APPENDIX I: Terms of Reference



Terms of Reference GENERAL INFORMATION

Services/Work Consultancy: Project Level Evaluation of a Sida-Supported

Description: Projects

Project/Program Title: Evaluation of the Projects titled

"Support to Capacity-Building under IPBES through the development of BES-Net and support to work for resilience

thinking in development" (Dec. 2013-Dec. 2015)

Post Title: International Consultancy (Individual)

Organisation: Global Level
Duty Station: Home-based

Expected Places of Travel: N/A

Duration: 15 calendar days
Expected Start Date: 15 August 2016
Expected End Date: 30 October 2016

PART A: INTRODUCTION

1. Background:

This evaluation is mandatory requirement from SwedBio and Sida, who have supported a project implemented by UNDP since December 2013.

This is a final evaluation of the project, which had a focus on the Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services Network (BES-Net) and on resilience, and was completed in December 2015.

2. The Project:

The project to be evaluated is:

"Support to Capacity-Building under IPBES through the development of BES-Net and support to work for resilience thinking in development", which started in December 2013, and ended in December 2015. It was managed by UNDP through its Global Biodiversity Programme which is being managed from UNDP HQ in New York. Evaluation of this component will be undertaken in 2016.

3. The stakeholders

For BES-Net:

BES-Net aims at bringing together policymakers, scientists/knowledge holders and practitioners to address specific policy issues in the arena of biodiversity and ecosystem services, each community bringing a different angle to science-policy questions.

Policymakers: They shape policy and legislation in the public sector and civil society. Policymakers use research to inform decision-making, and may need support to demystify the scientific evidence to inform policy. Engaging with a wide range of policymakers across sectors and ministries will help mainstreaming biodiversity effectively.

Scientists and knowledge holders: Holders and generators of knowledge, they include scientists from academic institutions, NGO researchers or traditional holders and generators of

knowledge, as well as technical specialists involved in managing biodiversity. Their knowledge significantly contributes to the sustainable management of ecosystems.

Practitioners: They work on the ground, directly or with intermediaries, to define and manage biodiversity and ecosystem challenges. They include members of NGOs, Intergovernmental Organizations, the private sector as well as indigenous people and local communities. Their engagement is critical for informing and implementing policy making.

For the Resilience component, stakeholders include Melca Ethiopia and its relevant stakeholders and global scientists (and other knowledge holders), policymakers and practitioners supporting countries in making informed decisions that conserve biodiversity while enhancing resilience to climate-intensified natural disasters and promoting positive transformations to escape poverty.

PART B: THE TERMS OF REFERENCE

TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR THE EVALUATION OF THE SIDA Support to BES-Net and resilience work of UNDP titled:

"Support to Capacity –Building under IPBES through the development of BES-Net and support to work for resilience thinking in development" (Dec. 2013- Dec. 2015)

For this proposal, 'evaluation' is defined as follows: "Development evaluation is a tool for analysing and assessing Swedish and other agencies' development cooperation and results. It has a central role in results based management (RBM) and for learning at Sida. It provides information on results, deepened understanding of how and why certain results were – or weren't – achieved, and determines whether they were satisfactory or not. Evaluation provides us with knowledge of what works, for whom, under what circumstances and how." (Sida)

1. BACKGROUND

The monitoring process of the project is described briefly in the following paragraph:

Specific progress and the achievement of objectives are measured against set logical frameworks and indicators specified in the Results Framework for the programme as outlined below:

Specific objectives and expected results of the collaboration as outlined in the proposals for "Support to Capacity-Building under IPBES through the development of BES-Net and support to work for resilience thinking in development", which started in December 2013, and ended in December 2015, were:

Component 1:

• To contribute to the development and operation of a Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (BES)-Net capacity network and web portal, facilitating exchanges between the global communities of science, policy and practice as described in the BES-Net Strategy

Component 2:

- To undertake an initial case study on resilience to drought and food insecurity in Ethiopia, with the exact scope to be determined through a scoping exercise.
- To engage Ethiopian scientists, policymakers and practitioners, through the process of developing the case study, in dialogue about the best means of monitoring changes in social and ecological resilience over time.

Main results of the collaboration will include:

Component 1:

- An operational BES-Net capacity network and web portal with registered users from the communities of science, policy and practice
- An operational frame work for conducting national dialogues on key topics (in this case resilience) (added in Amendment II)

Component 2 (as per Amendment agreement I):

- A comprehensive paper summarizing UNDP's learning through the project on methodologies for resilience assessment as an input to the case study and the national workshop (25-30 page analysis)
- A comprehensive paper summarizing learning and options to help frame issues and options for a global dialogue
- A case study on resilience to drought and food insecurity in Ethiopia (15-20 pages)
- A national science-policy-practice dialogue workshop, following the initial planning workshop, in which role-players in the case study community and their partners contribute ideas on monitoring changes in resilience and a report on the workshop (10-15 pages with accompanying supporting materials via various web platforms, including BES Net)

The rationale for this project level evaluation is to:

- Understand the progress made against the results framework of the project during the time period,
- Document and report on the achievements, successes and challenges and on the roles played by the project to overcome challenges,
- Share with the project stakeholders and the donor on the project: its successes, challenges, recommendations, and on the sustainability of the work undertaken by the project.

The intended users of the evaluation of this project are UNDP, the external funders: Sida, stakeholders –entities and bodies who are partners to the project.

2. PROJECT EVALUATION CONTEXT

- a) **Context**: The evaluation needs to be placed in the context of the overall monitoring framework of the project. Apart from the evaluation being a donor requirement, it is expected that the evaluation will identify the success, challenges and potential roadblocks to the project; suggest course correction measures and advice for further follow up to ensure sustainability of the activities and processes initiated by this project.
- b) **Scope of the evaluation**: the broad scope of the evaluation covers review of the project agreement(s) and its results framework; annual work plans; activities and results achieved against the timelines and result framework; review of project report, tools, technical reports and guides produced by the project as deliverables for the time period in question and review and recording of key challenges faced and key outcomes achieved.
- c) The main expected output from the evaluation exercise is a project evaluation report that will describe the evaluated project and the scope, objectives and methodology of the evaluation process; share the main findings from the evaluation; draw evaluative conclusions from the exercise; identify the key lessons learned, barriers faced and overcome; and recommend steps for sustaining the efforts initiated by the project.

3. PURPOSE, OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE

The overall **purpose** of the evaluation of this project is:

 To understand the successes, achievements and planned activities of the project for greater learning about what works and what does not; and ways to address challenges encountered in meeting end-of project targets and achievable outputs and outcomes. The evaluation and its report will also achieve the purpose of being a learning document for UNDP, its partners and the donor.

The **objectives** of the evaluation are:

- <u>to assess the contribution made by the Project</u> in terms of the activities planned and results achieved against the results framework that was agreed upon in the project document;
- to identify the enabling factors and challenges (if any) of the project (as learning);

- <u>to reach conclusions concerning the project's contribution</u> within the scope of this evaluation;
- <u>to provide specific and actionable recommendations</u>. These recommendations should be linked to the project's results and any future follow-ups, and draw upon lessons learned that have been identified.

The **scope** covered by the evaluation includes examining how far the Project's **programme objective** been achieved. It will also explore the pathways and linkages of these achievements to the overarching **development objective**.

4. EVALUATION QUESTIONS AND METHODOLOGY

Overall approach: This is an external programmatic evaluation in that it assesses performance against a given results framework that specifies its strategic intent and objectives, by an external agency/organisation/party.

Given that outcomes are, by definition, the work of a number of entities, attribution of development change to the project (in the sense of establishing a causal linkage between a development intervention and an observed result) is difficult, and in many cases not practically feasible. The evaluation will therefore consider contribution of the project to the stated results framework and identify the successes, challenges and ways forward. To make the assessment, the evaluators will examine the project document and results framework; identify the achievements with respect to the proposed deliverables over the period being evaluated on the basis of the baseline information presented in the results framework; and identify the strategies and actions undertaken, to understand the project's contributions to the change.

Evaluation criteria: The contribution of the Project to the planned results and outcomes will be assessed according to a standard set of evaluation criteria as below:

- **Relevance**. The extent to which the objectives of Project are consistent with global, regional and country needs and requests.
- **Effectiveness**. The extent to which the Project contributed to, or is likely to contribute to, the outcomes defined in the Project Document and the Project Results Framework.
- **Sustainability.** The extent to which the results achieved as per the results framework towards sustained changes.

Enabling / explanatory factors: To allow for lessons to be learned, the evaluators, using the above criteria, will identify the various enabling and explanatory factors for the performance achieved.

Other factors. A number of specific factors that have affected the performance of the Project will also be examined. For example:

- How well did the Project use its partnerships to improve its performance?
- Did the Project implementation process undertake appropriate risk analysis and take appropriate actions to ensure that results to which it contributed are not lost? To what extent are the benefits being, or are likely to be, maintained over time?

Data collection methods: This evaluation will draw on a variety of data collection methods including, but not limited to:

- Document review focusing on the project planning documents and progress reports, and relevant meeting and activity reports.
- Semi-structured interviews and wherever feasible and necessary, focused-group discussions with key stakeholders.
- Other methods as appropriate

Data collection methods must be linked to the evaluation criteria and evaluation questions that are included within the scope of the evaluation. The use of an evaluation matrix is helpful in linking these elements together. In addition, the precise data collection methods should be identified following:

• Understanding of the availability of existing evaluative evidence;

- Logistical constraints such as time limitations; and
- Ethical considerations. The overall ethical principle that the evaluation must adhere to is the principle of "do no harm".

For this evaluation, data collection methods and process should be predominantly based on review of documents and on qualitative methodology.

Evaluation Standards

The evaluation should also be conducted as per the following four broad sets of *quality* standards, namely propriety standards, feasibility standards, accuracy standards and utility standards:²³

- The propriety standards are ethical standards meant to ensure that evaluations are
 conducted with due regard for the rights and welfare of affected people. The most basic
 of the propriety standards is that evaluations should never violate or endanger human
 rights. Evaluators should respect human dignity and worth in their interaction with all
 persons encountered during the evaluation, and do all in their power to ensure that they
 are not wronged.
- The feasibility standards are intended to ensure that evaluations are realistic and
 efficient. To satisfy these requirements, an evaluation must be based on practical
 procedures, not unduly disrupting normal activities, and be planned and conducted in
 such a way that the co-operation of key stakeholders can be obtained. They should also
 be efficient.
- The *accuracy standards* are meant to ensure that the information produced by evaluations is factually correct, free of bias, and appropriate to the evaluation issues at hand.
- The *utility standards*, finally, are meant to ensure that evaluations serve the information needs of their intended users: to be useful, evaluations must be responsive to the interests, perspectives and values of stakeholders.

Validation: This Project evaluation will use a variety of validation methods to ensure that the information used and conclusions made carry the necessary depth.

5. MANAGEMENT AND CONDUCT OF THE EVALUATION

The Evaluation Management Structure: The Evaluation Team will work under the supervision of a multi-tiered evaluation management structure.

- Direct management oversight of the evaluation process, but not its content, will be provided by the Evaluation Task Manager, who is responsible for the day-to-day implementation of the evaluation and manages the evaluation budget.
- The Task Manager will report to **Project Management Committee** (PMC) The BES-Net Team which is composed of UNDP and the donor. The key roles of the PMC are to ensure that 1) the evaluation process meets relevant Norms, Standards and Ethical Guidelines and that 2) the evaluation findings are relevant and recommendations are implementable and that 3) the evaluation findings are disseminated and available for use and learning from the evaluation.

Evaluation Team Composition

This evaluation team, for this exercise, will consist of one consultant with the following responsibilities:

• The evaluation consultant will lead the entire evaluation process, working closely with all relevant stakeholders. He/she will manage the evaluation process in a timely manner and

²³ Molund S & Schill G. Looking Back Moving Forward: Sida Evaluation Manual. Sida (2004)

communicate with UNDP on a regular basis and highlight progress made/challenges encountered. The consultant will be responsible for producing the inception report and the draft and final evaluation reports.

Evaluation Process and Tentative timeframe

This evaluation process will be conducted over **15** calendar days each per evaluation, the first evaluation to be completed before 30 October 2016, and should be based on phases as defined below:

- 1. Briefing by the BES-Net Team with SwedBio's input and participation.
- 2. Inception Report preparation: The evaluation team will prepare an **inception report** that will operationalize the design elements, and develop a workplan based on this ToR prior to undertaking the evaluation.
- 3. Data collection that will include desk review, key informant interviews, focussed group discussion, etc.
- 4. Zero-draft evaluation report.
- 5. Validation of zero draft by the Project Management Committee and relevant stakeholders.
- 6. Submission of the draft one of the evaluation report to PMC for their final comments and feedback.
- 7. Delivering final report (as per annexed format), based on the feedback received.
- Follow-up and use. Once the evaluation report is completed and validated, and a final report
 prepared, UNDP will disseminate it using its channels to both internal and external
 stakeholders. The Project Management Committee of this Project will endorse a
 management response to the evaluation recommendations.

PART C: EVALUATION CALENDAR for each evaluation with INDICATIVE Number of DAYS

| Conducting each Evaluation | INDICATIVE Number of Days worked by the Evaluator | Person/Team Responsible |
|---|---|--|
| 1. Briefing the Evaluator | 1 | UNDP, Evaluator, and participation from SwedBio |
| 2. <u>Development of evaluation work plan and Inception</u> Report | 2 | Evaluator |
| 3. <u>Data Collection</u> : the Evaluator collects data deploying various data collection methods agreed upon in the Inception Report. Relevant stakeholders from UNDP will facilitate access to information and provide necessary logistic / organisational support. | 8 | Evaluation Team (support from relevant UNDP) |
| 4. Zero-Draft evaluation report: the Evaluator shares the zero-draft of the evaluation report – | 1 | Evaluator, UNDP |
| 5. <u>Validation of zero draft</u> by the Project Management Committee and relevant stakeholders. | | UNDP, Evaluator |
| 6. <u>Preliminary report</u> : incorporation of the feedback from the PMC and relevant stakeholders by the Evaluator to develop and present the next draft of the Evaluation Report to the PMC. | 2 | Evaluator |

| 7. Evaluator produces a <u>final report</u> based on the final feedback from PMC and stakeholders, in time for incorporation of the findings into the Project Annual Report. | 1 | Evaluator |
|--|----|-----------|
| TOTAL | 15 | |

PART D: EVALUATION TEAM QUALIFICATION

- A) Applications are solicited from highly-experienced regional organizations that have Africawide experience in the area of HIV, human rights, key populations, LGBTI groups, the law, health and development.
- B) As the Project Evaluation is considered an independent evaluation, a consultant/organisation will be recruited as the external evaluation team.
- C) The evaluation team should be able to demonstrate:
 - a. Strong experience and knowledge in the area of evaluation for development and or capacity building projects;
 - Extensive knowledge of, and experience in applying qualitative evaluation methods, and demonstrable experience in conducting evaluations of projects that focus on biodiversity and ecosystem services, resilience, and/or sustainable development and poverty reduction;
 - c. A strong record of working with similar organisations as UNDP, SwedBio and Sida;
 - d. Qualitative data collection and analysis skills;
 - e. Process management skills such as facilitation skills and ability to negotiate with a wide range of stakeholders;
 - f. Technical competence in undertaking project evaluations which predominantly involve the use of qualitative research/social science methods;
 - g. Prior experience in working with multilateral agencies;
 - h. Knowledge of UNDP's role, and UN programming at the country level, Global and regional levels;
 - i. Additional qualifications desired: these include demonstrable language skills (in English and French); experience in working globally; and experience in working with regional and/or continental entities and international donors.
- D) The Evaluation team should comply with the following UN Core Values to name a few:
 - Professionalism
 - Planning and Organizing ability
 - Accountability: takes ownership of responsibilities and honours commitments.
 - Communications: speaks and writes clearly and effectively; listens to others, correctly interprets messages from others and responds appropriately; asks questions to clarify, and exhibits interest in having two-way communication; tailors language, tone, style and format to match audience. Keeps confidential information undisclosed...
 - Innovator: learn, share and acquire new competencies and seek new challenges by exploring new approaches
 - Performer: works against an agreed outcome and priorities and seeks performance feedback from supervisors and support staff in the performance review in a constructive and objective manner.

PART E: CRITERIA FOR SELECTING THE BEST OFFER

Upon the advertisement of the Procurement Notice, **qualified** *organisations* are expected to submit both the Technical and Financial Proposals. Accordingly, the proposers (organisations) will be evaluated based on Cumulative Analysis as per the following scenario:

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. In this regard, the respective weight of the proposals are:
 - a. Technical Criteria weight is 70%
 - b. Financial Criteria weight is **30**%

| Criteria | | Weight | Max. Point |
|--|---------------------------------------|--------|------------|
| Technical Competence (based on CV, Proposal and interview | | 70% | 100 |
| (if required)) | | | |
| Criteria a. Strong e | experience and knowledge in the | | 40 |
| area of developme | ent and or capacity building projects | | |
| Criteria b. Extensive knowledge of, and experience in | | | 30 |
| applying qualitativ | e evaluation methods, and | | |
| demonstrable exp | erience in conducting evaluations of | | |
| projects that focus | on issues of biodiversity and | | |
| ecosystem service | s, resilience, and/or sustainable | | |
| development and | poverty reduction | | |
| Criteria c. A strong and demonstrable record of | | | 15 |
| working with simil | ar organisations as UNDP, SwedBio | | |
| and Sida; | | | |
| Criteria d. technical competence in undertaking | | | 10 |
| project evaluations which predominantly involve the | | | |
| use of qualitative | | | |
| prior experience ir | | | |
| and knowledge of UNDP's role, and UN programming | | | |
| at the country level and regional levels. | | | |
| Criteria e. Additional qualifications required desired | | | 5 |
| include demonstrable language skills (in English and | | | |
| French); and experience at the global level | | | |
| Financial (Lower Offer/Offer*100) | | 30% | 30 |
| Total Score Technical Score * 70% + Financial Score * 30% | | | |

PART F: PAYMENT MILESTONES AND AUTHORITY

The qualified consultancy organisation shall receive their lump sum service fees upon certification of the completed tasks satisfactorily, as per the following payment schedule:

| Instalment of Payment/ Period | Deliverables or Documents to be Delivered | Approval should be obtained | Percenta ge of Payment |
|-------------------------------------|--|-----------------------------|------------------------------|
| 1 st Instalment | Inception Report and Work Plan | | 20% |
| 2 nd Instalment | Delivery of the Final Evaluation Report | | 80% |

PART G: ADDITIONAL GUIDANCE AND RESOURCES

a) LIST OF DOCUMENTS, WEBSITES and RESOURCES

The following sources are recommended for use by the offerors in developing and implementing the evaluation:

- Evaluation norms, guidelines and standards
 - √ http://www.sida.se/PageFiles/79951/SIDA3753en_Looking_back.pdf (Sida, 2004 Looking Back Moving Forward, Sida Evaluation Manual)
 - ✓ Quality Checklist for Evaluation Reports
 - ✓ <u>Standards for Evaluation in the UN System</u>
 - ✓ Norms for Evaluation in the UN System
 - ✓ Good Practice Guidelines for Follow up to Evaluations

- ✓ <u>Sida's Gender Equality guidelines</u>
- ✓ <u>Sida's Gender Tool Analysis</u>

b) OVERALL STRUCTURE OF THE FINAL REPORT

The following template serves as a standard outline for the final evaluation report. This should be considered during the inception phase and taking account of the specific scope and focus of the evaluation, a detailed outline of the evaluation report should be included in the inception report.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Summary of the evaluation, with particular emphasis on main findings, conclusions, lessons learned and recommendations: The executive summary provides a synopsis of the evaluation and its purpose, emphasising main findings, evaluative conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned. Descriptions of methodology should be kept to a minimum. The summary should be self-contained and self-explanatory. Special care should be taken to prepare the executive summary, as it is may be the only part of the report that some people have time to read.

INTRODUCTION

Presentation of the evaluation's purpose, questions and main findings: The introduction presents the background and overall purpose of the evaluation, including how and by whom it is intended to be used, as well as the evaluation criteria employed and the key questions addressed. It also outlines the structure of the report and provides guidance to readers.

THE EVALUATED INTERVENTION

Description of the evaluated intervention, and its purpose, logic, organisation and stakeholders: This chapter describes the main characteristics of the evaluated intervention and its organisation and stakeholders. It should cover the key issue(s) addressed by the intervention, the objectives of the intervention, the expected results and its logic of cause and effect. A description of activities carried out and key outputs delivered should be included.

The chapter should also cover the policy and development context of the evaluated intervention, including the assumptions about external factors that were part of intervention planning. When preparing the chapter, the evaluators should summarize the findings and conclusions of any earlier evaluations of the same intervention.

FINDINGS

Factual evidence and observations that are relevant to the specific questions asked by the evaluation: Findings are information/data and inferences from such data that the evaluators present as evidence relevant to the evaluation questions. They are the facts of the matter, in other words. In the findings chapter, this body of evidence is systematically presented so that readers can form their own opinion about the strengths and weakness of the conclusions of the evaluation. The quality of the findings – their accuracy and relevance – should be assessed with reference to standard criteria of reliability and validity and with reference to the project document and its results framework.

EVALUATIVE CONCLUSIONS

Assessment of the intervention and its results against given evaluation criteria, standards of performance and policy issues: these evaluative conclusions are the evaluators' concluding assessments of the intervention against given evaluation criteria, performance standards and policy issues. They provide answers as to whether the intervention is considered good or bad, and whether the results are found positive or negative. In many cases, it makes sense to combine the presentation of findings and evaluative conclusions in one chapter.

LESSONS LEARNED

General conclusions that are likely to have a potential for wider application and use: Lessons learned are findings and conclusions that can be generalised beyond the evaluated intervention. In formulating lessons, the evaluators are expected to examine the intervention in a wider perspective and put it in relation to current ideas about good and bad practice.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Actionable proposals to the evaluation's users for improved intervention cycle management and policy: Recommendations indicate what actions the evaluators believe should be taken on the basis of the evaluation.

Recommendations should always identify their respective addressees and be tailored to the specific needs and interests of each addressee. They should be simply stated and geared to facilitate implementation.

APPENDIXES

Terms of reference, methodology for data gathering and analysis, references, etc.: The report should include an Appendix describing how the evaluation was carried out. The Appendix should cover standard methodology topics, including research design, sampling and data collection methods and analytical procedures. It should discuss the limitations of the selected methods as well as their strengths.

PART H RECOMMENDED PRESENTATION OF PROPOSAL

For purposes of generating proposals whose contents are uniformly presented and to facilitate their comparative review, you are hereby given a template of the Table of Content. Accordingly; your Technical Proposal document must have at least the following preferred content and shall follow its respective format/sequencing as follows.

Proposed Table of Contents

Page

TECHNICAL PROPOSAL COVER PAGES

Cover Page (use the template hereto)

Cover Letter (use the template hereto)

Statement of Declaration (use the template hereto)

SECTION I. TECHNICAL PROPOSAL SUBMISSION FORM

- 1.1 Letter of Motivation
- 1.2 Proposed Methodology
- 1.3 Past Experience in Similar Consultancy and/or Projects
- 1.4 Implementation Timelines
- 1.5 List of Personal Referees
- 1.6 Bank Reference

SECTION II. ANNEXES

Annex a. Duly Signed Offeror's Letter to UNDP Confirming Interest and Availability (use the template hereto)

Annex b. Duly Signed Personal CV's

Documentation Checklist (please refer to the checklist attached hereto)

PART I: CONFIDENTIALITY AND PROPRIETARY INTERESTS

The Consultant shall not either during the term or after termination of the assignment, disclose any proprietary or confidential information related to the consultancy service without prior written consent. Proprietary interests on all materials and documents prepared by the consultants under the assignment shall become and remain properties of UNDP.

PART J: APPROVAL OF TOR