

## Terms of Reference

### **Independent Baseline Evaluation of the Strengthening capacities in the use of geospatial information for improved resilience in Asia-Pacific and Africa project**

#### **Background**

1. The **United Nations Institute for Training and Research (UNITAR)** is a principal training arm of the United Nations, with the aim to increase the effectiveness of the United Nations in achieving its major objectives through training and research. UNITAR's mission is to develop individual, institutional and organizational capacities of countries and other United Nations stakeholders through high quality learning solutions and related knowledge products and services to enhance decision making and to support country-level action for overcoming global challenges. Learning outcomes are associated with about two-thirds of the Institute's 800-some events organized annually, with a cumulative outreach to over 320,000 individuals (including some 200,000 learners). Approximately three-quarters of beneficiaries from learning-related programming are from developing countries. UNITAR programming is aligned with the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and the outcomes of other major outcomes from 2015, including those of the Sendai (Disaster Risk Reduction), Paris (Climate Change) and Addis Ababa (Financing for Development) conferences. In accordance with 2030 Agenda principles of reaching the furthest behind first, emphasis will be placed on the needs of countries in special situations, including the small island developing States (SIDS), the land-locked developing countries (LLDCs) and the least developed countries (LDCs).
2. UNITAR's Operational Satellite Applications Programme - UNOSAT is a knowledge centre within the UN dedicated to supporting fellow agencies and Member States in their use of Geospatial Information Technologies (GIT) and has recently been recognized by ECOSOC as the United Nations Satellite Centre (resolution E/2021/L.22). The programme has spearheaded the use of these technologies in various fields of application, namely for emergency response, disaster risk reduction, peace and security, but also for the protection of cultural heritage and monitoring and evaluation of development projects.
3. Since 2011, UNOSAT has been implementing, with the financial support from the Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs and NORAD, training and capacity development activities in Asia with support from its Office in Bangkok hosted at United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific (UNESCAP), and in East Africa with key contribution from its Office in Nairobi.
4. The **"Strengthening capacities in the use of geospatial information for improved resilience in Asia-Pacific and Africa"** project aims to improve resilience in Africa and in the Asia – Pacific region using geo-spatial information technologies. This will be accomplished through capacity development that is comprised of trainings delivered in various modalities, and in developing actual solutions tailored to beneficiaries' needs and resources. The aim will be accomplished through a user-centered approach focusing on practical technical trainings, technical backstopping and support from peers through a community of practice.
5. The project builds on past experiences by:
  - I. Deepening the impact of past capacity development trainings ;
  - II. Replicating success in new regions, namely in the Pacific SIDS and in West Africa; and

- III. Revealing the inter-connections between various risks in developing applications of geo information technologies to other thematic areas where it brings high benefits, like Climate Resilience, Environmental Preservation and Food Security, and fostering exchanges of knowledge acquired between project stakeholders by inter alia assisting selected countries to apply GIT to interlinked thematic areas such as climate resilience, environmental preservation, and food security to improve knowledge sharing among project stakeholders.
- 6. More precisely, the project design intends to further strengthen capacities from previous project cycles, introduce modern technological advancement including artificial intelligence, and provide integrated solutions for decision making related to the thematic areas. Through awareness raising activities the project will promote project achievements and impacts of innovative technological solutions at the regional/national level. Also, a community of practice will be created, and technical backstopping will be continued for sustaining developed knowledge and capacities. Finally, a training of trainers is planned to ensure capacities will be sustained in the future.
- 7. The proposed activities will benefit a wide range of stakeholders in eight countries (seven of which are in special situations) across four regions.
- 8. The project document calls for an independent baseline, midline and endline evaluation.

#### **Purpose of the baseline evaluation**

- 9. The purpose of the baseline evaluation is to reflect on past initiatives and experiences, and assess the entry level project conditions in order to provide a baseline against which the project's progress can be measured and evaluated. The specific objectives of the evaluation are to validate and obtain baseline evidence on the project's log frame indicators, including measures such as:
  - Number of countries that have communicated the strengthening of institutional, systemic and individual capacity-building to implement adaptation, mitigation and technology transfer, and development actions (impact indicator related to SDG 13.3.2);
  - Number of deaths, missing persons and persons affected by disaster per 100,000 people(impact indicator related to SDG 11.5.1); and
  - Direct disaster economic loss in relation to global GDP, including disaster damage to critical infrastructure and disruption of basic services(impact indicator related to SDG 11.5.2);.

Moreover, specific baselines shall be established for the current use of geospatial applications for decision-making related to improving resilience. A 2-step needs assessment exercise will be implemented by project management in parallel to the baseline evaluation and it is recommended to closely collaborate.

The purpose of the baseline evaluation is to also validate the project's theory of change; the adequacy of the log frame, including the adequacy of the indicators, performance measures, means of verification and underlying assumptions; and the project's implementation strategy.

#### **Scope of the evaluation**

- 10. The evaluation will cover the project's four regions (East-Africa, West-Africa and Asia and Pacific) and more specifically the project countries (Bhutan, Bangladesh, Fiji, Nigeria, Lao PDR, the Solomon Islands, Uganda and Vanuatu) and will focus on identifying measures of the log frame indicators just prior to project start-up, using 2020 as a baseline. In the event 2020 measures are

not available, the evaluation will identify earlier measures e.g., 2019 or measures of alternative measures or proxy indicators if required.

### Principal evaluation questions

11. The following questions are intended to guide the evaluation:

- What are the **existing capacities** in applying GIT and Earth Observation in the thematic areas? What is the current knowledge, skills and awareness about GIT? More particularly what are the abilities to analyse geospatial data and information in situations of (response to) humanitarian crisis?
- What is the **use of GIT** in stakeholder's respective **national institutions/organizations**?
- To what extent is **GIT yet used** by **humanitarian actors during major disaster** events in the target countries?
- What is the countries' and stakeholders' respective institutions/organizations current **access of climate funding**?
- What **other institutions/organizations** (beyond the partners) in countries are already intervening in the project's area of intervention, if any, and how?
- What other **knowledge platforms/e-learning/communities of practice** are already being offered in the project's area of intervention, if any?
- To what extent are **regional or inter-regional exchanges and learning** happening?
- What lessons have been learned from previous (and ongoing) initiatives and experiences on the subject matter and to what extent have lessons been incorporated into the project's design?
- Are there any gender related issues that the project can address in its activities to ensure gender action?
- What are some other steps the project can take to ensure sustainability of the project's activities?
- What is the possible **contribution/attribution** of the project outputs and outcomes to the intended impact?
- Are the suggested **impact indicators valid and measurable**?
- Do the suggested/planned activities and outputs address the identified challenges to be attended by the intervention?
- Are there other risks beyond those identified by the project likely to impact delivery of results, and are mitigation measures for the risks already identified sufficient?

All key data collected shall be disaggregated by sex and age grouping.

### Evaluation Approach and Methods

12. The evaluation is to be undertaken in accordance with the [UNITAR Monitoring and Evaluation Policy Framework](#) and the [Norms and Standards of the United Nations Evaluation Group](#). The evaluation will be undertaken by a supplier or an international consultant (the "evaluator") under the overall responsibility of the UNITAR Planning, Performance Monitoring and Evaluation (PPME) Manager.
13. The evaluation shall follow a participatory approach and engage a range of project stakeholders in the process. Data collection should be triangulated to the extent possible to ensure validity and reliability of findings and draw on the following methods: comprehensive desk review, including a

stakeholder analysis; surveys; key informant interviews; focus groups; field visits and comparison groups. These data collection tools are discussed below.

14. The evaluator should engage in quantitative and qualitative analysis in responding to the principal evaluation questions and present the findings qualitatively or quantitatively as most appropriate. The evaluator should also identify comparison groups with similar geographical and socio-economic characteristics as the treatment groups to assess the counterfactual for the midline and endline evaluations. Baseline data for the comparison groups shall be collected as well.

### **Data collection methods:**

#### *Comprehensive desk review*

The evaluator will compile, review and analyze background documents and secondary data/information related to the project. A list of background documentation for the desk review is included in Annex A.

#### *Stakeholder analysis*

The evaluator will identify the different stakeholders involved in the project:

- 8 national partners in Asia, the Pacific and Africa.
- Partners:
  - In Asia: UNESCAP, GISTDA, and the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN).
  - In the Pacific: the Commonwealth Secretariat and The Pacific Community (SPC).
  - In East Africa, the Intergovernmental Authorities for Development (IGAD) and in particular its Climate Prediction and Application Centre (ICPAC) will remain the main partner. Other Agencies based in Nairobi.
  - In West Africa: the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) will serve as main catalyst for regional participation.

#### *Survey(s)*

With a view to maximizing feedback from the widest possible range of project stakeholders, the evaluator shall develop and deploy a survey(s) following the comprehensive desk study to provide an initial set of findings and allow the evaluator to easily probe during the key informant interviews.

#### *Key informant interviews*

Based on stakeholder identification, the evaluator will identify and interview key informants. The list of global focal points is available in Annex B. In preparation for the interviews with key informants, the consultant will define interview protocols to determine the questions and modalities with flexibility to adapt to the particularities of the different informants, either at the global or at the national level.

#### *Focus groups*

Focus groups should be organized with selected project stakeholders at the national and regional levels to complement/triangulate findings from other collection tools.

#### *Field visit*

A field visit to at least one country by region either by the lead evaluator or by national consultants (treatment countries) shall be organized if the COVID-19 related restrictions allow and the evaluator shall identify national informants, whom he/she will interview.

#### *Identify and interview key informants (national)*

Based on the stakeholder analysis, the evaluator will identify national informants, whom he/she or the national consultants will interview. The list of national focal points is available in Annex B.

#### *Comparison Groups (quasi-experimental design)*

A comparison of 'treatment' and 'comparison' groups shall be involved against a selection of outcome and impact level Log frame indicators to determine the extent of changes that are attributable to the project, being the difference between the two groups. A 'treatment' group is made up of people who are included in/affected by the project while the comparison group receives no intervention.

The comparison group is designed to be as similar to the treatment group as possible across a large number of characteristics. For example, when comparing with groups from other small island developing states, they need to be of similar geography, demographics, socio-economic status, level of education, development status, climate change vulnerability and risk of natural disasters etc. Potential groups can be matched based on, e.g., the average difference across key characteristics by using a 'propensity score matching'.

The evaluator should identify at least three to four comparison groups (one per region).

### **Gender and human rights**

15. The evaluator should incorporate human rights, gender and equity perspectives in the evaluation process and findings, particularly by involving women and other disadvantaged groups subject to discrimination. All key data collected shall be disaggregated by sex and age grouping and be included in the draft and final evaluation report.
16. The guiding principles for the evaluation should respect transparency, engage stakeholders and beneficiaries; ensure confidentiality of data and anonymity of responses; and follow ethical and professional standards.

### **Timeframe, work plan, deliverables and review**

17. The proposed timeframe for the baseline evaluation spans from October 2021 (initial desk review and data collection) to February 2022 (submission of final baseline evaluation report). An indicative work plan is provided in the table below.
18. The consultant shall submit a brief evaluation design/question matrix following the comprehensive desk study, stakeholder analysis and initial key informant interviews. The evaluation design/question matrix should include a discussion on the evaluation objectives, methods and, if required, revisions to the suggested evaluation questions or data collection methods. The Evaluation design/question

matrix should indicate any foreseen difficulties or challenges in collecting data and confirm the final timeframe for the completion of the evaluation exercise.

19. Following data collection and analysis, the consultant shall submit a zero draft of the evaluation report to the evaluation manager and revise the draft based on comments made by the evaluation manager.
20. The draft evaluation report should follow the structure presented under Annex C. The report should state the purpose of the evaluation and the methods used and include a discussion on the limitations to the evaluation. The report should present evidence-based and balanced findings, including strengths and weaknesses, consequent conclusions and recommendations, and lessons to be learned. The length of the report should be approximately 20-30 pages, excluding annexes.
21. Following the submission of the zero draft, a draft report will then be submitted to the project management team to review and comment on the draft report and provide any additional information using the form provided under Annex D by 7 February 2022. Within one week of receiving feedback, the evaluator shall submit the final evaluation report. The target date for this submission is 14 February 2022.

22. Indicative timeframe: October 2021 – February 2022

Activity	October	November	December	January	February
Evaluator selected and recruited					
Initial data collection, including desk review, stakeholder analysis					
Evaluation design/question matrix					
Data collection and analysis, including survey(s), interviews and focus groups and field visit					
Zero draft report submitted to UNITAR					
Draft evaluation report consulted with UNITAR evaluation manager and submitted to Project Management					

Presentation of emerging findings					
Project Management reviews draft evaluation report and shares comments and recommendations					
Evaluation report finalized and management response by Project Management					



#### 24. Measurable outputs/Deliverables/Schedule of Deliverables\*:

Deliverable	From	To	Deadline
Evaluation design/question matrix	Evaluator	Evaluation manager	9 November 2021
Comments on evaluation design/question matrix	Evaluation manager	Evaluator	16 November 2021
Zero draft report	Evaluator	Evaluation manager	10 January 2022
Comments on zero draft	Evaluation manager	Evaluator	17 January 2022
Draft report	Evaluator	Evaluation manager	24 January 2022
Presentation of emerging findings	Evaluator	Project Management	24 January 2022
Comments on draft report	Project Management	Evaluation manager	7 February 2022
Final report	Evaluator	Evaluation manager	14 February 2022

\*Subject to review and adjustment on agreement between the consultant and the Evaluation Manager.

#### Communication/dissemination of results

25. The baseline evaluation report shall be written in English. The final report will be shared with all partners and be posted on an online repository of evaluation reports open to the public.

#### Evaluation management arrangements

26. The evaluator will be contracted by UNITAR and will report directly to the Director of the Strategic Planning and Performance Division and Manager of Planning, Performance Monitoring, and Evaluation Unit (PPME) ('evaluation manager').

27. The evaluation manager reports directly to the Executive Director of UNITAR and is independent from all programming related management functions at UNITAR. According to UNITAR's Monitoring and Evaluation Policy, in due consultation with the Executive Director/programme management, PPME issues and discloses final evaluation reports without prior clearance from other UNITAR Management or functions. This builds the foundations of UNITAR's evaluation function's independence and ability to better support learning and accountability.

28. The evaluator should consult with the evaluation manager on any procedural or methodological matter requiring attention. The evaluator is responsible for planning any meetings, organizing online surveys and undertaking administrative arrangements for any travel that may be required (e.g. accommodation, visas, etc.). The travel arrangements, if any, will be in accordance with the UN rules and regulations for consultants.

#### Evaluator Ethics

29. The evaluator selected should not have participated in the project's design or implementation or have a conflict of interest with project activities. The selected consultant shall sign and return a copy of the code of conduct under Annex F prior to initiating the assignment and comply with [UNEG Ethical Guidelines](#).

#### Professional requirements

30. The evaluator should have the following qualifications and experience:

- MA degree or equivalent in international relations, political science, environmental science, development studies, evaluation or a related discipline. Training and/or experience in the area



of GIS, disaster risk reduction and climate resilience and environmental preservation and food security would be a clear advantage.

- At least 7 years of professional experience conducting evaluation in the field of capacity building, sustainable learning, GIS, disaster risk reduction and climate resilience and environmental preservation and food security.
- Technical knowledge of the focal area.
- Field work experience in developing countries.
- Excellent research and analytical skills, including experience in a variety of evaluation methods and approaches.
- Excellent writing skills.
- Strong communication and presentation skills.
- Cross-cultural awareness and flexibility.
- Availability to travel.
- Fluency in English.

**Annexes:**

**A: List of documents and data to be reviewed**

**B: List of Project Partners and Contact Points**

**C: Structure of evaluation report**

**D: Project logical framework**

**E: Audit trail**

**F: Evaluator code of conduct**

**Annex A: List of documents/data to be reviewed**

- Legal Agreement
- Project document
- Capacity needs assessments (broad and specific), once available
- CRED's disaster loss database EM-DAT
- National statistics for SDG indicators
- Any other document deemed to be useful to the evaluation

**Annex B: List of Contact Points (to be completed by project Management)**

Partners	
Organization	Focal Point

## **Annex C: Indicative Structure of baseline evaluation report**

- i. Title page
- ii. Executive summary
- iii. Acronyms and abbreviations
1. Introduction
2. Project description, objectives and development context of the project in each country
3. Theory of change/project design logic
4. Methodology and limitations
5. Evaluation findings based on:
  - 5.1 Indicator specific narrative (contextual) information
  - 5.2 Quantitative measurements of each Logframe indicator (a table)
  - 5.3 Assessment of potential (suspected) negative and unintended (positive and negative) impacts
  - 5.4 Qualitative assessment of likelihood of achieving outcome and impacts
6. Conclusions
7. Recommendations, including on changes to Logframe (ToC?)
8. Lessons Learned
9. Annexes
  - 9.1 Terms of reference
  - 9.2 Survey/questionnaires deployed
  - 9.3 List of persons interviewed
  - 9.4 List of documents reviewed
  - 9.5 Evaluation question matrix
  - 9.6 Evaluation consultant agreement form and ethical pledge

### Annex D: Project Logical Framework

LEVEL	EXPECTED RESULT	INDICATORS	Indicator data				Data source of verification	Comments
			BASELINE Y0	TARGET Y1	TARGET Y2	FINAL TARGET YX		
IMPACT	Improved resilience to natural disasters and climate change in Africa and Asia & Pacific	SDG 13.3 Improve education, awareness-raising and human and institutional capacity on climate change mitigation, adaptation, impact reduction and early warning	(Baseline=0)	<i>only measured at the end of the project</i>	<i>only measured at the end of the project</i>	Evidence in each target country	Impact stories, interviews with training participant and high-level stakeholders	Analysis of this indicator should be qualitative. It should demonstrate evidence that the target countries have taken relevant action regarding policies, plans, or projects as a result of enhanced capacity

		<p><i>13.3.2 Number of countries that have communicate d the strengthening of institutional, systemic and individual capacity- building to implement adaptation, mitigation and technology transfer, and development actions</i></p>						
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

		<p><i>Reduced human loss from natural disasters</i></p> <p>11.5.1 Number of deaths, missing persons and persons affected by disaster per 100,000 people</p> <p><i>Reduced economic damages from multi-hazards</i></p> <p>11.5.2 Direct disaster economic loss in relation to</p>	<p>(Baseline= 2019 statistics from CRED's disaster loss database EM-DAT)</p>	<p><i>only measured at the end of the project</i></p>	<p><i>only measured at the end of the project</i></p>	<p>20% reduction</p> <p><i>From the baseline</i></p> <p><i>(disaggregated by gender when possible)</i></p>	<p>Global and national disaster losses databases and reports</p>	<p>Same magnitude and number of hazard events to occur in the same geographic locations compared to baseline year 2019</p>
--	--	--	--	---	---	--	--	--



		<p>global GDP, including disaster damage to critical infrastructure and disruption of basic services</p> <p>(of the two regions)</p>						
Evidence from end-users and training beneficiaries demonstrating the benefit of UNOSAT's products and services on reducing disaster impact	i.1 Number of "impact stories" published on UNOSAT's website highlighting a beneficiary from a technical training	0	<p>Africa: 1 impact story</p> <p>Asia-Pacific: 1 impact story</p>	<p>4 impact stories</p> <p>(1 in each sub-region: Nigeria, Kenya, Fiji, Thailand )</p>	<p>4 impact stories</p> <p>(1 in each sub-region: Nigeria,</p>	Interviews with key informants	Participants from trainings are willing to be interviewed and featured on UNOSAT's website	

						<i>Kenya, Fiji, Thailand)</i>		
		i.2 Number of “impact stories” published on UNOSAT’s website highlighting the impact technical backstopping activities have had on partner agencies’ and member states’ efforts	0	0	Africa: 1 impact story  Asia-Pacific: 1 impact story	Africa: 1 impact story  Asia-Pacific: 1 impact story	Interviews with key informants	Sufficient requests are submitted to UNOSAT on a yearly basis from beneficiary organizations
OUTCOME 1	Strengthened knowledge, skills and awareness on the use of geospatial applications	1.a Percentage of trained technical	Male: 0% Female: 0%	Male: 75% Female: 75%	Male: 80%	Male : 80%	Training records, including	Assumptions:

	and tools for decision making	participants successfully meeting learning objectives			Female: 80%	Female: 80%	assessment scores	Selected participants successfully complete training  Training participants have had the opportunity to use skills
		1.b Percentage of trained technical stakeholders confirming application of knowledge and skills from the training	Male 0% Female: 0%	Male 60% Female: 60%  *survey submitted at the end of year	Male 60% Female: 60%  *survey submitted at the end of year	Male 60% Female: 60%  *survey submitted at the end of year	Surveys administered to training beneficiaries	Awareness raising targets correct audiences. Senior government official attend events. Attendance lists are available and willingness to participate in the survey.

		1.c Percentage of high-level stakeholders in member states and regional institutions surveyed agreeing or strongly agreeing to the benefit of geospatial applications solutions for decision making	Male: 0% Female: 0%	Male: 60% Female: 60%	Male: 70% Female: 70%	Male : 70% Female: 70%	Surveys administered to stakeholders / Interviews with select gov. focal points	
<i>OUTPUT 1.1</i>	In-country capacity development trainings delivered to technical officials	1.1.1 Number of In-Country Technical Trainings delivered per year	0	8 trainings  <i>1 training (face-to-face, distance</i>	8 trainings  <i>1 training (face-to-</i>	8 trainings  <i>1 traini</i>	Project activity reports, Training evaluation reports	Assumptions:  Logistic support and required equipment are provided by target countries while cost of

				<i>learning, or blended) per country</i>	<i>face, distance learning, or blended) per country</i>	<i>ing (face -to-face, distance learning, or blended) per country</i>	
							training is covered by the project
		1.1.2 Number of key national/regional institutions targeted as beneficiaries per training	0	Africa: 3  Asia-Pacific: 6	Africa: 3  Asia-Pacific: 6	Africa: 3  Asia-Pacific: 6	Country focal points are able to select participants respecting the gender ratio proposed  The number of participants remains unchanged, as the trainings seek to target the same audience to go more in-depth

		1.1.3 Number of participants per training	0	16 per training (8 M: 8 F)	16 per training (8 M: 8 F)	16 per training (8 M: 8 F)		

OUTPUT 1.2	Awareness raising events delivered to stakeholders	1.2.1 Number of awareness raising events organized or attended by project management team per year	0	4 events  <i>1 per sub-regional hub (Nigeria, Kenya, Thailand, Fiji)</i>	4 events  <i>1 per sub-regional hub (Nigeria, Kenya, Thailand, Fiji)</i>	4 events  <i>1 per sub-regional hub (Nigeria, Kenya, Thailand, Fiji)</i>	Awareness on the importance of geospatial applications across thematic areas is already quite high, thus these awareness raising events will act more as outreach events highlighting the project's results and potentially reaching out to new interested beneficiaries
		1.2.2 Number of key national/regional agencies or institutions at each event	0	Africa: 10  Asia-Pacific: 10	Africa: 10	Africa: 10	



					Asia-Pacific: 10	Asia-Pacific: 10		
		1.2.3 Number of attendees at each event	0	30 per event (15 M: 15 F)	30 per event (15 M: 15 F)	30 per event (15 M: 15 F)		
OUTCOME 2	Knowledge and skills are sustained, thereby enhancing evidence-based decision making amongst training beneficiaries	2.a Percentage of trained technical stakeholder's "regularly" or "often" applying geospatial information technology in their respective	(Baseline: Training and capacity needs assessments)	Male: 60 %  Female: 60%	Male: 60 %  Female: 60%	Male : 60 %  Female: 60%	Surveys administered to stakeholders and training participants	Support from senior government officials to use acquired skills in the day by day work.

		home institutions/organizations						
<i>OUTPUT 2.1</i>	Ad-hoc technical backstopping provided to stakeholders in the two regions	2.1.1 Number of ad-hoc technical backstopping provided to national/regional key stakeholders per year	0	8 in total  (1 per target country)	8 in total  (1 per target country)	8 in total  (1 per target country)	Project activity reports, users feedback reports	Technical backstopping activities act as on-the-job application of skills through ad-hoc technical assistance
<i>OUTPUT 2.2</i>	A knowledge hub is created, acting as the portal for training resources and the Community of Practice	2.2.1 Knowledge hub and community of practice are established for cross	0	1 knowledge platform established			Project activity reports, users feedback reports, website statistics	Training participants are willing to join and participate actively in the community of practice

		regional collaboration					on the knowledge hub	
OUTCOME 3	Strengthened knowledge and skills on accessing climate finance	3.a Percentage of national stakeholders in the three partner countries who feel informed (“very informed” in surveys) about accessing climate funds	Male: 0% Female: 0%	Male: 50% Female: 50%	Male: 60% Female: 60%	Male: 60% Female: 60%	Surveys with select government focal points	There will be climate finance advisors in the Pacific region to assist stakeholders in applying for climate funds
<i>OUTPUT 3.1</i>	Support to proposals writing to climate financing mechanisms is provided to partner countries	3.1.1 Number of proposals prepared with the support of climate	0	2 proposals	4 proposals	6 proposals	Project documents collected by climate finance advisors	This climate finance work package is building off of UNOSAT’s extensive experience in the Pacific. UNOSAT hopes to continue to leverage the presence of

		finance advisors		<i>(in the Pacific region)</i>	<i>(in the Pacific region)</i>	<i>(in the Pacific region)</i>	climate finance technical backstopping logs	climate finance advisors to support member states in the region.
Activities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• WP100: Overall project management and coordination.</li> <li>• WP200: Design and Implementation of regional/national training &amp; capacity development/ awareness raising events in the use of geospatial information for effective disaster risk reduction in target countries in Asia &amp; Pacific and Africa.</li> <li>• WP300: Implementation of sustainability mechanisms through the knowledge platform, community of practice, and technical backstopping (on the job training).</li> <li>• WP400: Climate finance advisor</li> </ul>							

### Annex E: Evaluation Audit Trail Template

*(To be completed by Project Management to show how the received comments on the draft report have (or have not) been incorporated into the evaluation report. This audit trail should be included as an annex in the evaluation report.)*

**To the comments received on (date) from the evaluation of the “Strengthening Capacities in the use of geospatial information for improved resilience in Asia-Pacific and Africa” project**

*The following comments were provided in track changes to the draft 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 evaluation report	Evaluator response and actions taken

## Annex F: Evaluation Consultant Code of Conduct and Agreement Form\*

### The evaluator:

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. He/she should provide maximum notice, minimize demands on time, and respect people's right not to engage. He/she must respect people's right to provide information in confidence, and must ensure that sensitive information cannot be traced to its source. He/she are not expected to evaluate individuals, and must balance an evaluation of management functions with this general principle.
4. Sometimes uncovers evidence of wrongdoing while conducting evaluations. Such cases must be reported discreetly to the appropriate investigative body. He/she 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, he/she must be sensitive to and address issues of discrimination and gender equality. He/she should avoid offending the dignity and self-respect of those persons with whom he/she comes in contact in the course of the evaluation. Knowing that evaluation might negatively affect the interests of some stakeholders, he/she should conduct the evaluation and communicate its purpose and results in a way that clearly respects the stakeholders' dignity and self-worth.
6. Is responsible for his/her performance and his/her product(s). He/she is responsible for the clear, accurate and fair written and/or oral presentation of study imitations, findings and recommendations.
7. Should reflect sound accounting procedures and be prudent in using the resources of the evaluation.

### Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form<sup>1</sup>

#### Agreement to abide by the Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN System

**Name of Consultant:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Name of Consultancy Organization** (where relevant): \_\_\_\_\_

**I confirm that I have received and understood and will abide by the United Nations Code of Conduct for Evaluation.**

Signed at *place* on *date*

<sup>1</sup>[www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct](http://www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct)

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_

\*This form is required to be signed by each evaluator involved in the evaluation.