

## 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 *project title* “Enhancing Resilience of Liberia Montserrado County Vulnerable Coastal Areas to Climate Change Risks”. (PIMS #5550).

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

### PROJECT SUMMARY TABLE

<b>Project Title:</b>	Enhancing Resilience of Liberia Montserrado County Vulnerable Coastal Areas to Climate Change Risks			
GEF Project ID:	00093013		<u>at endorsement</u> <u>(Million US\$)</u>	<u>at completion</u> <u>(Million US\$)</u>
UNDP Project ID:	00093013	GEF financing:	USD2,000,000	USD2,000,000
Country:	Liberia	IA/EA own:	USD	
Region:	West Africa	Government:	Government of Liberia	
Focal Area:	Climate Change	Other:		
FA Objectives, (OP/SP):		Total co-financing:	USD	USD
Executing Agency:	UNDP	Total Project Cost:	USD2,000,000	USD2,000,000
Other Partners involved:	Ministry of Mines and Energy	Prodoc Signature (date project began):		May 2011
		(Operational) Closing Date:	Proposed:	Actual: June 2019

### OBJECTIVE AND SCOPE

The project was designed to: Enhance Resilience of Liberia Montserrado County Vulnerable Coastal Areas to Climate Change Risks.

The Goal of the project is to promote climate-resilient development in the coastal areas of Montserrado, particularly New Kru Town Community.

The Objective of the project is to reduce vulnerability and build resilience of local communities and socio-economic sectors to the threats of climate change in the Montserrado County coastal areas. This will notably be achieved in one community, New Kru Town Community.

In order to achieve this Objective, two Outcomes will be delivered:

- i) Strengthen the capacity of the Montserrado coastal County and the County coastal protection unit (CCPU) to plan and respond to climate change, and key staff of the Ministry of Lands, Mines and Energy (MLME), of

the Ministry of Public Works (MPW), National Climate Change Secretariat (NCCS) to make them able to include in the national development process the climate induced coastal concerns; and

- ii) Implement at the pilot sites of Hotel Africa and Kru Town, sustainable and affordable measures including the construction of 500m of breakwater (T-Groynes) and 25,000 M<sup>2</sup> of coastal revetment to protect 0.4 km of coastal areas against climate change impacts.

The terminal evaluation (TE) will be conducted according to the guidance, rules and procedures established by UNDP and GEF as reflected in the UNDP Evaluation Guidelines.

The objective of the evaluation is 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<sup>1</sup> 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 through a gender and human rights-based approach** as defined and explained in the UNDP Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-supported, GEF-financed Projects. A template covering each criterion has been added (See [Annex B](#)). The evaluators are 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 New Kru Town, Montserrado County.

Interviews will be held with the following organizations and individuals at a minimum:

- Ministry of Lands, Mines and Energy
- Ministry of Public Works
- Environmental Protection Agency
- New Kru Town Borough Authority

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 A](#) 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<sup>2</sup>, which provides performance and impact indicators for project implementation

---

<sup>1</sup> For additional information on methods, see the [Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results](#), Chapter 7, pg. 163

<sup>2</sup> This will be reviewed as part of the documents provided to the successful candidate.

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 C](#).

<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	

## 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	Planned	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.<sup>3</sup>

## 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 Liberia. 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 21 days over a time period of 3 weeks (*recommended: 10-12*) according to the following plan:

Activity	Timing	Completion Date
<b>Preparation</b>	5 days	<i>TBD</i>
<b>Evaluation Mission</b>	9 days	<i>TBD</i>
<b>Draft Evaluation Report</b>	4 days	<i>TBD</i>
<b>Final Report</b>	2 days	<i>TBD</i>

## EVALUATION DELIVERABLES

The evaluation team is expected to deliver the following:

Deliverable	Content	Timing	Responsibilities
<b>Inception Report</b>	Evaluator provides clarifications on timing and method	No later than 2 weeks before the evaluation mission:	Evaluator submits to UNDP CO
<b>Presentation</b>	Initial Findings	End of evaluation mission:	To project management, UNDP CO
<b>Draft Final Report</b>	Full report, (per annexed template) with annexes	Within 3 weeks of the evaluation mission:	Sent to CO, reviewed by RTA, PCU, GEF OFPs
<b>Final Report*</b>	Revised report	Within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft:	Sent to CO for uploading to UNDP ERC.

<sup>3</sup> 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](#)

\*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. See [Annex G](#) for an audit trail template.

## TEAM COMPOSITION

---

The evaluation team will be composed of 1-international and 1-national. The consultants shall have prior experience in evaluating similar projects. Experience with GEF financed projects is an advantage. The international consultant will be 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.

The Team members must present the following qualifications:

- Minimum 7 years of relevant professional experience;
- Knowledge of and/or experience with UNDP and/or GEF;
- Previous experience with results-based monitoring and evaluation methodologies;
- Technical knowledge in the targeted focal area of Climate change and impacts on agriculture sector development.
- *Additional skills based on project particulars:*

### Education

- Master in natural sciences; social sciences with a specialization in environment, biodiversity, climate change or any other closely related field; PhD would be a plus.

### Experience:

- At least 7 years' experience with GEF related project evaluation
- Experience in UN/international organizations project monitoring and evaluation, preferably UNDP-GEF experience, is an advantage
- Proven ability to work with governments and local communities in an agricultural settings
- Demonstrated experience in Mid-term and terminal evaluations

## 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

---

%	Milestone
10%	At submission and approval of inception report
20%	Following the presentation of initial findings
30%	Following submission and approval of the final draft terminal evaluation report
40%	Following submission and approval of the final terminal evaluation report

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

---

*GEF Project Information Form (PIF), 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 Implementation (APR/PIR) Reports*

*Project budget and financial data*

*Project Tracking Tool, at baseline, at mid-term, and at terminal points*

*UNDP Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF)*

*UNDP Country Programme Document (CPD)*

*UNDP Country Programme Action Plan (CPAP)*

*GEF focal area strategic program objectives*

## ANNEX B: EVALUATION QUESTIONS

*(Note: This is a generic list, to be further detailed with more specific questions by CO and UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based on the particulars of the project. Refer to Annex 4 of the TE Guidance for a completed, sample evaluation criteria matrix)*

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

Evaluative Criteria Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
<b>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?</b>			
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
<b>Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved?</b>			
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
<b>Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards?</b>			
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
<b>Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, social-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?</b>			
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
<b>Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward, reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status?</b>			
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•



## ANNEX C: RATING SCALES

<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</p> <p>5. Satisfactory (S): minor shortcomings</p> <p>4. Moderately Satisfactory (MS): moderate shortcomings</p> <p>3. Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): significant shortcomings</p> <p>2. Unsatisfactory (U): major shortcomings</p> <p>1. Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): severe shortcomings</p>	<p><b><i>Sustainability ratings:</i></b></p> <p>4. Likely (L): negligible risks to sustainability</p> <p>3. Moderately Likely (ML): moderate risks</p> <p>2. Moderately Unlikely (MU): significant risks</p> <p>1. Unlikely (U): severe risks</p>	<p><b><i>Relevance ratings</i></b></p> <p>2. Relevant (R)</p> <p>1. Not relevant (NR)</p>
<p><b><i>Additional ratings where relevant:</i></b></p> <p>Not Applicable (N/A)</p> <p>Unable to Assess (U/A)</p>		

## ANNEX D: 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>4</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>4</sup>[www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct](http://www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct)

## ANNEX E: EVALUATION REPORT OUTLINE<sup>5</sup>

---

- 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<sup>6</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>7</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>5</sup>The Report length should not exceed 40 pages in total (not including annexes).

<sup>6</sup> UNDP Style Manual, Office of Communications, Partnerships Bureau, updated November 2008

<sup>7</sup> See Annex D for rating scales.

- 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
  - Report Clearance Form
  - *Annexed in a separate file:* TE audit trail
  - *Annexed in a separate file:* Terminal GEF Tracking Tool, if applicable

## ANNEX F: 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 G: 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