Interim Evaluation Terms of Reference for UNDP-supported GCF-financed projects

Type of Contract: Individual Contract
Post Level: International Consultant
Duty Station: Home based with field mission(s) as required
Languages Required: English
Starting Date: *17 April 2023*
Duration of Contract: *35* working days

1. INTRODUCTION

This is the Terms of Reference (ToR) for the Interim Evaluation (IE) of the UNDP-supported GCF-financed project titled *Safeguarding rural communities and their physical assets from climate induced disasters in Timor-Leste* (PIMS5910) implemented through the *Secretary of State for the Environment under the Coordinating Ministry of Economic Affairs (CMEA)*, which is to be undertaken in *2023*. The project started on the 09 March 2020 and is in its *3rd* year of implementation. This ToR sets out the expectations for this Interim Evaluation.

2. PROJECT BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Approximately 70% of Timor-Leste's rural population (840,000 people) is highly vulnerable to climate change impacts, particularly increasing variability of rainfall and extreme weather events. Lives and livelihoods in the remote interior of the country and coastal regions are both highly exposed. Impacts of intensified extreme events include damage and degradation of decentralized small-scale critical infrastructure, particularly water supply and drainage structures, embankments, and feeder roads and bridges. Damages leave rural populations isolated, lacking basic services. According to climate change scenarios and risk models, occurrences of climate extremes and related damages will at least double towards mid-century.

The project objective is to safeguard vulnerable communities and their physical assets from climate change-induced disasters. It aims to address existing institutional, financial and legislative barriers, increasing the climate resilience of vulnerable small-scale rural infrastructure. The two complementary outputs of the project are:

1. Output 1: Climate risk information is developed, monitored and integrated into policies, regulations and institutions to inform climate resilient small-scale rural infrastructure planning and management. This output focuses on strengthening the capacity of mandated institutions to assess and manage climate risks in order to maintain local infrastructure services. GCF-funded activities will embed new skills, technologies, and innovative methods in climate risk identification and mitigation processes. Monitoring and recording of climate risk information will be enhanced, and these data will be integrated into policies, standards, guidelines, and long-term investment planning for small-scale rural infrastructures.

2. Output 2: Climate risk reduction and climate-proofing measures for small-scale rural infrastructures are implemented to build the resilience of vulnerable communities in six priority districts. This output focuses on implementing climate resilient building measures to improve

small-scale rural infrastructures in vulnerable areas. GCF funds will assist in the development and implementation of catchment management strategies, supporting long-term resilience and climate risk reduction via landscape restoration and enhanced land stability, particularly in vulnerable catchments where small-scale infrastructure is present.

Benefits include increased climate resilience for small-scale infrastructure as well as 300 ha of reforested and rehabilitated land to buffer against climate-induced disasters. The project will ensure long-term infrastructure resilience via (i) embedding climate resilience standards into the processes through which small-scale infrastructure is planned, designed, constructed and maintained; (ii) improving climate hazard and risk assessment capacity and access to climate risk information.

The project is implemented in six priority districts of Baucau, Ermera, Aileu, Viqueque, Lautem and Liquica which are highly prone to natural disasters. The project targets 175,840 direct beneficiaries, an estimated 15% of the total population.

The total duration of the project is six years (09 March 2020 to 09 March 2026). The total cost of the project is USD 59,443,867. This is financed through a GCF grant of USD 22,356,805, USD 400,000 in UNDP Trac Fund and USD 36,687,062 in government co-financing.

The project is implemented by Secretariat of State for Environment using UNDP's National Implementation Modality with UNDP Country Office Support Services. More specifically, the project has engaged the following responsible parties in achieving project outputs:

1. The Secretariat of State for Environment (SSE): is the Implementing Partner (IP) responsible and accountable for managing this project, including the monitoring and evaluation of project interventions, achieving project outcomes, and for the effective use of UNDP resources. The Implementing Partner is responsible for: (i) Approving and signing the multiyear workplan; (ii) Approving and signing the combined delivery report at the end of the year; and, (iii) Signing the financial report or the funding authorization and certificate of expenditures.
2. The Ministry of State Administration (MSA): is the lead agency and Responsible Party (RP) for Activities 2.1 and 2.2, and their activities will include development of standards, manuals, guidelines for climate resilient infrastructure designs, and responsible for leading the municipality engineers on the design and implementation of climate resilient infrastructure.
3. Ministry of Interior – Secretary of State for Civil Protection (MI-SSCP): is the lead agency and Responsible Party (RP) for Activities 1.1 and 1.2. Utilizing technical assistance, the MI-SSCP will develop and undertake multi-hazard, risk, and vulnerability assessments and mapping as well as damage and loss accounting activities.
4. The Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries (MAF): is the Responsible Party (RP) for Activity 2.3. With Technical Assistance, it will develop agro-forestry and reforestation strategies for target catchments, implement agroforestry and reforestation schemes in these catchments, train local extension workers, train communities to implement and maintain agroforestry activities, and undertake long-term monitoring of agroforestry schemes.

While overall project outputs and activities/sub-activities will be implemented by the above-mentioned Responsible Parties (RPs), other relevant government and non-government entities will be engaged in and support implementation of activities/sub-activities at national and local level including the Ministry of Public Works, National Directorate for Water Resources; Municipalities; Development Commissions, Local Authorities, and international and local NGOs.

3. OBJECTIVES OF THE INTERIM EVALUATION

The IE will assess implementation of the project and progress towards the achievement of the project objectives and outcomes as specified in the UNDP Project Document and GCF Funded Activity Agreement (FAA), and assess early signs of project success or failure with the goal of identifying the necessary changes to be made in order to set the project on-track to achieve its intended results. The Interim Evaluation will also review the project's strategy and its risks to sustainability.

The IE will take into consideration assessment of the project in line with the following evaluation criteria from the GCF IEU TOR (GCF/B.06/06) and GCF Evaluation Policy, along with guidance provided by the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) Development Assistance Committee (DAC). Additional evaluation criteria can be assessed, as applicable. The IE must assess the following:

- **Implementation and adaptive management** – seeks to identify challenges and propose additional measures to support more efficient and effective implementation. The following aspects of project implementation and adaptive management will be assessed: management arrangements, work planning, finance and co-finance, project-level monitoring and evaluation systems, stakeholder engagement, reporting, and communications.
- **Risks to sustainability** – seeks to assess the likelihood of continued benefits after the project ends. The assessment of sustainability at the Interim Evaluation stage considers the risks that are likely to affect the continuation of project outcomes. The IE should validate the risks identified in the Project Document, Annual Project Reports, and the ATLAS Risk Management Module and whether the risk ratings applied are appropriate and up to date.
- **Relevance, effectiveness and efficiency** - seeks to assess the appropriateness in terms of selection, implementation and achievement of FAA and project document results framework activities and expected results (outputs, outcomes and impacts).
- **Coherence in climate finance delivery with other multilateral entities** - looks at how GCF financing is additional and able to amplify other investments or de-risk and crowd-in further climate investment.
- **Gender equity** - ensures integration of understanding on how the impacts of climate change are differentiated by gender, the ways that behavioural changes and gender can play in delivering paradigm shift, and the role that women play in responding to climate change challenges both as agents but also for accountability and decision-making.
- **Country ownership of projects and programmes** - examines the extent of the emphasis on sustainability post project through country ownership; on ensuring the responsiveness of the GCF investment to country needs and priorities including through the roles that countries play in projects and programmes.
- **Innovativeness in results areas** - focuses on identification of innovations (proof of concept, multiplication effects, new models of finance, technologies, etc.) and the extent to which the project interventions may lead to a paradigm shift towards low-emission and climate-resilient development pathways.
- **Replication and scalability** – the extent to which the activities can be scaled up in other locations within the country or replicated in other countries (this criterion, which is considered in document GCF/B.05/03 in the context of measuring performance could also be incorporated in independent evaluations).
- **Unexpected results, both positive and negative** - identifies the challenges and the learning, both positive and negative, that can be used by all parties (governments, stakeholders, civil society, AE, GCF, and others) to inform further implementation and future investment decision-making.

4. INTERIM EVALUATION APPROACH & METHODOLOGY

The IE team must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful.

The IE team will review all relevant sources of information including documents prepared during the preparation phase (i.e. baseline Funding proposal submitted to the GCF, FAA, the Project Document, project reports including Annual Performance Reports, Quarterly Progress Reports, UNDP Environmental & Social Safeguard Policy, project budget revisions, records of surveys conducted, national strategic and legal documents, stakeholder maps, and any other materials that the team considers useful for this evidence-based assessment).

The IE team is expected to follow a collaborative and participatory approach[1] ensuring close engagement with the Project Team, Implementing Partner, NDA focal point, government counterparts, the UNDP Country Office, Regional Technical Advisers, and other principal stakeholders and beneficiaries.

Engagement of stakeholders is vital to a successful IE. Stakeholder involvement should include (where possible) surveys/questionnaires, focus groups, interviews with stakeholders who have project responsibilities, including but not limited to executing agencies, senior officials and task team/component leaders, key experts and consultants in the subject area, Project Steering Committee, project stakeholders, local government, CSOs, project beneficiaries, etc. Additionally, the Interim Evaluation team is expected to conduct field missions to project sites in the six project municipalities of Baucau, Ermera, Aileu, Viqueque, Lautem and Liquica of Timor-Leste, to be decided in consultation with the project team. Data collection (government data/records, field observation visits, CDM verifications, public expenditure reporting, GIS data, etc.) will be used to validate evidence of results and assessments (including but not limited to: assessment of Theory of Change, activities delivery, and results/changes occurred).

The specific design and methodology for the IE should emerge from consultations between the IE team and the above-mentioned parties regarding what is appropriate and feasible for meeting the IE purpose and objectives and answering the evaluation questions, given limitations of budget, time and data. The IE team must, however, use gender-responsive methodologies and tools and ensure that gender equality and women's empowerment, as well as other cross-cutting issues and SDGs are incorporated into the IE report.

The final methodological approach including interview schedule, field visits and data to be used in the IE must be clearly outlined in the Inception Report and be fully discussed and agreed between UNDP, stakeholders and the IE team.

The final Interim Evaluation report should describe the full evaluation approach taken and the rationale for the approach making explicit the underlying assumptions, challenges, strengths and weaknesses about the methods and approach of the assessment. The final report must also describe any limitations encountered by the Interim Evaluation team during the evaluation process, including limitations of the methodology, data collection methods, and any potential influence of limitation on how findings may be interpreted, and conclusions drawn. Limitations include, among others: language barriers, inaccessible project sites, issues with access to data or verification of data sources, issues with availability of interviewees, methodological limitations to collecting more extensive or more representative qualitative or quantitative evaluation data, deviations from planned data collection and analysis set out in the ToR and Inception Report, etc. Efforts made to mitigate the limitations should also be included in the Interim Evaluation report.

5. DETAILED SCOPE OF THE INTERIM EVALUATION

[1] For ideas on innovative and participatory Monitoring and Evaluation strategies and techniques, see [UNDP Discussion Paper: Innovations in Monitoring & Evaluating Results](), 05 Nov 2013.

The Interim Evaluation team will assess the following categories of project progress. The following questions are intended to guide the Interim Evaluation team to deliver credible and trusted evaluations that provide assessment of progress and results achieved in relationship to the GCF investment, can identify learning and areas where restructuring or changes through adaptive management in project implementation are needed, and can make evidence-based clear and focused recommendations that may be required for enhancing project implementation to deliver expected results and to what extent these can be verified and attributed to GCF investment.

i. Project Strategy

Project design:

- Review the problem addressed by the project and the underlying assumptions. Review the effect of any incorrect assumptions or changes to the context to achieving the project results as outlined in the Project Document.
- Review the relevance of the project strategy and assess whether it provides the most effective route towards expected/intended results. Were lessons from other relevant projects properly incorporated into the project design?
- Review how the project addresses country priorities. Review country ownership. Was the project concept in line with the national sector development priorities and plans of the country (or of participating countries in the case of multi-country projects)?
- Review decision-making processes: were perspectives of those who would be affected by project decisions, those who could affect the outcomes, and those who could contribute information or other resources to the process, taken into account during project design processes?
- Review the extent to which relevant gender issues were raised in the project design. See Annex 9 of *Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects* for further guidelines.
- If there are major areas of concern, recommend areas for improvement.

Results Framework/Logframe and Theory of Change:

- Undertake a critical analysis of the project's logframe indicators and targets, assess how "SMART" the midterm and end-of-project targets are (Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Relevant, Time-bound), and suggest specific amendments/revisions to the targets and indicators as necessary.
- Are the project's objectives and outcomes or components clear, practical, and feasible within its time frame?
- Examine if progress so far has led to, or could in the future catalyse beneficial development effects (i.e. income generation, gender equality and women's empowerment, improved governance, etc.) that should be included in the project results framework and monitored on an annual basis.
- Ensure broader development and gender aspects of the project are being monitored effectively. Develop and recommend SMART 'development' indicators, including sex-disaggregated indicators and indicators that capture development benefits.
- Ensure that the indicators (gender-disaggregated) are SMART, aligned with GCF/Results Management Framework (RMF)/Performance Measurement Frameworks (PMFs) and the guidance in the GCF programming manual.
- Evaluate the Theory of Change (ToC) proposed by the project during the inception and design phases in comparison to the approach, relevance, actions, interventions, practicality, and current context. Foresee the way forward and propose necessary adjustments.

ii. Relevance, Effectiveness and Efficiency

- Were the context, problem, needs and priorities well analysed and reviewed during project initiation?
- Are the planned project objectives and outcomes relevant and realistic to the situation on the ground?

- Do outputs link to intended outcomes which link to broader paradigm shift objectives of the project?
- Are the outputs being achieved in a timely manner? Is this achievement supportive of the ToC and pathways identified?
- How is the project Theory of Change (ToC) used in helping the project achieve results/ How is the ToC applied through the project?
- Is the project Theory of Change (ToC) and intervention logic coherent and realistic? Does the ToC and intervention logic hold or does it need to be adjusted? Reconstruct the ToC, if appropriate, aligning it with the GCF ToC format.
- Verify the mitigation impact that the project has achieved. Analyse the GHG emissions achieved (including indirect emissions). Has an appropriate MRV system for GHG emission been established and implemented? Do outputs link to intended outcomes which link to broader paradigm shift objectives of the project?
- Are the planned inputs and strategies identified realistic, appropriate and adequate to achieve the results? Were they sequenced sufficiently to efficiently deliver the expected results?
- What and how much progress has been made towards achieving the overall outputs and outcomes of the project (including contributing factors and constraints)?
- To what extent is the project able to demonstrate changes against the baseline (assessment in approved Funding Proposal) for the GCF investment criteria (including contributing factors and constraints)?
- How realistic are the risks and assumptions of the project?
- How did the project deal with issues and risks in implementation?
- To what extent did the project's M&E data and mechanism(s) contribute to achieving project results?
- Are the project's governance mechanisms functioning efficiently?
- To what extent did the design of the project help or hinder achieving its own goals?
- Were there clear baselines indicators and/or benchmark for performance measurements? How were these used in project management? To what extent and how the project apply adaptive management?
- What, if any, alternative strategies would have been more effective in achieving the project objectives?

iii. Progress Towards Results

Progress Towards Outcomes and Outputs Analysis:

- By reviewing the aspects of the project that have already been successful, identify ways in which the project can further expand these benefits.
- Assess the logframe indicators against progress made towards the end-of-project targets using the Progress Towards Results Matrix and colour code progress in a "traffic light system" based on the level of progress achieved; assign a rating on progress for each indicator; make recommendations from the areas marked as "Not on target to be achieved" (red).

Table. Progress Towards Results Matrix (Achievement of indicators against End-of-project Targets)

Project Strategy	Indicator[2]	Baseline Level[3]	Level in 1st APR (self-reported)	Midterm Target[4]	End-of-project Target	Midterm Level & Assessment[5]	Achievement Rating[6]	Analysis: status of indicator; justification for rating (triangulated with evidence and data); how realistic it is for target to be achieved
Fund Level Impact:	Indicator:							
Outcome 1:	Indicator:							
	Indicator:							
Output	Indicator:							
Output	Indicator:							
Outcome 2:	Indicator:							
	Indicator:							
Output	Indicator:							
Output	Indicator:							
Etc.								

<u>Indicator Assessment Key</u>

Green= Achieved	Yellow= On target to be achieved	Red= Not on target to be achieved

In addition to the progress towards outcomes and outputs analysis:

- Assess whether the total number of beneficiaries and indirect beneficiaries of the project has been properly calculated.
- Identify remaining barriers to achieving the project objective in the remainder of the project.
- By reviewing the aspects of the project that have already been successful, identify ways in which the project can further expand these benefits.
- Include a comprehensive assessment of the impact of COVID-19 on different aspects of project implementation. Assess the impact on results delivery, overall funded activity performance along with a plan of action to address these.

iv. Project Implementation and Adaptive Management

<u>Management Arrangements:</u>

- Review overall effectiveness of project management as outlined in the FAA/Funding proposal. Have changes been made and have these been approved by GCF? Are responsibilities and reporting lines

[2] Populate with data from the Logframe and scorecards
[3] Populate with data from the Project Document
[4] If available
[5] Colour code this column only
[6] Use the 6 point Progress Towards Results Rating Scale: HS, S, MS, MU, U, HU

clear? Is decision-making transparent and undertaken in a timely manner? Recommend areas for improvement.

- Review the quality of execution of the Executing Agency/Implementing Partner(s) and recommend areas for improvement.
- Review the quality of support provided by UNDP and recommend areas for improvement.

Work Planning:

- Review any delays in project start-up and implementation, identify the causes and examine if they have been resolved.
- Are work-planning processes results-based? If not, suggest ways to re-orientate work planning to focus on results?
- Examine the use of the project's results framework/ logframe as a management tool and review any changes made to it since project start.

Financing and Co-financing:

- Consider the financial management of the project, with specific reference to the cost-effectiveness of interventions.
- Review the changes to fund allocations as a result of budget revisions and assess the appropriateness and relevance of such revisions.
- Have project resources been utilized in the most economical, effective and equitable ways possible (considering value for money; absorption rate; commitments versus disbursements and projected commitments; co-financing; etc.)?
- Does the project have the appropriate financial controls, including reporting and planning, that allow management to make informed decisions regarding the budget and allow for timely flow of funds?
- Assess factors that contributed to low/high expenditure rate and impact on the project.
- Informed by the co-financing monitoring table to be filled out, provide commentary on co-financing: Is co-financing being used strategically to help the objectives of the project? Comment on the use of different financial streams (parallel, leveraged, mobilized finance), as applicable in the context of the project – see GCF policy on co-finance[7]. Discuss whether co-finance related conditions and covenants, as listed in the FAA, have been fulfilled, as applicable.
- Conduct an analysis of materialized co-financing and implications for project scope and results. If co-finance is not materialising as planned (timing and/or amount), assess mitigation measures, and discuss the impact of that on the project and results on the ground.

Coherence in climate finance delivery with other multilateral entities

- Who are the partners of the project and how strategic are they in terms of capacities and commitment?
- Is there coherence and complementarity by the project with other actors for other local climate change interventions?
- To what extent has the project complimented other on-going local level initiatives (by stakeholders, donors, governments) on climate change adaptation or mitigation efforts?
- How has the project contributed to achieving stronger and more coherent integration of shift to low emission sustainable development pathways and/or increased climate resilient sustainable development (GCF RMF/PMF Paradigm Shift objectives)? Please provide concrete examples and make specific suggestions on how to enhance these roles going forward.

Project-level Monitoring and Evaluation Systems:

---

[7] https://www.greenclimate.fund/sites/default/files/document/policy-cofinancing.pdf

- Review the monitoring tools currently being used: Do they provide the necessary information? Do they involve key partners? Do they use existing information? Are they efficient? Are they cost-effective? Are additional tools required? How could they be made more participatory and inclusive?
- Discuss any quality assuring mechanisms being used (e.g. ISO standard, government accreditations, international certificates, etc.)
- Is project reporting and information generated by the project linked to national SDGs, NDC and other national reporting systems?
- Examine the financial management of the project monitoring and evaluation budget. Are sufficient resources being allocated to monitoring and evaluation? Are these resources being allocated effectively?

Stakeholder Engagement:
- Project management: Has the project developed and leveraged the necessary and appropriate partnerships with direct and tangential stakeholders?
- Participation and country-driven processes: Do local and national government stakeholders support the objectives of the project? Do they continue to have an active role in project decision-making that supports efficient and effective project implementation?
- Participation and public awareness: To what extent has stakeholder involvement and public awareness contributed to the progress towards achievement of project objectives?
- Is a gender aware grievance mechanism in place ? If so, assess its effectiveness as per local context

Social and Environmental Standards (Safeguards)
- Validate the risks identified in the project's most current SESP/ESIA, and those risks' ratings; are any revisions needed?
- Summarize and assess the revisions made since Board Approval (if any) to:
    - The project's overall safeguards risk categorization.
    - The identified types of risks[8] (in the SESP).
    - The individual risk ratings (in the SESP).
- Describe and assess progress made in the implementation of the project's social and environmental management measures as outlined in the SESP submitted at the Funding Proposal stage (and prepared during implementation, if any), including any revisions to those measures. Such management measures might include Environmental and Social Management Plans (ESMPs) or other management plans, though can also include aspects of a project's design; refer to Question 6 in the SESP template for a summary of the identified management measures.

A given project should be assessed against the version of UNDP's safeguards policy that was in effect at the time of the project's approval.

Reporting:
- Assess how adaptive management changes have been reported by the project management and shared with the Project Board.
- Assess how well the Project Team and partners undertake and fulfil GCF reporting requirements (i.e. how have they addressed poorly-rated APRs, if applicable?)
- Assess how lessons derived from the adaptive management process have been documented, shared with key partners and internalized by partners.
- Assess the efficiency, timeliness, and adequacy of reporting requirements

[8] Risks are to be labeled with both the UNDP SES Principles and Standards, and the GEF's "types of risks and potential impacts": Climate Change and Disaster; Disadvantaged or Vulnerable Individuals or Groups; Disability Inclusion; Adverse Gender-Related impact, including Gender-based Violence and Sexual Exploitation; Biodiversity Conservation and the Sustainable Management of Living Natural Resources; Restrictions on Land Use and Involuntary Resettlement; Indigenous Peoples; Cultural Heritage; Resource Efficiency and Pollution Prevention; Labor and Working Conditions; Community Health, Safety and Security.

Communications:

- Review internal project communication with stakeholders: Is communication regular and effective? Are there key stakeholders left out of communication? Are there feedback mechanisms when communication is received? Does this communication with stakeholders contribute to their awareness of project outcomes and activities and investment in the sustainability of project results?
- Review external project communication: Are proper means of communication established or being established to express the project progress and intended impact to the public (is there a web presence, for example? Or did the project implement appropriate outreach and public awareness campaigns?)
- For reporting purposes, write one half-page paragraph that summarizes the project's progress towards results in terms of contribution to sustainable development benefits, as well as global environmental benefits.

v. Sustainability

- Validate whether the risks identified in the FAA and Funding proposal, APRs and the ATLAS Risk Management Module are the most important and whether the risk ratings applied are appropriate and up to date. If not, explain why.
- In addition, assess the following risks to sustainability:

Financial risks to sustainability:

- What is the likelihood of financial and economic resources not being available once the GCF assistance ends (consider potential resources can be from multiple sources, such as the public and private sectors, income generating activities, and other funding that will be adequate financial resources for sustaining project's outcomes)?

Socio-economic risks to sustainability:

- Are there any social or political risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project outcomes? What is the risk that the level of stakeholder ownership (including ownership by governments and other key stakeholders) will be insufficient to allow for the project outcomes/benefits to be sustained? Do the various key stakeholders see that it is in their interest that the project benefits continue to flow? Is there sufficient public/stakeholder awareness in support of the long-term objectives of the project? Are lessons learned being documented by the Project Team on a continual basis and shared/transferred to appropriate parties who could learn from the project and potentially replicate and/or scale it in the future?

Institutional Framework and Governance risks to sustainability:

- Do the legal frameworks, policies, governance structures and processes pose risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project benefits? While assessing this parameter, also consider if the required systems/mechanisms for accountability, transparency, and technical knowledge transfer are in place.

Environmental risks to sustainability:

- Are there any environmental risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project outcomes?

vi. Country Ownership

- To what extent is the project aligned with national development plans, national plans of action on climate change, or sub-national policy as well as projects and priorities of the national partners?
- How well is country ownership reflected in the project governance, coordination and consultation mechanisms or other consultations?
- To what extent are country level systems for project management or M&E utilized in the project?
- Is the project, as implemented, responsive to local challenges and relevant/appropriate/strategic in relation to SDG indicators, National indicators, GCF RMF/PMF indicators, AE indicators, or other goals?

- Were the modes of deliveries of the outputs appropriate to build essential/necessary capacities, promote national ownership and ensure sustainability of the result achieved?

vii. Gender equity

- Does the project only rely on sex-disaggregated data per population statistics?
- Are financial resources/project activities explicitly allocated to enable women to benefit from project interventions?
- Does the project account in activities and planning for local gender dynamics and how project interventions affect women as beneficiaries?
- Do women as beneficiaries know their rights and/or benefits from project activities/interventions?
- How do the results for women compare to those for men?
- Is the decision-making process transparent and inclusive of both women and men?
- To what extent are female stakeholders or beneficiaries satisfied with the project gender equality results?
- Did the project sufficiently address cross-cutting issues including gender?
- How does the project incorporate gender in its governance or staffing?

viii. Innovativeness in results areas

- What are the lessons learned to enrich learning and knowledge generation in terms of how the project played in the provision of "thought leadership," "innovation," or "unlocked additional climate finance" for climate change adaptation/mitigation in the project and country context? Please provide concrete examples and make specific suggestions on how to enhance these roles going forward.

ix. Unexpected results, both positive and negative

- What has been the project's ability to adapt and evolve based on continuous lessons learned and the changing development landscape? Please account for factors both within the AE/EE and external.
- Can any unintended or unexpected positive or negative effects be observed as a consequence of the project's interventions?
- What factors have contributed to the unintended outcomes, outputs, activities, results?
- Do any of the unintended results constitute a major change?[9]

x. Replication and Scalability

- Assess the effectiveness of exit strategies and approaches to phase out assistance provided by the project including contributing factors and constraints? Is there a need for recalibration?
- What factors of the project achievements are contingent on specific local context or enabling environment factors?
- Are the actions and results from project interventions likely to be sustained, ideally through ownership by the local partners and stakeholders?
- What are the key factors that will require attention in order to improve prospects of sustainability, scalability or replication of project outcomes/outputs/results?

Conclusions, Recommendations and Lessons Learned

The Interim Evaluation team will include a section of the report setting out the evaluation's evidence-based conclusions, in light of the findings. Explain whether the project will be able to achieve planned development objective and outcomes by the end of implementation.

[9] See Section '9.4 Major Changes and Restructuring' in the GCF Programming Manual

Recommendations should be succinct suggestions for critical intervention that are specific, measurable, achievable, and relevant. A recommendation table should be put in the report's executive summary.

The Interim Evaluation team should make no more than 10 recommendations total.

The Interim Evaluation will also include a separate section with a concise and logically articulated set of lessons learned (new knowledge gained from the project, context, outcomes, even evaluation methods; failures/lost opportunities to date, what might have been done better or differently, etc.). Lessons should be based on specific evidence presented in the report and can be used to inform design, adapt and change plans and actions, as appropriate, and plan for scaling up.

The Interim Evaluation report's findings, conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned need to consider gender equality and women's empowerment and other cross-cutting issues.

Ratings

The Interim Evaluation team will include its ratings of the project's results and brief descriptions of the associated achievements in an *Interim Evaluation Ratings & Achievement Summary Table* in the Executive Summary of the Interim Evaluation report. See Annex E for ratings scales. No rating on Project Strategy and no overall project rating is required.

Table. Interim Evaluation Ratings & Achievement Summary Table for (*Project Title*)

Measure	Interim Evaluation Rating[10]	Achievement Description
Project Strategy	N/A	
Progress Towards Results	Objective Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale)	
	Outcome 1 Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale)	
	Outcome 2 Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale)	
	Outcome 3 Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale)	
	Etc.	
Project Implementation & Adaptive Management	(rate 6 pt. scale)	
Sustainability	(rate 4 pt. scale)	

10 Ratings for Objective/Outcome Achievement and Project Implementation & Adaptive Management: 6 = Highly Satisfactory (HS): exceeds expectations and/or no shortcomings; 5 = Satisfactory (S): meets expectations and/or no or minor shortcomings; 4 = Moderately Satisfactory (MS): more or less meets expectations and/or some shortcomings; 3 = Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): somewhat below expectations and/or significant shortcomings; 2 = Unsatisfactory (U): substantially below expectations and/or major shortcomings; 1 = Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): severe shortcomings, Unable to Assess (U/A): available information does not allow an assessment

Ratings for Sustainability: 4 = Likely (L): negligible risks to sustainability; 3 = Moderately Likely (ML): moderate risks to sustainability; 2 = Moderately Unlikely (MU): significant risks to sustainability; 1 = Unlikely (U): severe risks to sustainability; Unable to Assess (U/A): Unable to assess the expected incidence and magnitude of risks to sustainability

6. TIMEFRAME

The total duration of the Interim Evaluation will be approximately *35* working days (including 10-days of field mission) over a time period *from April 15 to June 30, 2023.* The tentative Interim Evaluation timeframe is as follows:

ACTIVITY	NUMBER OF WORKING DAYS	COMPLETION DATE
I. Desk review and Inception Report		
Document review and preparation of Interim Evaluation (IE) Inception Report; Submission of IE Inception Report (Inception Report due no later than 2 weeks before the evaluation mission)	*3 days*	*(20/04/2023)*
II. Mission and Data Collection		
IE mission: stakeholder meetings, interviews, field visits	*14 days*	*(10/05/2023)*
Presentation of initial findings- last day of the Interim Evaluation mission	*1 day*	*(14/05/2023)*
III. Report Writing		
Preparation and submission of Draft IE Report #1 (at least 6 ½ weeks before final report due date)	*8 days*	*(31/05/2023)*
Incorporation of comments on Draft IE Report #1; Preparation and submission of Draft IE Report #2 (at least 5 ½ weeks before final report due date. Draft #2 will be shared with the GCF Secretariat for a 4-week review period. Please ensure that the timeline incorporates this review period. Comments from other stakeholders will be collected in parallel)	*5 days*	*(08/06/2023)*
Incorporation of comments from Draft IE Report #2 and Finalization of IE report + completed audit trail from feedback on draft report (note: accommodate time delay in dates for circulation and review of the draft report)	*4 days*	*(19/06/2023)*

7. INTERIM EVALUATION DELIVERABLES

#	Deliverable	Description	Timing & Due Date	Responsibilities
D1	**Interim Evaluation (IE) Inception Report**	Proposed evaluation methodology, work plan and structure of the Interim Evaluation report, and options for site visits	No later than 2 weeks before the evaluation mission (Due date: 20/04/2023)	Interim Evaluation team submits to the Commissioning Unit and project management
D2	**Presentation**	Initial Findings	End of evaluation mission (Due date: 14/05/2023)	Interim Evaluation Team presents to project management and the Commissioning Unit

D3	**Draft IE Report #1**	Full report (using guidelines on content outlined in Annex B) with annexes	Within 3 weeks of the evaluation mission (Due date: 31/05/2023)	Interim Evaluation Team sends draft to the Commissioning Unit, reviewed by RTA, Project Coordinating Unit, NDA focal point
D4	**Draft IE Report #2**	Full report (using guidelines on content outlined in Annex B) with annexes	*(8/06/2023)*	Interim Evaluation Team sends draft to the Commissioning Unit, reviewed by RTA, Project Coordinating Unit, NDA focal point
D5	**Final Interim Evaluation Report* + Audit Trail**	Revised report with audit trail detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final report	Within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft (19/06/2023)	Interim Evaluation Team sends final report Commissioning Unit
D6	**Concluding Stakeholder Workshop** (optional; strongly encouraged)	Meeting to present and discuss key findings and recommendations of the evaluation report, and key actions in response to the report.	Within 1-2 weeks of completion of final Interim Evaluation report (30/06/2023)	Led by Interim Evaluation team or Project Team and Commissioning Unit

*The final Interim Evaluation report must be in English. If applicable, the Commissioning Unit may choose to arrange for a translation of the report into a language more widely shared by national stakeholders.

8. INTERIM EVALUATION ARRANGEMENTS

The principal responsibility for managing this IE resides with the Monitoring & Evaluation Focal Point of the Commissioning Unit. The Commissioning Unit for this project's IE is UNDP Timor-Leste Country Office. During this assignment, the Interim Evaluation team will report to the Quality Assurance and RBM Analyst in the Commissioning Unit who will provide guidance and ensure satisfactory completion of deliverables.
(*NOTE: The M&E Focal Point of the Commissioning Unit manages the IE. If there is no M&E Focal Point then senior management must appoint someone, not involved in managing the project being evaluated, to manage this IE).*

The Commissioning Unit will contract the IE team and ensure the timely provision of per diems and travel arrangements within the country. The Project Team will be responsible for liaising with the Interim Evaluation team to provide all relevant documents, set up stakeholder interviews, and arrange field visits.

9. TEAM COMPOSITION

A team of *two independent consultants* will conduct the IE - one team leader International IE (current TOR) (with experience and exposure to projects and evaluations in other regions globally) and one national expert from Timor-Leste (which is to be hired under separate procurement process) with expertise in Disaster Risk Management or/and Climate Change Adaptation. The consultants cannot have participated in the project preparation, formulation, and/or implementation (including the writing of the Project Document) and should not have a conflict of interest with project's related activities.

The selection of consultant will be aimed at maximizing the overall "team" qualities in the following areas: *(give a weight to all these qualifications so applicants know what is the max amount of points they can earn for the technical evaluation; edit criteria, as needed; create separate lists, as needed, if there will be two independent consultants with different required experience)*

International Lead/National Consultant

Education

- A Master's degree in Disaster Risk Management/Reduction; Climate Change Adaptation, Environment, Natural Resource Management, Environmental Engineering, Watershed Management or other closely related field (20%)

Work Experience (70%)

- More than seven years (five years for national consultant) of professional experience of project evaluations with recent experience of result-based management evaluation methodologies; (10%)
- Demonstrated knowledge and previous experience in the design, implementation, monitoring/evaluation of projects focusing on areas of Disaster Risk Management/Mitigation, Climate Change Adaptation, Climate Proofing of Small-Scale Infrastructures and Catchment/watershed Management; (15%)
- Experience applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios; (10%)
- Experience working in Asia especially in small islands nations of South and Southeast East Asia (10%)
- Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender and gender sensitive evaluation and analysis; (10%)
- Excellent communication skills; (5%)
- Demonstrable analytical skills; (5%)
- Project evaluation/review experiences within United Nations system or GCF funded projects will be considered an asset; (5%)

Language (10%)

- Fluency in written and spoken English. Knowledge of Portuguese or Tetun will be considered an asset for international consultant and must for national consultant.

10. EVALUATOR ETHICS

The evaluation team will be held to the highest ethical standards and is required to sign a code of conduct (see ToR Annex D) upon acceptance of the assignment. This evaluation will be conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation. The evaluation team must safeguard the rights and confidentiality of information providers, interviewees and stakeholders through measures to ensure compliance with legal and other relevant codes governing collection of data and reporting on data. The evaluation team must also ensure security of collected information before and after the evaluation and protocols to ensure anonymity and confidentiality of sources of information where that is expected. The information knowledge and data gathered in the evaluation process must also be solely used for the evaluation and not for other uses without the express authorization of UNDP and partners.

11. PAYMENT MODALITIES AND SPECIFICATIONS

20% upon satisfactory delivery and approval of the final Interim Evaluation Inception Report
50% upon satisfactory delivery of the of the first draft Interim Evaluation report
30% upon satisfactory delivery and approval of the final Interim Evaluation report by the Commissioning

Unit, UNDP Nature, Climate and Energy (NCE) Regional Technical Advisor and UNDP NCE Principal Technical Advisor +submission of completed Audit Trail

Criteria for issuing the final payment of 30%[11]:

i) The final IE report includes all requirements outlined in the IE TOR and is in accordance with the IE guidance.
ii) The final IE report is clearly written, logically organized, and is specific for this project (i.e. text has not been cut & pasted from other IE reports).
iii) The Audit Trail includes responses to and justification for each comment listed.
iv) RTA and PTA approvals are via signatures on the TE Report Clearance Form

12. APPLICATION PROCESS[12]

(Commissioning Unit to adjust this section, as appropriate)

Recommended Presentation of Proposal:

a) **Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability** using the template[13] provided by UNDP;
b) **CV** and a **Personal History Form** (P11 form[14]);
c) **Brief description of approach to work/technical proposal** of why the individual considers him/herself as the most suitable for the assignment, and a proposed methodology on how they will approach and complete the assignment; (max 1 page)
d) **Financial Proposal** that indicates the all-inclusive fixed total contract price and all other travel related costs (such as flight ticket, per diem, etc), supported by a breakdown of costs, as per template attached to the Letter of Confirmation of Interest template. If an applicant is employed by an organization/company/institution, and he/she expects his/her employer to charge a management fee in the process of releasing him/her to UNDP under Reimbursable Loan Agreement (RLA), the applicant must indicate at this point, and ensure that all such costs are duly incorporated in the financial proposal submitted to UNDP.

Criteria for Evaluation of Proposal: Only those applications which are responsive and compliant will be evaluated. Offers will be evaluated according to the Combined Scoring method – where the educational background and experience on similar assignments will be weighted at 70% and the price proposal will weigh as 30% of the total scoring. The applicant receiving the Highest Combined Score that has also accepted UNDP's General Terms and Conditions will be awarded the contract.

---

[11] The Commissioning Unit is obligated to issue payments to the IE team as soon as the terms under the ToR are fulfilled. If there is an ongoing discussion regarding the quality and completeness of the final deliverables that cannot be resolved between the Commissioning Unit and the IE team, the Regional M&E Advisor and Vertical Fund Directorate will be consulted. If needed, the Commissioning Unit's senior management, Procurement Services Unit and Legal Support Office will be notified as well so that a decision can be made about whether or not to withhold payment of any amounts that may be due to the evaluator(s), suspend or terminate the contract and/or remove the individual contractor from any applicable rosters. See the UNDP Individual Contract Policy for further details:

https://popp.undp.org/_layouts/15/WopiFrame.aspx?sourcedoc=/UNDP_POPP_DOCUMENT_LIBRARY/Public/PSU_Individual%20Contract_Individual%20Contract%20Policy.docx&action=default

[12] Engagement of the consultants should be done in line with guidelines for hiring consultants in the POPP: https://info.undp.org/global/popp/Pages/default.aspx

[13] https://intranet.undp.org/unit/bom/pso/Support%20documents%20on%20IC%20Guidelines/Template%20for%20Confirmation%20of%20Interest%20and%20Submission%20of%20Financial%20Proposal.docx

[14] http://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/corporate/Careers/P11_Personal_history_form.doc

ToR ANNEX A: List of Documents to be reviewed by the Interim Evaluation Team

1. Funding Proposal
2. Funded Activity Agreement (FAA)
3. UNDP Project Document
4. UNDP Environmental and Social Screening results (Environmental and Social Impact Assessment and Environmental and Social Management Plans (ESIAs and ESMPs)
5. Project Inception Report
6. Project Baseline Report
7. All Annual Performance Reports (APRs)
8. Progress reports and work plans of the various implementation task teams
9. Audit reports
10. Mission reports
11. All monitoring reports prepared by the project
12. Financial and Administration guidelines used by Project Team
13. Co-financing data with expected and actual contributions
14. Electronic copies of the project outputs/reports

The following documents will also be available:

15. Project operational guidelines, manuals and systems
16. UNDP country/countries programme document(s)
17. Minutes of the Project Board Meetings and other meetings (i.e. Project Appraisal Committee meetings)
18. Project site location maps

ToR ANNEX B: Guidelines on Contents for the Interim Evaluation Report[15]

i. Basic Report Information *(for opening page or title page)*
- Title of UNDP-supported GCF-financed project
- UNDP PIMS# and GCF project ID#
- Interim Evaluation time frame and date of report
- Region and countries included in the project
- Executing Agency/Implementing Partner and other project partners
- Interim Evaluation team members

ii. Acknowledgements

iii. Table of Contents

iv. Acronyms and Abbreviations

v. Project Information Table

1. Executive Summary *(2-3 pages)*
- Project Description (brief)
- Project Progress Summary
- Interim Evaluation Ratings & Achievement Summary Table
- Concise summary of conclusions
- Recommendations Summary Table

2. Introduction *(2-3 pages)*
- Purpose of the Interim Evaluation and objectives
- Scope & Methodology: principles of design and execution of the Interim Evaluation, Interim Evaluation approach and data collection methods, limitations
- Structure of the Interim Evaluation report

[15] The Report length should not exceed *40* pages in total (not including annexes).

3. Project Description and Background Context *(3-5 pages)*

- Development context: environmental, socio-economic, institutional, and policy factors relevant to the project objective and scope
- Problems that the project sought to address: threats and barriers targeted
- Project Description and Strategy: objective, outcomes and expected results, description of field sites (if any)
- Project Implementation Arrangements: short description of the Project Board, key implementing partner arrangements, etc.
- Project timing and milestones
- Main stakeholders: summary list

4. Findings *(12-14 pages)*

4.1 Project Strategy

- Project Design
- Results Framework/Logframe

4.2 Relevance

4.3 Effectiveness and Efficiency

4.4 Progress Towards Results

- Progress towards outcomes analysis
- Remaining barriers to achieving the project objective
- Comprehensive assessment of impact of COVID-19 on project implementation

4.5 Project Implementation and Adaptive Management

- Management Arrangements
- Work planning
- Financing
- Coherence in climate finance delivery with other multilateral entities
- Project-level monitoring and evaluation systems
- Stakeholder engagement
- Social and Environmental Standards (Safeguards)
- Reporting
- Communications

4.6 Sustainability

- Financial risks to sustainability
- Socio-economic to sustainability
- Institutional framework and governance risks to sustainability
- Environmental risks to sustainability

4.7 Country Ownership

4.8 Innovativeness in results areas

4.9 Unexpected results, both positive and negative

4.10 Replication and Scalability

4.11 Gender Equity

5. Conclusions and Recommendations *(4-6 pages)*

5.1 Conclusions

- Comprehensive and balanced statements (that are evidence-based and connected to the Interim Evaluation's findings) which highlight the strengths, weaknesses and results of the project

5.2 Lessons Learned

- Concise and logically articulated set of lessons learned based on specific evidence presented in the report, to be used to inform design, adapt and change plans and actions, as appropriate, and plan for scaling up.

5.3 Recommendations

- 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

6. Annexes

- Interim Evaluation ToR (excluding ToR annexes)
- Interim Evaluation evaluative matrix (evaluation criteria with key questions, indicators, sources of data, and methodology)
- Questionnaire or Interview Guide used for data collection
- Mission itinerary
- List of persons interviewed
- List of documents reviewed
- Co-financing table (if not previously included in the body of the report)
- Signed UNEG Code of Conduct form
- Signed Interim Evaluation final report clearance form
- *Annexed in a separate file:* Audit trail from received comments on draft Interim Evaluation report

ToR ANNEX C: Interim Evaluation Evaluative Matrix Template

(Questions to be filled out by the Commissioning Unit) – to be updated

This Interim Evaluation Evaluative Matrix must be fully completed/amended by the Interim Evaluation team and included in the Inception Report and as an Annex to the final Interim Evaluation report.

Evaluative Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
Project Strategy: To what extent is the project strategy relevant to country priorities, country ownership, and the best route towards expected results?			
(include evaluative question(s))	(i.e. relationships established, level of coherence between project design and implementation approach, specific activities conducted, quality of risk mitigation strategies, etc.)	(i.e. project documents, national policies or strategies, websites, project staff, project partners, data collected throughout the evaluation mission, etc.)	(i.e. document analysis, data analysis, interviews with project staff, interviews with stakeholders, etc.)
Progress Towards Results: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved thus far?			
Project Implementation and Adaptive Management: Has the project been implemented efficiently, cost-effectively, and been able to adapt to any changing conditions thus far? To what extent are project-level monitoring and evaluation systems, reporting, and project communications supporting the project's implementation?			
Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, socio-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?			

ToR ANNEX D: UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluators/Interim Evaluation Consultants[16]

Evaluators/Consultants:

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 limitations, findings and recommendations.
7. Should reflect sound accounting procedures and be prudent in using the resources of the evaluation.
8. Must ensure that independence of judgement is maintained and that evaluation findings and recommendations are independently presented.
9. Must confirm that they have not been involved in designing, executing or advising on the project being evaluated.

Interim Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form

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: ____________________________

[16] http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/100

ToR ANNEX E: Interim Evaluation Ratings

Ratings for Progress Towards Results: (one rating for each outcome and for the objective)		
6	Highly Satisfactory (HS)	The objective/outcome is expected to achieve or exceed all its end-of-project targets, without major shortcomings. The progress towards the objective/outcome can be presented as "good practice".
5	Satisfactory (S)	The objective/outcome is expected to achieve most of its end-of-project targets, with only minor shortcomings.
4	Moderately Satisfactory (MS)	The objective/outcome is expected to achieve most of its end-of-project targets but with significant shortcomings.
3	Moderately Unsatisfactory (HU)	The objective/outcome is expected to achieve its end-of-project targets with major shortcomings.
2	Unsatisfactory (U)	The objective/outcome is expected not to achieve most of its end-of-project targets.
1	Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)	The objective/outcome has failed to achieve its midterm targets, and is not expected to achieve any of its end-of-project targets.
Ratings for Project Implementation & Adaptive Management: (one overall rating)		
6	Highly Satisfactory (HS)	Implementation of all seven components – management arrangements, work planning, finance and co-finance, project-level monitoring and evaluation systems, stakeholder engagement, reporting, and communications – is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management. The project can be presented as "good practice".
5	Satisfactory (S)	Implementation of most of the seven components is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management except for only few that are subject to remedial action.
4	Moderately Satisfactory (MS)	Implementation of some of the seven components is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management, with some components requiring remedial action.
3	Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)	Implementation of some of the seven components is not leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive, with most components requiring remedial action.
2	Unsatisfactory (U)	Implementation of most of the seven components is not leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management.
1	Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)	Implementation of none of the seven components is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management.
Ratings for Sustainability: (one overall rating)		
4	Likely (L)	Negligible risks to sustainability, with key outcomes on track to be achieved by the project's closure and expected to continue into the foreseeable future
3	Moderately Likely (ML)	Moderate risks, but expectations that at least some outcomes will be sustained due to the progress towards results on outcomes at the Midterm Review
2	Moderately Unlikely (MU)	Significant risk that key outcomes will not carry on after project closure, although some outputs and activities should carry on
1	Unlikely (U)	Severe risks that project outcomes as well as key outputs will not be sustained

ToR ANNEX F: Interim Evaluation Report Clearance Form

(to be completed and signed by the Commissioning Unit, RTA and PTA included in the final report)

Interim Evaluation Report Reviewed and Cleared By:

Commissioning Unit (M&E Focal Point)

Name: ____

Signature: ____ Date: _________________________________

Regional Technical Advisor - Nature, Climate and Energy

Name: ____

Signature: ____ Date: _________________________________

Principal Technical Advisor - Nature, Climate and Energy

Name: ____

Signature: ____ Date: _________________________________

ToR ANNEX G: Audit Trail Template

Note: The following is a template for the Interim Evaluation Team to show how the received comments on the draft Interim Evaluation report have (or have not) been incorporated into the final report. This audit trail should be listed as an annex in the final report but not attached to the report file.

To the comments received on (*date*) from the Interim Evaluation of Safeguarding Communities and Their Physical Assets from Climate Change Induced Disasters in Timor-Leste (UNDP Project ID-*PIMS 5910)*

The following comments were provided in track changes to the draft Interim 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 report	Interim Evaluation team response and actions taken