A. TERMS OF REFERENCE

International consultant to undertake the Mid-Term Review of Suriname FCPF REDD+ readiness project

Location: Paramaribo, SURINAME and home-based

Vacancy Type: External

Type of Contract: Individual Consultant (contracted by UNDP)

Languages Required: English

Starting Date: (date when the selected candidate is expected to start)

October, 1st

Duration of Initial Contract:

25 days over 7 weeks, with a mission of at least 2 weeks in Suriname

1. Background and context

Suriname is a country with high forest cover (about 93% of the land surface) and historically low deforestation (less than 0.1% per year). Recent trends show increasing pressures on the forest that could potentially change this situation in the future. The Government of Suriname has expressed the intention to keep the country’s High-Forest cover and Low-Deforestation (HFLD) status, while not compromising the needs for economic and social prosperity. In this context, as a signatory to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), the Government of Suriname has decided to prepare the country to enter the REDD+ mechanism. The objective of REDD+ is to reduce emissions from deforestation and forest degradation and the conservation, sustainable management of forests and enhancement of forest carbon stocks.

Before REDD+ participant countries can be eligible for results based payments for verifiable reduced emissions and/or enhanced carbon stocks, they need to develop an implementation framework for REDD+ including a national REDD+ strategy, a national forest reference emission level, a national forest monitoring system, a safeguards information system, as well as the necessary institutional arrangements for REDD+ implementation.

The Government of Suriname made a first attempt to enter the REDD+ readiness phase in 2009-2010, but it was not until 2013 that the government presented its Readiness Preparation Proposal (R-PP) to the World Bank’s Forest Carbon Partnership Facility (FCPF) and received a US$ 3.8M grant to support some preparatory activities towards REDD+. This funding has resulted in the development of the project “Strengthening national capacities of Suriname for the elaboration of the National REDD+ strategy and the design of its implementation framework”3, structured around three pillars: (i) human capacities and stakeholders engagement, (ii) REDD+ strategy, (iii) implementation framework and tools. It is implemented by the Government of Suriname (GoS) with the United Nations Development Program (UNDP) as delivery partner. The National Institute for Environment and Development in Suriname (NIMOS) serves as the GoS technical focal point for implementation of the project while the Foundation for Forest Management and Production Control (SBB) is also responsible for specific outputs.

This 3-years project was signed in May 2014. Implementation has started relatively slowly with the project coordinator recruited in mid-2015, and the required staff progressively put in place in the Project Management Unit (PMU). Trainings and consultations have been carried out, as well as works on national forests and carbon monitoring systems. Many consultancies have already been launched or planned for the next months. Beyond the objective to achieve REDD+ readiness, this process can also be seen as an opportunity to support and foster national dialogue with indigenous and maroon peoples, strengthen democratic practices, improve public governance, accelerate decentralization, and enhance diplomatic positioning.

As stated is the project document signed between UNDP and Suriname, the project will undergo an independent mid-term review at the mid-point of project implementation.

3 Project document available at:

This mid Term review was originally scheduled to take place in early 2016 but due to the delay during the inception phase, it has been agreed by the Project Board to postpone this mid-term review until end of 2016. The mid-term review will determine progress being made towards the achievement of outcomes and will identify course correction if needed. It will focus on the effectiveness, efficiency and timeliness of project implementation while also considering relevance, sustainability and impact; will highlight issues requiring decisions and actions; and will present initial lessons learned about project design, implementation and management. Findings of this review will be incorporated as recommendations for enhanced implementation during the final half of the project’s term. The final MTR report will be available in English. A management response will be prepared by the institutions involved in the project, explaining how the recommendations of this mid-term review are being addressed and which actions are taken, when needed.

This MTR will be carried out by a Review Team (RT) composed of an international consultant (team leader) and a national consultant (team member). They will work as a team, agree on work repartition and produce together the requested deliverables.

2. Objectives and scope of work

The objective of this Mid Term Review is to evaluate the project’s performance and the factors affecting it and propose recommendations to improve it. While project’s performance evaluation will have a strong focus on the effectiveness of the project implementation (progress towards project targets), it will also have to include efficiency, sustainability, relevance and impact criteria.

In addition, the review will have to assess the project’s compliance with the various aspects of the Common Approach to Social and Environmental Safeguards for Multiple Delivery Partners under the Forest Carbon Partnership Facility (FCPF) Readiness Fund4: Strategic Environmental and Social Assessments (SESAs) and Environmental and Social Management Frameworks (ESMFs), stakeholder engagement, grievance and redress mechanism, and disclosure of information.

3. Evaluation questions

It is expected that the main evaluation questions for each criteria will include at least the ones below.

Relevance - What is the relevance of the Project’s design from the perspective of national development priorities, climate change and forest agenda, and the national REDD+ process in general? - What is the relevance of the Project’s design from the perspective of the UN and UNDP support to GoS? - Is the project design sound and realistic? - Has the project been able to adapt successfully to changing circumstances? - Does the project logical framework allow for good project management?

Effectiveness - To which extent progresses towards outputs or outcomes have been achieved or are on-track to do so? What has been the quality of the main outputs? - To what extent gender has been sufficiently mainstreamed in project implementation? - What factors have contributed to achieving or not achieving intended outputs and outcomes?

Efficiency - How efficient are resources (funds, expertise and time) converted to achieve outcomes and outputs? - Has the project rate of delivery been satisfactory? How timely (cf project document and annual work plans) have the main outputs been achieved? - What are the main factors influencing the efficiency of project implementation? In particular, what has been the efficiency of (i) the project management (including in terms of planification, budgeting, procurement and fund management), the coordination (ii) between UNDP and the GoS, (iii) within the governments, and (iv) between the project and other relevant initiatives? - To which extent project implementation will be affected by the end of the ACTO project sustaining SBB Forest Covert Monitoring Unit, and what should be the resources dedicated by the project to the staffing of this unit to be able to achieve the project’s objectives ?

Sustainability - What are the prospects for sustaining the REDD+ process after the termination of the project? - What are the major factors influencing the achievement or non-achievement of sustainability of the programme?

- To which extent the project has been able to build sufficient institutional and human capacity and implement the institutional arrangement needed to ensure a successful REDD+ process? - To which extent the project has been able to secure sufficient national ownership of the REDD+ process and the participation of the different stakeholders in particular indigenous people and maroons? - To which extent progress has been made in securing on the long term the achievements of this project (through for example fundraising for R-PP Implementation, REDD+ investment and results-based payment, or building up REDD+ potential for High-Forest Low-Deforestation countries) ?

Impact - To which extent the project’s intervention is able to achieve (some level of) REDD+ readiness without additional funding for R-PP implementation? - To which extent the project has been successful in positioning REDD+ as a strategic priority for the development of the country? - To which extent the project has been able to improve national dialogue with indigenous and maroon peoples?

4. Methodology

The Review should develop and adopt the most effective method to carry out the above tasks and reach the above objectives, whilst ensuring constant and high level quality standards throughout. Overall guidance and adherence to the UNEG Norms & Standards5 or UNDP handbook on planning, monitoring and evaluating for development results6 are used as a reference.

Findings should be based on facts, sound evidence and analysis, they should be crosschecked and the evidence should be clearly documented in the final report. Analysis leading to judgments should always be clearly reasoned. The limitations of conclusions based on methods applied shall be addressed in the final report. In attempting to attribute any outcomes and impacts to the programme, the evaluators should consider the difference between what has happened with and what would have happened without the programme.

The methodology for this work will be based on the following elements:

- Desk review of all relevant background documentation, including: o The project document,

o The monthly, quarterly and annual reports, o Annual work plans, procurement plans and budgets, o HACT assessment, o Audits, o Main deliverables produced by the project, o Minutes of Project Board meetings and of the meeting of the Project Management Unit, o Back To Office Reports, o Minutes of workshops and events, o Laws or policies relevant to the project, o National REDD+ website7, o FCPF and UNDP websites8…

- Semi-structured interviews (face-to-face or through any other appropriate means of communications) or focus groups meetings with key informants, stakeholders and participants, including in particular representatives from: o Government, in particular from the Project Monitoring Unit, NIMOS, SBB, the cabinet of the President, and the Foundation Planning Suriname; o UNDP Suriname, regional and global; o Civil Society Organizations, in particular indigenous and tribal people and maroons organizations; o Business and Industry; o Other representatives from the Major Group Collective (official stakeholders representation platform: children and youth, farmers, local authorities, NGOs, scientific and technological community, women, workers and trade unions… o Other relevant bi-lateral or multi-lateral initiatives and donors.

- Field visits to villages in two areas where consultations have been carried out.

- Meeting with project board representatives to present and discuss preliminary findings.

- Participation by skype to project board meeting to present the report.

5. Deliverables and payments

The review will produce the following deliverables: - An inception report outlining :

o Context o Objective o Evaluation methodology through a detailed evaluation matrix that displays for each of the evaluation criteria, the questions and subquestions that the evaluation will answer, and for each question, the data that will be collected to inform that question and the methods that will be used to collect that data; o Working modalities stakeholders participation and institutional arrangements; o Work plan and timeline including work repartition among the team; o Deliverables, including an outline of the final report.

- A draft Mid Term Review Report

- A final Mid Term Review Report of 50 pages maximum, with the following indicative outline : o Executive summary o Introduction : objective of the review, approach and methodology used o Progress - Findings o Factors affecting progress o Recommendations o Conclusion Annexes to the evaluation report will include, though not limited to, the following as relevant: o Terms of reference for the evaluation; o Additional methodology-related documentation; o List of documents reviewed; o List of institutions and stakeholders interviewed by the evaluation team; o List of programme outputs/Programme results framework;

NIMOS, SBB, PMU and UNDP are expected to provide written comments on the deliverables of the review team within 5 working days. The review team is expected to explain how these comments have been taken into account, using for instance responses matrix.

The consultant will be paid on a lump sum basis under the following installments.

Upon acceptance of Deliverables Each Team member receives

Inception report 20% of contract value Draft Mid-Term Review report 40% of contract value Final Mid-Term Review report 40% of contract value

6. Institutional Arrangements

The Team should work under the supervision of UNDP Specialist Energy and Environment, assisted by the UNDP REDD programme Regional Technical Advisor and the Chief Technical Advisor for the project.

The project coordinator within the Project Management Unit, assisted by the M&E specialist, will be the main operational counterpart.

In addition to these, NIMOS director and representative from SBB will be also closely associated to the review.

7. Evaluation team

The evaluation team will be composed of one international and one national consultant, contracted for the same period.

8. Duration of the work and tentative timeline

The work is expected to be carried out between October 3rd, 2016 and November, 15th, 2016 for a total of 25 working days.

The table below presents a tentative timeline.

Tentative Dates Activity Expected working days

Responsibility

October, 7th Preparation of inception report

5 Review Team (consultants). Work Plan reviewed by UNDP, PMU and NIMOS

October, 10th – October 28th

Desk review and mission to Suriname, including presentation of preliminary findings during the wrap up debriefing (October 21st)

13 Review Team (consultants). Logistical support provided by the PMU and UNDP 0.5 days debriefing workshop with project board members

October, 31st – November 4th

Preparation of draft Mid Term Review Reports

5 Review Team (consultants) reviewed by UNDP, PMU, NIMOS and SBB

November 7th – November 15th

Finalization of Mid Term Review Report

2 Review Team (consultants) reviewed by UNDP, PMU, NIMOS and SBB

9. Duty Station

The duty stations for this assignment are Paramaribo, Suriname and home country. During the assignment the consultant is required to be in Suriname for a minimum of two weeks. Up to two field visits to villages will be required.

10. Minimum qualifications of the Individual Contractor

Education: - Master’s degree or equivalent in natural resource management, forestry, or a related field

Experience: - A minimum of 10 years of relevant experience (natural resource management, climate change, REDD+, environmental policy…) - Prior work experience and sound understanding of REDD+ - Demonstrated experience in Mid Term Review or other types of evaluations of similar types of programmes

Competencies: - Outstanding analytical, writing and communication skills, dutch an asset - Prior experience in Suriname/Latin America an asset

11. Technical evaluation criteria

Technical evaluation criteria

Master’s degree or equivalent in natural resource management, forestry, or a related field

A minimum of 10 years of relevant experience – natural resource management, climate change, REDD+, environmental policy

Prior work experience and sound understanding of REDD+ 20 Demonstrated experience in Mid Term Review or other types of evaluations of similar types of programmes 30 Outstanding analytical, writing and communication skills, dutch an asset and Prior experience in Suriname/Latin America an asset

Total Obtainable Score 100

12. Evaluation ethics

In order to ensure evaluation ethics, the evaluation team will be requested to read carefully, understand and sign the “Code of Conduct for Evaluators in the UN System”9. This will ensure the review will be conducted in accordance with principles such as avoiding conflict of interest, ensuring the rights and confidentiality of information providers or adopting a transparent approach with internal and external stakeholders.