



**UNITED NATIONS DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME
TERMS OF REFERENCE (TOR)**

I. Position information

Title: Mid-term evaluation for the “**Strengthening Climate Information and Early Warning Systems for Climate Resilient Development and Adaptation to Climate Change**” project

Reports to: UNDP and Prime Minister’s Office, Disaster Management Department

Duty station: Home based with mission travel to Tanzania

Duration of assignment: 35 working days.

Contract period: 15th March-16th June, 2016

full time/office based

COA:

GL BU	Account	Fund	Op. Unit	Dept.	Project	Impl. Agent	Donor	Activity
UNDP1	71205	62160	TZA	38205	00086724	001459	10003	Activity3

II. Background information

This is the Terms of Reference (ToR) for the UNDP-GEF Mid-term review (MTR) of the full-sized project titled “Strengthening Climate Information and Early Warnings System for Climate Resilient Development and Adaptation to Climate Change Tanzania” implemented through the Presidents’ Office – Disaster Management Department (PO-DMD). The project duration is four years with implementation started on December 2013, currently in its second year of implementation. In line with the UNDP-GEF Guidance on MTRs, sets out the expectations for this MTR. The MTR process will follow the guidance outlined in the document [http://web.undp.org/evaluation/documents/guidance/GEF/mid-term/Guidance Midterm % 20 Review% 20 EN 2014.pdf](http://web.undp.org/evaluation/documents/guidance/GEF/mid-term/Guidance%20Midterm%20Review%20EN%202014.pdf).

The ability of decision-makers in Tanzania to understand the likely impacts of climate change in the short and long-term is of critical importance to the countries sustainable growth aspirations. Given Tanzania reliance on climate sensitive agriculture , natural resources management and energy, the impacts of warming that has already been experienced has had negative effects on the national land based productive sectors and existing urban infrastructure. This project therefore aims at strengthening the capacity of the Government of Tanzania to observe, analyze and forecast climate information to enhance their warning systems and for climate resilient development and adaptation to climate change.

III. Objectives of the Mid-term evaluation

The MTR will assess progress towards the achievement of the project objectives and outcomes as specified in the Project Document, 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 MTR will also review the projects strategy and its risks to sustainability.

IV. Application process & Evaluation criteria

Application process

The consultant should submit current and complete C.V, technical and financial proposal (in separate submissions) in English with indication of email and phone contact.

Applicants are requested to apply online using the following site: <http://jobs.undp.org>

Evaluation Criteria

Individual consultants will be evaluated based on the following methodology:

Cumulative analysis:

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

- Responsive/compliant/acceptable; and
- Having received the highest score out of a pre-determined set of weighted technical and financial criteria specific to the solicitation. 70%-30%.

Technical Criteria weight; [70%]

Financial Criteria weight; [30%]

Only candidates obtaining a minimum of 49 points (70% of the total technical points) would be considered for the Financial Evaluation.

Technical Criteria – Maximum 70 points:

- Relevance of education – 10 Points;
- Language skills – 5 Points;
- Knowledge of the area of work and expectation from the activities being covered-15 points;
- Relevance of professional experience in conducting assignments of similar nature and scope- 25 points;
- Experience in writing/publication- 15 points.

Financial proposal - Maximum 30 points:

Appropriateness shall be computed as a ratio of the proposal's offer to the lowest price among the proposals received by UNDP.

Financial assessment:

A lump sum amount approach shall be used with the following expectations:

- The lump sum amount must be "all-inclusive";
- The contract price is fixed regardless of changes in the cost of components;

- For duty travels, UN’s Daily Subsistence Allowance (DSA) rates prevailing at the time of sourcing, for the duty station and all other cities indicated in the TOR as part of duty travel destinations will be used. This will give Offerors an indication of the cost of living in a duty station/destination, to aid their determination of the appropriate fees and financial proposal amount, but it does not imply that Offerors are entitled to DSA payment; and
- The initial payment includes the actual cost of the IC’s travel to arrive at the designated Duty Station. This implies that the completion of the journey can be considered as one of the deliverables payable upon arrival.

V. Scope of work, Tasks, Methodology, Deliverables, Timeline

Scope of work

The IC will assess the following four categories of project progress

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 to the project’s design
- Review how the project addresses countries 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 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 frameworks /log-frame:

- Undertake a critical analysis of the projects log frame indicators and targets assess how “SMART” development indicators as necessary.
- Are the projects objectives and outcomes or components clear, practical, and feasible within its frame?
- Examine if progress so far has led to, or could in the future catalyze beneficial development effects (i.e. income generation, gender equality and women’s empowerment, improved governance etc.) that should be included in the project results frameworks and monitored on annual basis.
- Ensure broader development and gender aspects of the projects are being monitored effectively. Develop and recommend SMART development indicators including sex-disaggregated indicators and indicators that capture development benefits.

II. Progress Towards Results

Progress Towards Outcome Analysis:

Review the log-frame indicators against progress made towards the end –of project targets using the Progress Towards Results Matrix and following the *Guidance for Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP*

–supported, GEF –Financed projects; color code progress in a “traffic light system” based on the level of progress achieved; assign a rating on progress for each outcome; make recommendations from the areas marked as “Not on target to be achieved.

In addition to the progress towards outcome analysis :

- Compare and analyze the GEF tracking tool at the baseline with the one completed right before MTR
- Identify remaining barriers to achieving the project that have already been successful, identify ways in which the project can further expand these benefits

III. Project Implementation and Adaptive Management

- Review overall effectiveness of project management as outlined in the Project Document. Have changes been made and are they effective? Are responsibilities and reporting lines clear? Is decision – making transparent and undertaken in a timely manner? Recommend 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 the GEF partner agency (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 result –based? If not, suggest ways to re-orientate work planning to focus on results
- Examine the use of the project’s result framework /log –frame as a management tool and review any changes made to it since the project start.

Finance and co-finance:

- 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.
- 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.
- 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? Is the project team meeting with all co-financing partners regularly in order to align financing priorities and annual work plans.

Project –Level Monitoring and Evaluations Systems:

- Review the monitoring tools currently being used: do they provide the necessary information? Do they involve key partners? Are they aligned or mainstreamed with national systems? 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?
- 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? Is the project Team meeting with all co-financing partners regularly in order to align financing priorities and annual work plans?

Project- level Monitoring and Evaluation Systems:

- Review the monitoring tools currently being used: Do they provide necessary information? Do they involve key partners? Are they aligned or mainstreamed with national systems? Do they use existing

information? Are they cost effective? Are additional tools required? How could they be made more participatory and inclusive?

- Examine the financial management of the project monitoring and evaluation budget. Are sufficient resources being allocated effectively?

Stakeholder engagement:

- Project management: Has the project developed and leveraged the necessary and appropriate partnerships with direct and indirect 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?

Reporting:

- Assess how adaptive management changes have been reported by the project management and shared with the Project board
- Asses how well the Project team and partners undertake and fulfill GEF reporting requirements (i.e. How have they addressed poorly-rated PIRs ,if applicable)
- Asses how lessons derived from the adaptive management process have been documented, shared with key partners and internalized by partners.

Communications:

- Review internal project communication with stakeholders: is communication regular and effective? Are there key stakeholders left out of communication? Are there feedback mechanisms were communication is received? Does this communication with stakeholders contribute to their awareness of project results
- Review external projects communications: Are proper means of communications 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.

IV. Sustainability

- Validate whether the risks identified in the Project Document, Annual Project Review /PIRs 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 GEF 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 sustainability:

- Are there any social or political risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project outcomes? What is the risk that the level of stakeholder's ownership (including ownership by governments and other key stakeholder) will be insufficient to allow for the project benefits to be sustained? Do the various key

stakeholders 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?

Conclusions & Recommendations:

The IC will include a section of the report setting out the MTR's evidence-based conclusions, in light of the findings.¹

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. See the *Guidance for Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects* for guidance on a recommendation table.

The MTR team should make no more than 15 recommendations total.

Ratings:

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

Methodology:

The MTR shall provide evidence based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The IC will review all relevant sources of information including documents prepared during the preparation phase (i.e. PIF, UNDP Initiation Plan, UNDP Environmental & Social Safeguard Policy, the Project Document, project reports including Annual Project Review/PIRs, project budget revisions, lesson learned reports, national strategic and legal documents, and any other materials that the team considers useful for this evidence-based review). The IC will review the baseline GEF focal area Tracking Tool (AMAT) submitted to the GEF at CEO endorsement, and the midterm GEF focal area Tracking Tool.

The MTR is expected to follow a collaborative and participatory approach² ensuring close engagement with the Project Team, government counterparts (the GEF Operational Focal Point), the UNDP Country Office(s), UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Advisers, and other key stakeholders.

Engagement of stakeholders is vital to a successful MTR.³ Stakeholder involvement should include interviews with stakeholders who have project responsibilities, including but not limited to: executing agencies, senior officials and task team leaders, key experts and consultants in the subject area, Project Steering Committee, project stakeholders, academia, local government and CSOs, etc. Additionally, the IC is expected to conduct

¹ Alternatively, MTR conclusions may be integrated into the body of the report.

² For ideas on innovative and participatory Monitoring and Evaluation strategies and techniques, see [UNDP Discussion Paper: Innovations in Monitoring & Evaluating Results](#), 05 Nov 2013.

³ For more stakeholder engagement in the M&E process, see the [UNDP Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results](#), Chapter 3, pg. 93.

field missions to selected 7 regions (Dar es Salaam, Lindi, Mtwara, Kilimanjaro, Tanga, Arusha and Manyara where the IC should be able to meet the project responsible parties and conduct site verification.

The final MTR report should describe the full MTR approach taken and the rationale for the approach making explicit the underlying assumptions, challenges, strengths and weaknesses about the methods and approach of the review.

Deliverables:

Deliverables to be submitted by consultant/s will include the following:

- (a) **Inception report:** The consultant will produce an inception report which clarifies objectives and methods of mid-term review within 2 weeks after the commencement of the consultancy service and submit the report to UNDP and PO-DMD
- (b) **Draft reports:** The consultant will produce the following draft reports for presentation and review by stakeholders, within 8 weeks of the MTR mission and sent to the UNDP reviewed by UNDP Regional Technical Advisor, Project Coordinating Unit, and GEF Operational Focal Point.
- (c) **Final report:** The consultant will produce the final reports on the following: This is the revised report with audit trail detailing how all received comments have (have not) been addressed in the final MTR report, within 2 weeks of receiving UNDP comments on draft and submitted to UNDP Tanzania.

Timeline:

The total duration of the MTR will be approximately 35 working days over a time period of 12 weeks.

Payment terms against the deliverables:

- i) 10% upon approval of the final MTR Inception report and approved by UNDP/PO-DMD
- ii) 30% Upon submission of the draft MTR report to and approved by UNDP/PO-DMD
- iii) 60% upon finalization of the MTR report to and approved by UNDP/PO-DMD

VI. Recruitment qualification

Education	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Advanced (Master or PhD) degree in environmental/climate change governance, Social science, Project management, Development studies or any other related field
Experience	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A minimum of 8 years relevant professional experience • Knowledge of/experience with GEF and UNDP monitoring and evaluation policies and procedures • Previous experience with meteorological (policies, technology, products, community use of climatic and weather information, etc.) and climate change (adaptation and mitigation) issues in Africa, specifically Tanzania • Proven experience with environmental/climate change governance (inter alia policy analysis, dialogue, negotiation, research, monitoring and assessment) and in the implementation of climate change/environmental policies • Experience in evaluation of international donor driven development projects will be an advantage • Recent experience with result-based management evaluation methodologies • Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender and climate change adaptation; experience in gender sensitive evaluation and analysis

<p>Competencies</p>	<p><i>Corporate Competencies:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates integrity by modelling the UN’s values and ethical standards • Promotes the vision, mission, and strategic goals of UNDP • Displays cultural, gender, religion, race, nationality and age sensitivity and adaptability • Treats all people fairly without favoritism. <p><i>Technical Competencies:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrated ability to coordinate processes to collate information and facilitate discussion and analysis of material; • Technical competencies in undertaking complex evaluations which involve multiple countries and variety of stakeholders • Demonstrated strong research and analytical skills <p><i>Professionalism:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrated ability to meet deadlines and work under pressure • Demonstrated excellent organizational skills.
<p>Language requirements</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fluency in English is essential

Approval

This TOR is approved by:

Signature: _____

Name: Amon Manyama

Designation: Head of Programme

Date: _____