

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 ***Integrating Climate Change Into the Management Of Priority Health Risks in Ghana Project (PIMS 3796)***.

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

PROJECT SUMMARY TABLE

Project Title:	integrating climate change into the management of priority health risks in Ghana			
GEF Project ID:	PIM 3796		<i>at endorsement</i> (Million US\$)	<i>at completion</i> (Million US\$)
UNDP Project ID:	00075310	GEF financing:	1,718,182	
Country:	Ghana	IA/EA own:	200,000 (UNDP)	
Region:	Africa	Government:		
Focal Area:	CCA	Other:		
FA Objectives, (OP/SP):		Total co-financing:		
Executing Agency:	Ministry of Health	Total Project Cost:		
Other Partners involved:		ProDoc Signature (date project began):		
		(Operational) Closing Date:	Proposed: 30 June 2015	Actual: 31 December 2015

OBJECTIVE AND SCOPE

The project was designed to develop systems and response mechanisms to strengthen the integration of climate change risks into the health sector. Critical barriers were to shift the response capacity of the health sector in Ghana from being reactive towards being more anticipatory, deliberate and systematic. Project actions were to identify, implement, monitor, and evaluate adaptations to reduce likely future burdens of malaria, diarrhoeal diseases, and cerebrospinal meningitis (CSM), priority climate change-related health issues identified by national stakeholders. This was to be achieved through strengthening technical capacities of health sector workers to manage climate change-related health risks: mainstreaming climate change health risks into decision-making at local and national health policy

levels; and strengthening the climate change-health risk knowledge base by managing information and effectively disseminating it, for enhanced response to climate change-related health risks.

Institutional architecture and capacity was to be developed for enhancing Ghana's management of priority climate change-health issues. Pilot interventions in Keta District (Volta region), Gomoe West/Apam District (Central Region), and Bongo District (Upper East Region) were to demonstrate the effectiveness of improved disease surveillance and response in reducing the burden of climate-sensitive diseases. Training interventions was to target staff in relevant national programmes and units, such as the Disease Surveillance Unit and the National Malaria Control Programme, to recognize and respond to climate-related health risks, and to establish district train-the-trainer courses to promote decentralization and scaling up of this capacity. A national strategy for mainstreaming climate change risks into health sector policies and measures was also to be developed and implemented, led by the Ministry of Health.

Besides, Sub-national level climate change health risk maps that depict current and likely future areas vulnerable to diarrhoeal disease, malaria, and CSM was to be developed, led by the Ministry of Health, as well as a tool to evaluate the effectiveness of current policies and measures to protect communities from these diseases and to identify modified or new responses. In order to monitor the effectiveness of the new response actions, indicators was to be identified and monitoring systems refined to measure climate change resilience in the health sector. A number of knowledge management aspects, including dissemination of lessons learned and new communication materials to assist with broader awareness raising and social mobilization activities were to be done.

Project Objective: To identify, implement, monitor, and evaluate adaptations to reduce current and likely future burdens of malaria, diarrheal diseases, and meningococcal meningitis in Ghana.

This was to be achieved through the following project components and outcomes

Component 1: Strengthen technical capacities to manage climate change-related health risks

Project Outcome 1: Improved national and local health technical sector capacity to plan for and manage climate change related alterations in the geographic range and/or incidence of climate-sensitive health outcomes, including malaria, diarrhoeal diseases and meningococcal meningitis

Component 2: Climate change health risk mainstreamed into decision-making at local and national health policy levels

Project Outcome 2: Mechanisms established for cross-sectoral coordination to support climate change resilient health policy formulation and implementation at national and local policy-making levels

Component 3: Information management and effective dissemination of climate change health risk knowledge base.

Project outcome 3: 'Lessons learned' collected and knowledge management components established

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 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 method¹ for conducting project terminal evaluations of UNDP supported GEF financed projects has been 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 (*fill in [Annex B](#)*). The evaluator is expected to amend, complete and submit this matrix as part of an evaluation inception report, and shall include it as an annex to the final report.

The evaluation must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The evaluator is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with government counterparts, in particular the GEF operational focal point, UNDP Country Office, project team, UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based in the region and key stakeholders. The evaluator is expected to conduct a field mission to Accra (Ghana) including some project sites in Ghana, such as Apam, Keta and Bongo. Interviews will be held with the following organizations at a minimum: Ministry of Health (in particular: Chief Director and Project Focal person at the Ministry), Ghana Health Service (Environmental and Occupation Health Unit, Disease surveillance), Ministry of Finance, Ministry of Environment, Science, Technology and Innovation and Environmental Protection Agency.

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

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](#).

Evaluation Ratings:			
1. Monitoring and Evaluation	rating	2. IA& EA Execution	rating
M&E design at entry		Quality of UNDP Implementation	

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

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:	

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: Good adaptations options to reduce current and likely future burdens of malaria, diarrheal diseases, and meningococcal meningitis in Ghana.

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 Ghana. The Project Team will be responsible for liaising with the Evaluator's team to set up stakeholder interviews, arrange field visits, coordinate with the Government etc.

EVALUATION TIMEFRAME

The total duration of the evaluation will be 30 days according to the following plan:

Activity	Timing	Completion Date
Preparation	4 days	<i>10 November 2015</i>
Evaluation Mission	12days	<i>18 November 2015</i>
Draft Evaluation Report	12 days	<i>25 November 2015</i>
Final Report	2 day	<i>9 December 2015</i>

EVALUATION DELIVERABLES

The evaluation team is expected to deliver the following:

Deliverable	Content	Timing	Responsibilities
Inception Report	Evaluator provides clarifications on timing and method	No later than 1 week after signing the contract and before the evaluation mission.	Evaluator submits to UNDP CO
Presentation	Initial Findings	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 2days 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 shall be carried out by a team of external and local consultants to ensure knowledge and skills transfer as well as promote collaboration and experience sharing among external and local consultants in the field Climate Change and Health. The team will be led by a seasoned international

consultant and supported by an experienced national consultant. Experience with GEF financed projects is an advantage. 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.

International Team Leader

The International consultant shall have responsibility for providing overall direction for the conduct of the evaluation and shall ensure the timely delivery of quality outputs by each team member, in accordance with the Terms of Reference. The National Consultant shall be recruited separately to assist in the assignment.

Specifically, he/she will perform the following tasks:

- Lead and manage the evaluation mission;
- Design the detailed evaluation scope and methodology and approach;
- Ensure efficient division of tasks between the mission members;
- Conduct the terminal evaluation in accordance with the proposed objective and scope of the evaluation;
- Draft and communicate the evaluation report;
- Finalize the evaluation report and submit it to UNDP

The International evaluator must present the following skills and qualifications:

- At least Master's degree in Public Health or Environmental Science with minimum of six years of relevant Climate Change and Health related M&E professional experience or related field
- Demonstrated technical knowledge in Climate Change Adaption options in the in particular of the Health Sector
- Demonstrated technical knowledge in gender sensitive monitoring and evaluation
- Highly knowledgeable of GEF and UNDP-GEF monitoring and evaluation policies procedures an advantage Previous experience with results-based monitoring and evaluation methodologies;
- Must have undertaken at least 3 Mid-Term and/or Final Evaluations, including one in the field of Climate Change and Health preferably for a similar UNDP/GEF project;
- Demonstrated ability to assess complex situations, succinctly distils critical issues, and draw forward-looking conclusions and recommendations;
- Familiarity with Ghana or any developing country is an advantage;
- Excellent human relations, coordination, planning and team work.
- Have exemplary written and oral communication skills in English, be fully IT literate

EVALUATION

The weighted scoring method will be utilized.

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

- a) responsive/compliant/acceptable, and
- b) Having received the highest score out of a pre-determined set of weighted technical and financial criteria specific to the solicitation.

* Technical Criteria weight: 70%

* Financial Criteria weight: 30%

Only proposals scoring at least 49 points in the technical evaluation will be further considered for the financial evaluation.

Criteria	Weight	Max. Point
1) Technical	70 %	70
<u>Qualifications of Consultant</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Academic Qualification Knowledge in the area of public health Knowledge in the area of climate change Knowledge of UNDP/GEF policies 	20%	20 8 4 4 4
<u>Professional Experience of Consultant</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Relevant experience in conducting mid-term / final evaluations Relevant experience in the public health field Relevant experience in the climate change field Relevant experience in Ghana or developing countries Relevant experience with UNDP/GEF Relevant experience in gender mainstreaming 	30%	30 13 5 5 3 2 2
<u>Proposed approach and understanding of the assignment</u>	20%	20
2) Financial	30%	30
<u>TOTAL</u>	100%	100

EVALUATOR ETHICS

Evaluation consultants will be held to the highest ethical standards and are required to sign a Code of Conduct (Annex D) 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
20%	At contract signing
40%	Following submission and approval of the 1st draft terminal evaluation report
40%	Following submission and approval (UNDP-CO and UNDP RTA) of the final terminal evaluation report

APPLICATION PROCESS

As indicated in the Procurement Notice.

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: LIST OF DOCUMENTS TO BE REVIEWED BY THE EVALUATORS

- PROJECT DOCUMENT
- REQUEST FOR CEO ENDORSEMENT/APPROVAL
- REQUEST FOR PROJECT PREPARATION GRANT (PPG)
- PROJECT IDENTIFICATION FORM (PIF)
- REPORT ON LOCAL PROJECT APPRAISAL COMMITTEE (LPAC) MEETING
- INCEPTION REPORT
- PRESENTATIONS AT INCEPTION MEETING
- MINUTES OF STEERING COMMITTEE MEETINGS
- ANNUAL BUDGETS AND WORK PLANS
- COMPILED QUARTERLY REPORTS
- MID-TERM EVALUATION REPORT
- GEF PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION REPORTS
- GEF TRACKING TOOL
- MANAGEMENT RESPONSE TO THE MID-TERM EVALUATION REPORT
- AUDIT REPORTS
- VARIOUS COMPLIANCE MONITORING MISSION REPORTS
- VARIOUS TRAINING REPORTS

EVALUATION QUESTIONS

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.

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

ANNEX C: RATING SCALES

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

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 Form²

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: _____

²www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct

ANNEX E: EVALUATION REPORT OUTLINE³

- 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 Manual⁴)
- 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 rated⁵)
- 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

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

⁴ UNDP Style Manual, Office of Communications, Partnerships Bureau, updated November 2008

⁵ 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.

- 3.2** Project Implementation
- Adaptive management (changes to the project design and project outputs during implementation)
 - Partnership arrangements (with relevant stakeholders involved in the country/region)
 - Feedback from M&E activities used for adaptive management
 - Project Finance:
 - Monitoring and evaluation: design at entry and implementation (*)
 - UNDP and Implementing Partner implementation / execution (*) coordination, and operational issues
- 3.3** Project Results
- Overall results (attainment of objectives) (*)
 - Relevance(*)
 - Effectiveness & Efficiency (*)
 - Country ownership
 - Mainstreaming
 - Sustainability (*)
 - Impact
- 4.** Conclusions, Recommendations & Lessons
- Corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project
 - Actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the project
 - Proposals for future directions underlining main objectives
 - Best and worst practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance and success
- 5.** Annexes
- ToR
 - Itinerary
 - List of persons interviewed
 - Summary of field visits
 - List of documents reviewed
 - Evaluation Question Matrix
 - Questionnaire used and summary of results
 - Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form

ANNEX 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: _____