

Appendix A: Scope of services

Evaluation of the Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF) for adaptation to climate change

1. Introduction

The Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF) was established in 2001 as one of the climate change adaptation (CCA) financing mechanisms under the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC). The LDCF has provided funding for the preparation of National Adaptation Programmes of Action (NAPA) in the Least Developed Countries (LDCs) and will provide funding for the implementation of NAPA priorities for CCA.

The LDCF is administrated by the Global Environment Facility (GEF). Projects are implemented by the three Implementing Agencies (IA) of the GEF (UNDP, UNEP and World Bank) and recently also made possible by the seven Executing Agencies (the regional development banks, FAO, IFAD and UNIDO).

Denmark through Danida (Danish International Development Assistance) and 18 other donors have pledged and contributed funding for the LDCF of USD 172.8 Million and the amount paid into LDCF is USD 91.8 Million (status: March 2008). Denmark has contributed DKK 90.4 Million to LDCF or 9.4 % of the total.

The *Danish Climate and Development Action Plan* (2005) requires that Denmark takes action in the bilateral and multilateral development cooperation and includes both climate change mitigation and adaptation measures. Concerning the adaptation to climate change the objective is to integrate climate change proofing into bilateral and multilateral development programmes.

For further information on the LDCF reference is made to the attached background note,

2. Intended Users of the Evaluation

The Danida Evaluation Department (EVAL) and the Department for Environment and Sustainable Development (MIL) of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Denmark (MFA) have proposed an evaluation of the LDCF. The evaluation will be jointly managed by EVAL, the GEF Evaluation Office (EO) and possibly a representative of relevant institution with a mandate in evaluation from one of the LDCs.

The proposed evaluation of the LDCF has a focus on the outcome and application of the NAPA process, and the planning and financing of adaptation to climate change in LDCs. The LDCF is currently at a stage where the modality is shifting from supporting the preparation of the NAPAs towards providing support for the implementation of the identified priority CCA projects in LDCs.

An added value of the evaluation is the assessment of the catalytic effects of the LDCF through the NAPA process for inclusion of CCA in bilateral and multilateral supported development programmes. The direct involvement of a bilateral donor agency like Danida in the evaluation is expected to contribute further to and expose the possible links and synergies of climate change

adaptation with the multilateral and bilateral development interventions as well as other present and future sources of climate change adaptation funds.¹

The outcome of the evaluation will be relevant for future development of the LDCF and actual and future climate change adaptation finance mechanisms. The outcome of the evaluation can be used by parties to UNFCCC, developing countries, GEF and Implementing Agencies, multilateral and bilateral donors, as well as multilateral finance institutions.

3. Purpose and Evaluation Criteria

3.1 Main Purpose

The objective of the evaluation of the LDCF is *to analyse and document the results and lessons learned from the use of the Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF) in financing and promoting climate change adaptation in development programmes in LDCs, and to provide recommendations regarding the future role of the LDCF and the implementation of the NAPAs.* The outcome of the evaluation of LDCF will be relevant for other adaptation funds (e.g. SCCF and KPAF) and their future operation and in particular for addressing the needs of the LDCs.

In meeting the objective of the evaluation the emphasis will be on the following focus areas:

- **The NAPA product:** The results and quality of the produced NAPAs including the relevance and feasibility of the selected priority projects for immediate action.
- **The NAPA process:** The institutional organisation, coordination, consultations within recipient government institutions and with non-governmental stakeholders, recipient LDC ownership of the NAPA process, and outcomes in the LDCs. The efficiency of the NAPA process, including delivery of services by the GEF and Implementing Agencies to the recipient LDCs. Efficiency of the GEF project cycle. Accessibility of financing from LDCF for urgent and immediate adaptation to climate change in LDCs.
- **The NAPA catalytic effect:** The catalytic effect including the momentum and synergies from the NAPA process on development programmes and institutions in LDCs. The documented results of mainstreaming CCA in national and sector development programmes. The improved institutional capability and effectiveness in addressing adaptation to climate change. The current and future synergies of LDCF with general development funding, i.e. ODA, private sector investments and Government development budgets, should be explored.

The evaluation of the LDCF will contribute to the development of a future monitoring and evaluation (M&E) framework including performance criteria for climate change adaptation and development, and indicators for vulnerability assessment.

The evaluation approach will take into account various climate change scenarios, different approaches to adaptation and baseline assessments for future M&E of climate change adaptation and development.

¹ The GEF Evaluation Guidelines (2006, p.23) calls for joint evaluations: “The GEF Evaluation Office and the GEF partners shall actively explore the possibility of joint evaluations which would provide the GEF with insights and feedback that might not be realized through a stand-alone evaluation.”

3.2 Specific Evaluation Criteria

The five standard evaluation criteria (relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impacts and sustainability) will be applied as outlined in Table 1.

Table 1: OECD/DAC Evaluation Criteria and LCDF

Evaluation Criteria	General relevance of the evaluation criteria		Specific relevance to LCDF
	Danida Guidelines	GEF Guidelines	
Relevance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ “The extent to which the objectives of a development intervention are consistent with beneficiaries’ requirement, country needs, global priorities and partners’ and donors’ policies”. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ “The extent to which the activity is suited to local and national development priorities, including changes over time”. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Are the proposed priority adaptation projects relevant to address the immediate climate change adaptation in a given LDC? ▪ Relevance to and inclusion in national development strategies? ▪ Compliance with the Danish Climate and Development Action Plan and similar strategies from contributing donors? ▪ Has ‘urgent and immediate adaptation’ been defined and the additional costs assessed? ▪ The rationale of separate adaptation finance mechanism compared to integration with adequate funding from general ODA. Overlap and coordination of different adaptation funding mechanisms
Efficiency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ “A measure of how economically resources/inputs (funds, expertise, time, etc.) are converted to results”. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ “The extent to which the results have been delivered with the least costly resources possibly; also called cost effectiveness or efficacy”. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Cost-efficiency of producing the NAPAs, i.e. outputs achieved compared with inputs from LDCF and other sources. ▪ Incurred transaction costs from preparing and implementing NAPAs. ▪ The time frame from project idea to project approval in the GEF project cycle. ▪ Management of the LDCF by GEF and Implementing Agencies. ▪ Accessibility of LDCF funding. ▪ Governance of the LDCF including the internal roles between the COP, GEF and the IA, and their roles in relation to the LDCs.
Effectiveness	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ “The extent to which the development intervention’s objectives were achieved, or are expected to be achieved, taking into account their relative importance”. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ “The extent to which results have been achieved or how likely it is to be achieved”. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Inclusion and coordination of climate change adaptation through the NAPA with national and sector development policies, strategies and plans. ▪ ‘Bankable’ adaptation activities and priorities identified during the NAPA process?
Impacts (Danida) / Results (GEF)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ “The positive and negative, primary and secondary long-term effects produced by a development intervention, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended”. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ “The positive and negative, and foreseen and unforeseen, changes to and effects produced by a development intervention. In GEF terms, results include 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Monitoring and documentation of adaptation benefits and costs as a result of LDCF supported NAPAs. ▪ A functional framework established in LDCs for issues related to adaptation to climate change. ▪ Results with capacity development, awareness raising and policy

Evaluation Criteria	General relevance of the evaluation criteria		Specific relevance to LCDF
		direct project outputs, short to medium-term outcomes, and longer-term impacts including global environmental benefits, replication effects, and other local effects.”	mainstreaming from to the NAPA process
Sustainability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> “The continuation of benefits from a development intervention after major development assistance has been completed. Probability of long-term benefits. The resilience to risk of the net benefit flows over time”. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> “The likely ability of an intervention to continue to deliver benefits for an extended period of time after completion. Projects need to be environmental, as well as financially and socially sustainable.” 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ownership to the NAPA process and commitment to follow-up by LDCs and development partners. Adequate financing for adaptation secured based on documented needs and expected results. Awareness of the NAPA process and outcomes among decision makers, line agencies, media and civil society.

Source: Adapted from the MFA Evaluation Guidelines (2006, p.47) and GEF Monitoring & Evaluation Policy (2006, p.19).

It may also be relevant to apply the 3Cs (Coherence, Complementarity and Coordination) approach for the LDCF evaluation. The 3Cs approach was developed in the pretext of the Maastricht Treaty by EU member states in 2003 for the evaluation for the EU’s development cooperation policies and operations.

Table 2: 3Cs evaluation approach and the LDCF

3 Cs approach	General Description	Issues of relevance to LDCF evaluation
Coherence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is non-occurrence of effects of policy [intervention] that are contrary to the intended results or aims of policy [intervention] 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensure that the LDCF funding is provided in accordance with both adaptation needs and development priorities. Avoidance of mal-adaptation (adaptation that increases vulnerability). Priorities of adaptation to climate change pursue same objectives as development programmes, i.e. poverty reduction and sustainable economic development.
Complementarity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There shall be complementarity to the [development] policies pursued by the Member States [and LDCs and Development Partners] 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> NAPA priority projects are complementary with and included in national development programmes and identified adaptation in the context of development programmes. Development programmes vulnerable to potential climate change risks are addressed in the NAPA or include climate change proofing.
Coordination	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Activities of two or more development partners that are intended [jointly] to mobilise aid resources or to harmonise their policies, programmes, procedures and practices so as to maximise the development effectiveness of aid resources. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Compliance with Paris Declaration on development harmonisation and alignment. Coordination among Implementing Agencies and with other ODA development partners. Coordination with similar interventions, e.g. disaster risk reduction (Hyogo Framework for Action).

Source: Adapted from www.three-cs.net. Text in [...] is added for clarity.

4. Approach and Methodology

Evaluations of Danish development activities and GEF operations are carried out in accordance with the OECD/DAC Evaluation Quality Standards which require, *i.a.* that a sound methodology for all evaluations be used and explained in the evaluation report. The purpose of the methodology, and the basis on which its soundness is assessed, is to produce reliable data that allow for valid evaluative judgments that are useful for learning and decision making (MFA, 2006, p.66).²

The LDCF evaluation can be considered a ‘thematic’ evaluation, i.e. with a focus on climate change adaptation and the financing mechanism. The delivery of aid is evaluated in terms of the efficiency of cooperation, the effects of the aid and the performance of the involved institutions.

The LDCF evaluation will be a real-time ‘learning evaluation’ since the support to adaptation is ongoing and outcomes beyond preparing the NAPAs are forthcoming. The evaluation will also provide recommendations on possible adjustments of ongoing activities of the LDCF and learn across the experiences from different LDCs, the NAPA process, focus sectors, and priority adaptation interventions.

The methodological approach of the evaluation of the LDCF is expected to include the following main elements:

- Analysis of all prepared NAPAs (38 NAPAs are submitted by July 2008 and additional 6 are near completion bringing the expected number of NAPAs to 44) to assess their overall quality and relevance, barriers identified and scope for implementation.
- Stakeholder analysis through structured interviews with: a) the GEF as the LDCF administrator, b) Implementing Agencies, c) relevant government and non-governmental actors in selected LDCs, d) selected donors to LDCF, e) the LEG, and f) the UNFCCC secretariat, regarding the results, operations and management of the LDCF. Interviews with international NGOs and other institutions involved in the climate change agenda will also be relevant to shed light on the relevance and effectiveness of the LDCF.
- In-depth qualitative analysis of selected cases of NAPA preparations and forthcoming implementations. In-depth country cases will assess the various experiences from the NAPA process, national policies and climate change vulnerability. The countries could, for example, be from Asia (Bangladesh, Cambodia, Nepal or Bhutan), East and Southern Africa (Tanzania, Uganda or Malawi), West Africa (Burkina Faso, Benin, Niger or Mali) as well as small island developing states (SIDS). Criteria for selection of case countries will be developed as part of the overall assessment of all available NAPAs as well as suggestions for case countries. Regional issues on adaptation to climate change can also be addressed.
- Selected thematic analysis and lessons from across NAPAs, e.g. on coastal zones, human health, agriculture, mountain glaciers, infra-structure, small-island states, and water resource management is also included.

The methodological approach shall seek to address the following topics in depth:

² GEF uses the following definition of an evaluation (GEF, 2006, p.3): “An evaluation is a systematic and impartial assessment of an activity, project, program, strategy, policy, sector, focal area, or other topics. It aims at determining the relevance, impact, effectiveness, efficiency, and sustainability of the interventions and contributions of the involved partners. An evaluation should provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable, and useful, enabling the timely incorporation of findings, recommendations, and lessons into the decision-making processes.”

- Identify the needs for adaptation finance and scope for synergies with other financing options including ODA.
- Map the barriers of accessing funding from the LDCF and how these have or can be addressed by the Governance system of the LDCF (COP, GEF and the Implementing Agencies) and the LDCs.
- Document the key lessons learned that can be replicated across countries and sectors with the available LDCF funding and with possible synergies with more general development ODA and other sources of adaptation financing.
- Recommend on how to maintain the momentum of the NAPA process and on effective ways of moving from analysis and assessment to implementation and mainstreaming.
- Counterfactual analysis, i.e. to assess what could be the incurred costs of climate change in the absence of adaptation finance and development mainstreaming.

The methodology will be further refined during the tender process and during the Inception Phase of the evaluation by the selected Evaluation Team.

5. Key evaluation questions and focus of the evaluation

The preparation and implementation of the evaluation of the LDCF includes a number of key evaluation questions. The purpose of the evaluation questions is to reach a shared understanding of the evaluation approach and outcome. The evaluation questions may be revised during the evaluation preparation process.

Proposed evaluation questions concerning **the LDCF mechanism and NAPA product**:

- **The NAPA results and quality** – What are the results of the NAPAs? Quality of the NAPAs produced based on defined criteria? Have the immediate and urgent measures for adaptation to climate change been identified and addressed in the NAPAs?
- **From assessments to implementation** – Quality and relevance of proposed priority adaptation projects? What are the financing requirements for urgent and immediate adaptation? Has it been assessed what are the relevant ‘additional costs’ for adaptation to climate change? How do the NAPAs support the assessment of the additional costs for adaptation to climate change and separate these from the development budget?
- **Harmonisation with national communication to UNFCCC** – Experience with the linkage of NAPAs to the adaptation and vulnerability assessments in the Initial National Communication and Second National Communication? (the latter is ongoing or not initiated in most LDCs)
- **Approval of adaptation projects** – Adequacy of the assessment procedure and approval by GEF of the PIFs for the proposed implementation projects? Involvement of host countries, donors and LEG in PIF and project design and approval?

Proposed evaluation questions concerning the **LDCF operation and the NAPA process**:

- **Lessons learned** - What are the main lessons learned from the NAPA process based on the experiences of the LDCs, i.e. with respect to relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impacts and sustainability?
- **Operation and management of LDCF** - The operation of the LDCF including accessibility of funding for adaptation? Delivery of technical and operational services by GEF and the

Implementing Agencies? The performance of GEF as the LDCF administrator? The roles, coordination and possible competition among the Implementing Agencies?

- **Consultation and coordination** – Role of the LDCD/SCCF Council? Involvement of the LEG in the NAPA preparation process? Results from the four regional NAPA preparation workshops? Consultation and feed-back from donors and LDCs? Decision making regarding the operations of LDCF by GEF and COP and the voice and influence of the LDCs?

Proposed evaluation questions concerning the **LDCF and NAPA catalytic effects and synergies**:

- **Mainstreaming of adaptation to climate change and development programmes** – To what extent has the outcome of the NAPAs been integrated in national and sector development plans? Have NAPAs resulted in a separation with free-standing climate change adaptation projects or a further inclusion of CCA in national and sector development programmes?
- **Synergies of financing mechanisms** - Scope for synergies of LDCF with other bilateral and multilateral ODA funding development programmes and projects? Is there a potential for synergy of the different adaptation mechanism (LDCF, SCCF, KPAF, SPA) for adaptation to climate change? Could LDCF be merged, e.g. with the adaptation programme of SCCF and the forthcoming KPAF?
- **Funding of adaptation to climate change** – Adequacy of LDCF to cover the additional costs of adaptation identified in the NAPAs? Other actual and potential sources of financing for adaptation than LDCF?
- **Disaster risk management** – Alignment with similar activities concerning Disaster Risk Management (DRR) under the Hyogo Framework for Action including institutional organisation and harmonisation of DRR and CCA?
- **Regional cooperation** – Experience with and scope for regional adaptation activities including capacity development, climate data collection and sharing and management of cross-border impacts?
- **Other GEF mechanism** – Comparison and lessons of NAPA and LDCF with other GEF enabling mechanism (biodiversity, land degradation, POPs) as well as other climate change adaptation funding managed by GEF?

6. Time Table

The evaluation of the LDCF is expected to be launched in November 2008 and to be finalised by June 2009. The Process Action Plan will be further revised and detailed as part of the preparation of the inception report and work plan by the Evaluation Team.

Process Action Plan³

Activity	Dates (tentative)	Responsible
Tender evaluation and selection of Evaluation Team	By October 24, 2008	EVAL, GEF EO, ERH
Evaluation launch date: Contract signed	By November 7, 2008	EVAL, ERH and selected Evaluation Team.
Draft Inception report and work plan forwarded for comments	By December 8, 2008	Evaluation Team
1 st meeting of ERG: Discussion and approval of inception report and work plan, and selection of country cases.	By December 15, 2008	EVAL, GEF EO, ERG <i>(potentially in Poznan with LEG group before COP14)</i>
Deadline for comments to Draft Inception report	By December 20, 2008	EVAL, GEF EO, ERG
Final Inception Report forwarded	By January 5, 2009	Evaluation Team
Analysis and 'field work'	January to April, 2009	Evaluation Team
Mid-Term Progress Report submitted	By March 15, 2009	Evaluation Team
Mid-Term Progress Report circulated for comments to ERG	March 2009	EVAL
2 to 3 regional stakeholder workshops	In March / April 2009	Evaluation Team
Draft Evaluation Report submitted for comments	By May 15, 2009	Evaluation Team
2 nd meeting of ERG: Presentation and discussion of draft evaluation report	By May 30, 2009	EVAL, GEF EO, ERG
Presentation of preliminary findings at Danida Development Days	In June 2009	EVAL, Evaluation Team
Final draft Evaluation Report submitted	By June 15, 2009	Evaluation Team
Publishing of Evaluation Report and presentation to the Danida Board, GEF and others	In August / September 2009	EVAL, GEF EO, Evaluation Team
Dissemination Workshops (one in Copenhagen and one in a LDC)	In August / September 2009	EVAL, GEF EO, Evaluation Team

3

EVAL: Evaluation Department of MFA / Danida
 GEF EO: Global Environment Facility Evaluation Office
 ERG: Evaluation Reference Group
 ERH: Contract Department of Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Denmark
 MIL: Department for Environment and Sustainable Development of MFA

7. Composition of the Evaluation Team

The Evaluation Team shall consist of international and national/regional consultants with experience in evaluation of development assistance (i.e. evaluations that conform to the DAC evaluation definition).

The organisation of the team's work is the responsibility of the consultant and should be specified and explained clearly in the tender.

The Team Leader should be an international consultant.⁴ The Team Leader is responsible for the team's reporting, and for the organisation of the work of the team. The Team Leader will participate in the Evaluation Reference Groups' meetings and other meetings as required.

The evaluation team should cover the following competencies:

Qualifications of the Team Leader:

- Higher relevant academic degree.
- At least 15 years of relevant professional experience.
- At least five years of experience with international development assistance in LDCs
- Extensive working knowledge on development assistance policies and delivery systems (including strategies of harmonisation and alignment, etc.)
- Experience in evaluation of development assistance. Preferably references as team leader for complex evaluations.
- At least three references as team leader for multi-disciplinary teams
- Preferably references with experiences in relation to climate change adaptation, climate change finance, and/or mainstreaming of climate change and development
- Fluent in English

The tender shall include other team members in addition to the team leader. The other team members will be weighted according to their relative inputs in man months in the tender evaluation.

Qualifications of each team members:

- Higher relevant academic degree.
- At least 5 years of relevant professional experience
- At least three relevant references within the professional tasks assigned to each team member
- Knowledge of development assistance policies, strategies and aid management and preferably experience in evaluation of development assistance.
- Fluent in English

Specific qualifications to be covered by at least one and preferably more of the team members:

⁴ 'International consultants' are defined as persons with an international background, i.e. a degree from an internationally recognised university and professional experience from assignments within developing and developed countries.

- Experience related to climate change adaptation, institutional processes, climate change adaptation financing, the GEF project cycle.
- Knowledge of organisational capacity development, including experience with technical assistance at country, programme and sector levels.
- Fluent in French

The tenders should clearly state which of the proposed team members cover which of the above qualifications.

Eligible consulting companies, institutions or individual team members are those according to the DAC evaluation principles of evaluation, which have not been involved in the preparation, appraisal, implementation or review of activities related to LDCF and the NAPA process.

A manageable and balanced team should be aimed at. Moreover, the Tenders should specify how they will manage the team to ensure optimal use of resources in the team. The evaluation of the composition of the team will be based on criteria such as:

- Relatively equal gender distribution in the Evaluation Team
- Manageable size of the Team (3 to 5 team members including international and regional)
- Balanced input at head office and in country case studies.
- At least one or preferably two of the team members should participate in all proposed country case studies to ensure some harmonisation in the approach and reporting.
- Relevance and complementarity of proposed consortiums

8. Inputs

The total budget for the consultancy services is a maximum of DKK 2.3 million. This includes all fees as well as implementation and personnel related reimbursable expenses required for the execution of the contract. A budget of DKK 300.000 (included in the maximum amount of DKK 2.3 million) shall be allocated for the stakeholder workshops.

The evaluation team is responsible for printing and circulating the draft evaluation report for comments. A budget of DKK 50,000 shall be allocated (from the maximum amount for the services) for printing and distribution of draft evaluation reports.

EVAL will cover the expenditures for the meetings of the Evaluation Reference Group, the two dissemination workshops and printing of the final evaluation report.

9. Evaluation principles, management and support

Management of the evaluation will be in accordance with MFA Evaluation Guidelines (2006) and GEF Evaluation Guidelines (2006).

Three sets of roles are contained in the evaluation process:

- the Evaluation Management
- the Evaluation Team (Consultant)

- the Evaluation Reference Group

Stakeholders will be consulted at strategic points in time of the evaluation notably in connection with the discussion of the inception report, progress reporting and the draft evaluation report. The key stakeholders are considered to be the following:

- Climate change focal points and other relevant stakeholders in recipient LDCs.
- Development Partners contributing to LDCF
- LEG members
- GEF and Implementing Agencies
- GEF (LDCF/SCCF) Council
- UNFCCC
- Resource persons from research and NGOs

9.1 Role of the Evaluation Management

The evaluation will be supervised and managed by a management group comprising EVAL (the MFA Evaluation Department), the GEF EO and possibly a representative from an institution with a mandate to evaluate development planning from one of the LDCs.

The management group will be responsible for managing the evaluation process with EVAL taking a lead role. The tasks of the Evaluation Management are to:

- Prepare the ToR of the evaluation and initiate announcement of the evaluation assignment through the MFA contract office.
- Participate in the selection of Evaluation Team based on received tenders. (MFA contract office chairs the selection committee which is assisted by an independent tender consultant.)
- Organise and chair meetings of the Evaluation Reference Group.
- Solicit management response from MFA and GEF during the evaluation process.
- Advise MFA departments and representations on the evaluation as well as coordinate internal MFA contributions (EVAL).
- Advise GEF departments on the evaluation (GEF EO).
- Inform and coordinate with relevant evaluation stakeholders.
- Provide feed-back to the Evaluation Team. Comment on and approve if feasible the draft versions of the inception report, work plan, progress reports and the evaluation report.
- Ensure that quality control has been carried out throughout the evaluation process.
- Participate in evaluation stakeholder workshops during the evaluation process as agreed.
- Organise the presentation of the evaluation results and the follow-up.
- Organise, facilitate and participate in the two dissemination workshops towards the end of the evaluation.

9.2 Role of the Evaluation Team

The DAC evaluation principles of independence of the Evaluation Team will be applied. The Evaluation Team shall be external to the development partners and implementing agencies, and the Evaluation Team shall not have previous involvement in the development interventions related to LDCF.

The Evaluation Team will carry out the evaluation based on a contract between MFA and the incumbent company. The Evaluation Team will:

- Prepare and carry out the evaluation according to these ToR and the approved Inception Report and Work Plan.
- Be responsible to the Evaluation Management for the findings, conclusions and recommendations of the evaluation.
- Report to the Evaluation Management regularly.
- Arrange and coordinate stakeholder meetings and field visits, and other key events related to the evaluation.
- Participate in and facilitate the two dissemination workshop together with the Evaluation Management and other presentation of the evaluations results.
- Carry out and document Quality Assurance during the evaluation process and forward Quality Assurance Notes to the Evaluation Management.

Suggestions provided by the Evaluation Team in the inception report and work plan will be addressed by members of the Evaluation Reference Group and the Evaluation Management prior to the initiation of the analysis and field work.

9.3 Role of the Evaluation Reference Group

An Evaluation Reference Group (ERG) will be established and chaired by the Evaluation Management. The mandate of the ERG is to provide:

- Advisory support on methodological issues and evaluation approach
- Inputs to the evaluation, e.g. through comments to the draft inception report, progress reports and draft evaluation reports.
- Support the implementation, dissemination and follow-up of the agreed evaluation findings and recommendations.

The members of the ERG are yet to be identified. The ERG can include representatives from relevant stakeholders including UNFCCC, LDCF donors, LDCs, LEG, GEF, Implementing Agencies, MFA (MIL, BFT and others), and selected resource persons, e.g. climate change adaptation specialists.

10. Outputs of the Evaluation

The following outputs are expected from the evaluation:

- The main output of the evaluation is the **evaluation report** synthesizing the findings, conclusions and recommendations from the evaluation (maximum 50 pages plus annexes).

- The **Inception Report and Work Programme** (to be prepared by the selected Evaluation Team) will further elaborate the methodology of the evaluation including the design, approach, sufficiency and appropriateness of evidence, data collection strategy and methods, analytical framework and reporting outline. The Evaluation Team will be obliged to forward a final inception report reflecting the agreed methodology and approach to the Evaluation Management before the analysis and field work is commenced.
- **Process outputs** include short debriefing reports from field visits, progress reports, quality assurance notes and draft evaluation reports. Reports from the field work should be included as annexes to the main report and made available on a CD-ROM to follow the main evaluation report.

The timing and contents of the evaluation outputs will be further specified in the Inception Report and Work Plan. Responsibility for the content and presentation of the findings and recommendations of the evaluation rests with the team leader of the Evaluation Team.

The evaluation report will be submitted by the evaluation management to the Board of Danida, the GEF (LDCF/SCCF) Council, UNFCCC, LDCs, donors funding LDCF, and other relevant stakeholders. The findings and recommendations expressed in the evaluation report will not necessarily correspond to the views of MFA, GEF, Implementing Agencies, or donors funding LDCF.

11. Requirements for the Evaluation Team's home office Interventions

The Evaluation Team's home office shall provide the following, to be covered by the Consultants fees:

- General home office administration and professional back-up. The back-up activities shall be specified.
- Quality assurance (QA) of the consultancy services in accordance with the Evaluation Team quality management and quality assurance system, as described in the Tender. Special emphasis will be given to quality assurance of draft reports prior to the submission of such reports.
- Implementation of the business integrity management plan, as described in the Consultants application for qualification, in relation to the present evaluation. This implementation shall be specified.

The Tenders shall comprise a detailed description of the proposed QA, in order to document that the Tenderer has fully internalised how to implement the QA and in order to enable a subsequent verification that the QA has actually been carried out as agreed.

The Tenderer should select a QA Team, envisaged to consist of minimum two persons, to be responsible for Head Office QA. The members of the QA should not be directly involved in the evaluation. Their CV should be included in the Tender. The QA team should have the similar competence and professional experience as the Evaluation Team.

All QA activities should be properly documented and reported to the Evaluation Management.

12. Information and Data provided by the Client

Reference is made to Danida Procurement Guidelines – For award of service contracts according to the EU-Directive, October 2006 (www.danidacontracts.dk).

The following background documents will be made available to the Tenderers together with the Tender Document:

- Evaluation Guidelines, MFA/Danida, October 2006 (available on-line: <http://www.evaluation.dk>)
- Quality Standards for Evaluations, OECD/DAC, 2006 (available on-line: <http://www.oecd.org>)
- GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy, GEF EO (<http://www.thegef.org/gefevaluation.aspx>)
- Background note on the LDCF (attached to the invitation to tenderers).

13. Alternative Tenders

Alternative tenders will not be permitted.

14. Agreement of Exclusivity

The Consultant is not allowed to impose agreement of exclusivity on national sub-consultants.

15. Other relevant documents

Danida (2005): *“Danish Climate and Development Action Programme – a tool kit for climate proofing Danish Development Cooperation”*, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Denmark, Danida, August 2005.

GEF (2006): *“The GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy”*, GEF Evaluation Office, Evaluation Document No 1: 2006.

GEF (2007a): *“Financing adaptation action”*, 8 pp.

GEF (2008): Documents for LDCF/SCCF council meeting, April 2008 (GEF/LDCF.SCCF.4/Inf.1-5).

IPCC (2007): *“Climate Change 2007 - The Physical Science Basis”*, Working Group I Contribution to the Fourth Assessment Report of the IPCC, Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change; Cambridge University Press.

Mcgray, H.; A. Hammill & R. Bradley (2007): *“Weathering the storm – options for framing adaptation and development”*, World Resource Institute. November 2007.

MFA (2006-08): Climate Change Screening notes (see <http://www.danidadevforum.um.dk/en/menu/Topics/ClimateChange/ClimateAndDevelopment/ToolsAndReferences/DanidaEntryPoints/ClimateChangeScreeningReports/>)

Möhner, A. & R.Klein (2007): *“The global environment facility: Funding for adaptation or adaptation to funds”*, Climate and Energy working paper, Stockholm Environment Institute (SEI), June 2008.

Osman-Elasha, B. & T.E. Downing (2007): *“Lessons learned in preparing National Adaptation Programmes of Action in Eastern and Southern Africa”*, European Capacity Building Initiative, Policy Analysis Report, 40 pp.

SBI (2007): “*An assessment of the funding necessary to assist developing countries in meeting their commitments relating to the Global Environment Facility replenishment cycle*”, Subsidiary Body for Implementation (SBI), UNFCCC (FCCC/SBI/2007/21), November 14, 2007

Stern, N. (2007): “*The economics of climate change - the Stern review*”, Cambridge University Press, 692 pp.

World Bank (2007): “*IDA and Climate Change – making climate change action work for development*”, Report to IDA-15, November 2007.

Key UNFCCC COP decisions:

- [3/CP.11](#): Further guidance for the operation of the LDC fund
- [6/CP.9](#): Further guidance for the operation of the Least Developed Countries Fund
- [8/CP.8](#): Guidance to an entity entrusted with the operation of the financial mechanism of the Convention, for the operation of the Least Developed Countries Fund
- [28/CP.7](#): Guidelines for the preparation of national adaptation programmes of action (see paragraph 4)
- [27/CP.7](#): Guidance to an entity entrusted with the operation of the financial mechanism of the Convention, for the operation of the least developed countries fund
- [7/CP.7](#): Funding under the Convention (see paragraph 6)
- [5/CP.7](#): Implementation of Article 4, paragraphs 8 and 9, of the Convention (decision 3/CP.3 and Article 2, paragraph 3, and Article 3, paragraph 14, of the Kyoto Protocol) (see paragraph 12)

Web sites:

- UNFCC and LDCF: http://unfccc.int/cooperation_and_support/financial_mechanism/least_developed_country_fund/items/3660.php
- UNFCCC and NAPA: <http://unfccc.int/adaptation/napas/items/2679.php>
- UNDP and NAPA: <http://napa.undp.org/>
- UNITAR and NAPA: <http://www.napa-pana.org/>
- UNEP and NAPA: http://www.unep.org/themes/climatechange/Focus_area/napa.asp
- GEF and LDCF: <http://www.gefweb.org/interior.aspx?id=194> and <http://www.gefweb.org/interior.aspx?id=256>