satellite ministries with their own budget delivering technical advice; a 2-headed implementation should be avoided at all costs.
- A formal communication strategy at formulation stage has to be included in project design (with relevant financial resources) ; it should be targeting both the general public and Government so as advocate for project’s results mainstreaming into relevant institutions
- The lack of an institutional component to facilitate Government empowerment can limit significantly a project’s impact: as this project is focussing on new methodologies, approaches and uses innovative implementation mechanisms, it is fundamental that Government is empowered with its benefits so that it might in turn take advantage of the project results added value and transform into relevant policy and mainstream it into relevant institutions if necessary; therefore, a full scale project component on mainstreaming lessons learned and good practices into Government (policy making and adoption of routine activities) is necessary for these kinds of projects: e.g. create an enabling environment for policy making & appropriation of results at central level.
- An exit strategy should include the following: (i) ensuring infrastructures’ sustainability through quality criteria’, beneficiaries ownership and economic development / income generation for M&R and (ii) empowering central Government for replication and mainstreaming into amended/upgraded policies and strategies through mobilising Government to ensure advocacy).
- A more holistic approach to ensure sustainable climate proofing of infrastructures should be considered through exploring the potential for complementarities between donor-funded interventions: agree on common intervention areas/districts for enhanced impact: e.g. WB/IFAD for economic (income generation) aspects; UNDP for social/climate resilience aspects.
- Government contribution has been limited in the project to regular co-financing (premises and HR); field visits showed that substantial Government contribution for infrastructures is possible as long as they are considered critical. Hence, future interventions should ensure that government contribution for the DDF mechanism is secured at least for strategic infrastructures.
- The project commissioned CRVA that resulted in the drafting of LUP; new interventions should ensure that these plans are indeed implemented through the project and with external funding if necessary (necessity to seek complementarities) or their scope reduced to ensure that they are implemented with project’s limited resources, so as to avoid creating community frustrations.

Implementation and M&E:

- Community engagement has to be initiated at the start of the project and sustained all along: this requires participatory selection of priority infrastructures with definition of responsibilities of community / Government and the need for formal community engagement agreements to ensure maintenance / repair policy agreed by all parties
- The implementation approach should be modified so as to integrate EbA + infrastructures as one package (preferably through infrastructure clustering under fewer EbA projects): this will facilitate ownership by communities of EbA/infrastructures, decision taking for grants approval

will be swifter and no longer depend on different decision taking levels (no need to ask central team to assess); technical support (using guidelines, design issues...) would be requested on demand only; as a complementary measure or as an add-on, the economic aspects of the package would need attention so that beneficiaries can create enough income so as to change their livelihoods and generate enough financial resources to implement a M&R program.

- The current project M&E system has been moderately satisfactory at best; in addition to quantitative result indicators, there needs to be included indicators on the quality of infrastructures (e.g. # of incidents 1-3-6 months after completion) and on ownership/empowerment by Government (e.g. creation of commissions to review policies, working groups to assess results integration into relevant technical ministries, new laws drafting...) and communities (e.g. # of WUC meeting by 1-3-6 months with meeting quality indicators, \$ contributed, # of visits to monitor infrastructure/to district authorities to report issues...). In case of economic components, relevant indicators should also be integrated into the intervention.
- The monitoring of activities (M&E) needs to be strengthened substantially both during and mostly after infrastructures completion; at district level, there needs to be a cultural change from activity monitoring to RBM so as to focus on the essential and avoid multiplying monitoring efforts that are of limited value (e.g. # of trees planted → tree density after 1y planting).
- Future interventions should pay more attention to improving the project information system within the State apparatus; interviews showed that information sharing remains limited to the official Project Board, project team and direct implementers; other institutional stakeholders (ministries) may have difficulties in accessing information and taking advantage of it and somehow a quality interaction mechanism (regular inter-sectorial meetings / external communication workshop...) may be missing for non-directly involved but still relevant technical departments to get acquainted with the project and possibly gain indirect benefits through improved information sharing.

4.2.2 Actions to follow-up or reinforce initial benefits from the project

- **Action #1: Integration of CR guidelines into new generations of development projects:**

While it may not be on par with international standards, CR guidelines have the potential to increase substantially the lifetime of infrastructures, in particular when they are tied to EbA measures. First, there should be stakeholders-wide recognition on (i) the need for CR combining EbA measures when infrastructures are dealt with within development projects and (ii) the accrued costs that it usually entails. Second, there should be a consensus amongst Government and the donor community on the necessity to use these particular CR guidelines for infrastructures in Laos when development projects are being implemented. As a first step, MoNRE and new project's teams should make the necessary adaptations for implementation within their own interventions. This can be carried out nearly immediately with 2 interventions that are about to initiate in 2018:

1. GIDP funded by UNCDF, UNDP and SDC, and
2. “Enhancing the climate and disaster resilience of the most vulnerable rural and emerging urban human settlements in Lao PDR” project funded by the Adaptation Fund and UNHABITAT.

Further discussions (lobby by UNDP) are then needed with MoNRE to set up a mechanism that ensures CR and EbA measures are checked in when formulation teams (from any donor) step in for the design of new interventions (e.g. MoNRE checklist ticked if the intervention proposal is to be accepted)

- Who is taking the lead for action #1 implementation? UNDP first, then MoNRE
- Recipients: UNCDF, MoHA, UNDP itself, UN-HABITAT, MoPWT and afterwards development donors
- Need for resources?
 - Project team time to adjust work plan, move budget lines (often meaning inflating infrastructures budget lines at the expense of other lines) and secure higher level approval (e.g. project board/ formal donor agreement...) to ensure CR of intervention.
 - Staff time (MoNRE and UNDP) for advocacy and lobbying CR guidelines integration into donor’s project cycle
 - Financial resources (consultant) or in-house staff (?) if MoNRE wishes to go ahead with the development of a CR checklist when infrastructures are involved in the design of new development interventions.

- **Action #2: Integration of DDF CR guidelines in Government’ routine plans and actions:**

If the new GIDP is being implemented as planned, efforts should be made to integrate CR into routine tools and methods through the DDF; however, more efforts should also be made to empower government with the actual benefits (both technical like CR mainstreaming through guidelines and methodological like decentralised district planning) of the project.

Mechanisms should be devised so that updated guidelines can be applied to other donor/Government-funded infrastructure projects through advocacy both at donor and Government levels. This issue should be discussed through the establishment of a commission / inter-ministerial working group on how to apply CR measures related to infrastructures within each relevant sector (health, transport, education, agriculture...); this could be the first step for defining new construction standards more in-tune with accrued likelihood of extreme events.

- Who is taking the lead for action #2 implementation? MoNRE
- Recipients: MoHA, POHA, DOHA, PONRE, DONRE and other ministries
- Need for resources?
 - Staff time to discuss with relevant department’s head within ministries
 - Transport, DSA, financial resources for workshop organisation when discussions are lead at provincial level and if consultants are needed on analyse how to actually mainstream these guidelines (e.g. adapt them to other ministries)
 - Financial resources for consultant team to support the development of new construction standards with relevant ministries

- **Action #3: Sharing the benefits/added value of CRVAs with relevant stakeholders**

CRVA basically provides an integrated sequential approach to responding climate change infrastructures’ vulnerability through (i) climate and (ii) vulnerability assessment, prioritising the most (iii) vulnerable assets and support (iv) planning and (v) implementation. What is most important is that

it provides district authorities an overview of their infrastructures’ vulnerability; hence it becomes a tool for decision taking at district level should there be further centralised/decentralised infrastructures financing. Still, it seems to be the expert driven and some elements of the approach might be difficult to implement locally during the planning process. The main challenge can be referred to the low technical knowledge/capacity of local officials at provincial, district and community levels on how to apply this newly developed CRVA tool properly. Interviews revealed that the sub-national level heavily depended on support from the central level (MoNRE) and external specialists. The CRVA tool developer has anticipated this challenge and recommended the project to pay more attention on few aspects including provision further training in the CRVA methodology for government officials, development of CRVA guidelines for Lao PDR, upgrading the CRVA matrix, etc. So far, CRVA did not go beyond project activities. CRVA benefit could however be far more reaching if institutionalised as a MONRE tool for assessing climate vulnerability; an obvious advantage would be through using this methodology to further secure CR adoption nation-wide, in future interventions linked to MONRE if the ministry has mainstreamed the method as part of its mandate and routine activities.

It would be most beneficial for UNDP and MoNRE to examine which MONRE department has the mandate and capacity to ensure that CRVA logic is applied for future Government and donor funded interventions and possibly plan for more support to build capacity especially at central and provincial levels.

- Who is taking the lead for action #3 implementation? UNDP supported by MoNRE
- Recipients: internal department of MoNRE
- Need for resources?
 - MoNRE staff time to assess capacity building needs, how to mainstream the method and selecting which department has the potential to implement the method
 - Regular budget/donor resources to strengthen chosen department human resources
(CRVAs might be directly funded within the interventions’ budgets requesting it, so there would be no need at this stage for regular budgets)

- **Action #4: Empowering beneficiary communities to ensure follow-up of EbA measures and maintenance of infrastructures:**

Infrastructure community groups (WUC/WUA) remain weak in operational terms; interviews showed that their level of functionality is at best average (infrequent meetings, no minutes, little capacity to mobilize members, limited financial leeway...); these groups should be approached by the Small Grants Programme to ensure minimum follow-up and to strengthen them so they get more functional ; this support should focus on management capability, due diligence infrastructure maintenance and also on enforcing infrastructures / EbA regulation and guidelines.

- Who is taking the lead for action #4 implementation? DONRE/DOHA and UNDP SGP in close collaboration (MoNRE if required)
- Recipients: community leaders and Committees’ members
- Need for resources?
 - District staff time to commit to field trips and formulating a small grant to be funded by UNDP SGP

- (Possibly) Costs of a local consultant to formulate a small grant proposal if no in-house capacity (issue of English language)
- Transport, DSA for PONRE/POHA staff to move to villages to discuss enhancing the operationalisation of committees

- **Action #5: Develop a district follow-up programme of infrastructures and EbA measures as part as routine activities carried out by (provincial) district DONRE:**

Additional follow-up of beneficiary communities by district technical staff remains a necessity to (i) raise communities understanding on the linkages between EbA measures and infrastructures protection and (ii) better take care of infrastructures so as to detect early on issues (avoid patching up infrastructures long after degradation took place), hence requiring the establishment of some sort of follow-up plan.

- Who is taking the lead for action #5 implementation? DONRE (possibly with lower frequency support by PONRE)
- Recipients: community leaders and Committees’ members
- Need for resources?
 - District staff time to develop simple tools for awareness raising on EbA measures and infrastructures and checklist for technical visits
 - Mobilisation funds for communities
 - District regular budget resources for transport and DSA of local staff when going to the field

Action #6: Formalisation of infrastructures rules and regulations into official by-laws

In order to strengthen infrastructures’ sustainability by clarifying rights and duties of all stakeholders involved, it should be considered the reviewing of infrastructures community rules and regulations and possibly formalise them into official by-laws (for EbA and infrastructures) and also by including the district authorities if deemed relevant/necessary, so as to provide a legal basis for establishing a M&R programme broken down into a set of activities at local/district level involving the main partners.

- Who is taking the lead for action #6 implementation? PONRE for support to by-laws formalisation(at provincial and/or district levels); DONRE in close collaboration with community committees for M&R programme
- Recipients: Infrastructures’ Committee and district authorities
- Need for resources?
 - PONRE staff time to oversee the review of local guides and regulations
 - Financial resources to hire a law specialist to turn these rules and regulations into officialised by-laws
 - District staff time to validate the officialising of community/district roles in CR infrastructures by-laws
 - Staff transport, DSA and community mobilisation fund to discuss the setting-up of a M&E programme
 - Possibly additional district resources to implement activities under its responsibility

4.2.3 *Proposals for future directions underlining main objectives*

Future interventions have to take into account the following:

- In addition to infrastructures CR, it is necessary to integrate Ecosystem-based Adaptation measures into Government governance systems: there is still little understanding on the value of ecosystem-based adaptation measures benefits even by district technical staff as they viewed EbA as a project add-on in addition to the infrastructures’ component.
- New interventions should make sure that the component on infrastructures is co-financed by Government (10-15%), this would enable more ownership and probably more commitment to ensure results and follow-up of activities
- As per Sam Sang initiative on enhancing the ownership and accountability in government governance and socioeconomic management of local administrations, new interventions also have to mainstream economic aspects into project design in addition to climate proofing infrastructures through enhanced construction and EbA measures. These new projects should integrate economic aspects to fully take advantage of rehabilitated infrastructures; so far, there is little added value from the upgraded infrastructures because the project did not mobilise resources to increase the economic multiplication effect of the climate proof infrastructures. This, in turn, also results in little capacity to mobilise funds by communities.
- The project did not manage to be influential enough to overhaul national construction codes; new interventions should make available financial resources specifically for that purpose. By extension, these upgraded construction codes should be applied to other types of infrastructures.
- Under this project, the added value of central level (MoHA, MoNRE) has been limited because of the funding mechanism through DDF; given the widely different implementation approached used by MoNRE and MoHA, new projects could consider intervention decentralisation to the provincial level; this would bring several advantages and also some disadvantages: as for advantages, it reduces the number of implementation and reporting levels and of stakeholders (less cost), hence also the coordination efforts; as for disadvantages, language knowledge may be an issue for donors as most provincial staff do not speak English and reporting may require extra funding (translations).
- New interventions must ensure that CR is advocated to the highest level so as change construction standards based on project’s results both in the project’s sector and for other sectors
- The project focussed exclusively on small-scale rural water infrastructures; this may be a result of the pro-poor policy adoption; however, small-scale infrastructures from other sectors can also be affected by extreme events and should be included in new interventions; this would enable ministries to better grasp the consequences of extreme events and eventually encourage advocacy for CR codes of construction.

5. List of Tables

Table 1: SMART analysis of the logical framework	24
Table 2: Planned / actual stakeholders participation	27
Table 3: Planned vs actual project expenditures.....	32
Table 4: Annual Work Plan budget and actual expenditures (UNDP & LDCF).....	32

Table 5: Project’s fund disbursement status (UNDP & LDCF).....	33
--	----

6. List of Figures

Figure 1: Planned project organisational structure	29
Figure 2: cumulative planned and actual delivery rate	33

Annex 1: Terms of Reference

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 **Effective Governance for Small-scale Rural Infrastructure and Disaster Preparedness in a Changing Climate in Lao PDR (PIMS 4710)**. The project implemented by the Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment (MoNRE)/Department of Disaster Management and Climate Change (DDMCC).

The essentials of the project to be evaluated are as follows: *(fully complete the table below)*.

PROJECT SUMMARY TABLE

Project Title:	Effective Governance for Small-scale Rural Infrastructure and Disaster Preparedness in a Changing Climate in Lao PDR			
GEF Project ID:	00069456		<i>at endorsement</i> <i>(Million US\$)</i>	<i>at completion</i> <i>(Million US\$)</i>
UNDP Project ID:	00084024	LDCF (GEF) financing:	4,700,000	4,700,000
Country:	Lao PDR	IA/EA (UNDP) own:		
Region:	Asia Pacific	Government (In kind):	375,000	375,000
		Government (parallel):	4,210,000	4,210,000
Focal Area:	Climate change	Other:		
		IUCN (parallel):	4,150,000	4,150,000
		UNDP (parallel):	21,856,896	21,856,896
		UNDP (in-cash):	280,000	280,000
FA Objectives, (OP/SP):	Capacity building to mainstream climate change adaptation policies into development plan.	Total co-financing:	30,872,896	30,872,896
Executing Agency:	UNDP	Total Project Cost:	35,572,896	35,572,896
Other Partners involved:	Department of Disaster Management and Climate Change, Ministry of Natural Resource and Environment	ProDoc Signature (date project began):	May 2013	
		(Operational) Closing Date:	Proposed: Dec 2016	Actual: Dec 2017

OBJECTIVE AND SCOPE

The project was designed to increase climate resilience of rural small-scale water infrastructure, and the communities using them, through participatory planning processes that ensures full considerations of the genuine needs of communities vulnerable to climate variability and change, so that the development prospects of these communities

In order to achieve this, the project applies a ‘three-pronged’ approach: (i) strengthening of the national, provincial and district capacities for planning for rural infrastructure that incorporates climate considerations; (ii) direct financing for infrastructure projects to vulnerable districts through an existing District Development Fund (DDF) mechanism; (iii) implementing ecosystem-based adaptation measures that provide additional climate resilience at the watershed level of project infrastructure intervention.

The project target area is the two provinces of Sekong and Saravane in southern Lao PDR, including all their 12 districts. Those two provinces have been heavily affected by climate change in recent years. Changing rainfall and temperature patterns have caused an increased frequency and intensity of storms leading to flash-floods, flooding and landslides, as well more frequent and persistent dry periods and droughts.

The overall Project Objective is to “improve local administrative systems affecting the provision and maintenance of small scale rural infrastructure through participatory decision making that reflects the genuine needs of communities and natural systems vulnerable to climate risk”. The project structure around three outcomes:

- Outcome 1: Capacities provided for local administrative institutions to integrate climate risks into participatory planning and financing of small scale rural water infrastructure provision.
- Outcome 2: Incentives in place for small-scale rural infrastructure to be protected and diversified against climate change induced risks (droughts, floods, erosion and landslides) benefitting at least 50,000 people in 12 districts of Sekong and Saravane provinces.
- Outcome 3: Natural assets (such as wetlands, forests and other ecosystems in sub-catchments) are managed to ensure maintenance of critical ecosystem services, especially water provisioning, flood control and protection under increasing climate change induced stresses, in Sekong and Saravane provinces

The TE will be conducted according to the guidance, rules and procedures established by UNDP and GEF as reflected in the UNDP Evaluation Guidance for GEF Financed Projects.

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 method⁹ 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. A set of questions covering each of these criteria have been drafted and are included with this 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

⁹ For additional information on methods, see the [Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results](#), Chapter 7, pg. 163

Technical Adviser based in the region and key stakeholders. The evaluator is expected to conduct a field mission to project sites in Saravanh and Sekong Province. Interviews will be held with the following organizations and individuals at a minimum:

- UNDP staff who have project responsibilities
- Implementing Partner – National
- The Chair of Project Board
- The National Project Director (NPD) and Project Manager (PM)
- Component leaders and key experts
- Other project stakeholders, to be discussed at the MTR inception meeting

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, 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](#) of this Terms of Reference.

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](#)), 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](#).

Evaluation Ratings:			
1. Monitoring and Evaluation	rating	2. IA& EA Execution	rating
M&E design at entry		Quality of UNDP Implementation	
M&E Plan Implementation		Quality of Execution - Executing Agency	
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:	
5. IMPACT	rating	6. OVERALL PROJECT RESULTS	rating
Environmental Status Improvement			
Environmental Stress Reduction			
Progress towards stress/status change			

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 programs. 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.¹⁰

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 *Lao PDR*. 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 26 days according to the following plan:

Activity	Timing	Completion Date
Preparation	3 days	October 3, 2017
Inception Report	1 day	October 6, 2017
Evaluation Mission	12 days	October 23, 2017
Draft Evaluation Report	8 days	November 3, 2017
Final Report	2 days	November 8, 2017

EVALUATION DELIVERABLES

The evaluation team is expected to deliver the following:

¹⁰ 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](#)

Deliverable	Content	Timing	Responsibilities
Inception Report	Evaluator provides clarifications on timing and method	No later than 2 weeks before the evaluation mission.	Evaluator submits to UNDP CO
Presentation	Initial Findings of the Evaluation	End of evaluation mission	To project management, UNDP CO
Draft Final Report	Full report, (per annexed template) with annexes	Within 3 weeks of the evaluation mission	Sent to CO, reviewed by RTA, PCU, GEF OFPs
Final Report*	Revised report	Within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft	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 and 1 national evaluators)*. The consultants shall have prior experience in evaluating similar projects. Experience with GEF financed projects is an advantage. *The International Consultant/evaluator will serve as the team leader and to 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.

The Team members must present the following qualifications:

- Minimum 15 years of relevant professional experience in evaluations of capacity building, climate change adaptation, ecosystem based management and adaptation, or related disciplines
- Knowledge of UNDP and GEF supported projects
- Previous 10 experience with results-based monitoring and evaluation methodologies;
- Technical knowledge in the targeted focal area(s) of climate change adaptation, infrastructure and rural development, ecosystem base adaptation, or related fields
- Experience in South- East Asia would be an asset
- Experience working in multi-culture and diverse environmental settings

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'](#)

PAYMENT MODALITIES AND SPECIFICATIONS

(this payment schedule is indicative, to be filled in by the CO and UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based on their standard procurement procedures)

%	Milestone
10%	At contract signing
40%	Following submission and approval of the 1 st 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 (http://www.la.undp.org/content/lao_pdr/en/home/operations/jobs.html) by (date 11 September 2017).

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

Taken from project document Pages 69 – 72. See Separate attachment.

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

Project Document

Quarterly and Annual Project Reports

Technical Reports from Consultant,

Annual Work Plans and Budgets

Project Mid-term Review Report and Management Response

Minutes Project Steering Committee Meetings

Minutes of Annual Review Meetings

Minutes of Monthly Meetings

Annual Audit

Combined Delivery Reports

Training and Workshop Reports

Deliverables and Knowledge Products, including, but not limited to the following:

Lao Climate Risk and Vulnerability Assessment Report

District Development Fund Guideline

Etc.