**Terms of Reference for the Terminal Evaluation**

**TERMS OF REFERENCE (TOR)**

**FOR THE TERMINAL EVALUATION OF THE PROJECT**

***Type of consultancy: Individual Contractor***

***(Intellectual Service)***

1. **Project title:** *Implementing Priority Adaptation Measures to Build Resilience of rainfed farmer and pastoral communities of Sudan, especially women headed households to the adverse impacts of Climate Change (Foreign Affairs, Trade and Development Canada (FATDC)*
2. **Project description:**

|  |
| --- |
| In accordance with applicable policies for UNDP/GEF projects, all GEF-funded projects implemented by UNDP are subjective to a mid-term and a final independent evaluation. The purpose for this independent Terminal Evaluation (TE) is to undertake at the end of the last year of implementation an evaluation will determine whether the project has achieved its intended outcomes. The TE will focus on the effectiveness, efficiency and timeliness of project implementation; will highlight issues requiring actions for implementation of similar programmes; and will present the lessons learned about project design, implementation and management. Findings of this TE will be incorporated as recommendations for enhanced implementation of similar projects. The evaluation is to be undertaken in accordance with the “GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy” (see  <http://www.thegef.org/gef/sites/thegef.org/files/documents/ME_Policy_2010.pdf>  The project is funded by theForeign Affairs, Trade and Development Canada(FATDC) for Adaptation to climate change (USD 3,080,000). The project is being implemented through the Direct Implementation Modality (NIM) by the UNDP through an LOA with the Higher Council for Environment and Natural Resources (HCENR). In terms of project ‘supervision’ (as opposed to ‘implementation’), UNDP is the GEF Implementing Agency and provides strategic, technical and administrative support to the HCENR.  The project is currently implementing NAPA priority interventions to build resilience in the agriculture and water sectors to the adverse Impacts of Climate Change in Sudan which aims at minimizing and reversing the food insecurity and enhance adaptive capacity of small-scale farmers and pastoralists resulting from climate change, including variability in four vulnerable regions representing the different ecological settings. The project has been implemented over three -year period, having started in August 2014 and ending in December 2016.  The PRODOC has identified two components (outcomes) and several results-oriented indicators. The outcomes that will contribute to the achievement of the project  Objectives are:   * Outcome 1. Resilience of food-production systems and food-insecure communities enhanced in the face of climate change. * Outcome 2. A better understanding of lessons learned and emerging best practices, captured and up-scaled at the national level |
|  |
| **C: Scope of work**  The overall purpose of the evaluation is to measure the effectiveness and efficiency of project activities in relation to the stated objective, identify lessons learnt and to produce possible recommendations on how to expand and upscale the best climate change adaptation practices. The Terminal Evaluation serves as an agent of change and plays a critical role in supporting future climate change adaptation programming in the country. Its main objectives are:   * To document the lessons learnt on project management and monitoring functions of the climate change adaptation projects; * To document the best lessons learnt for enhancing accountability for the achievement of the climate change adaptation objectives; * To enhance organizational and development learning; * To enable informed decision-making for future climate change adaptation programming.   Particular emphasis should be put on the current project results and the extent of achieving all the outcomes in the given timeframe, taking into consideration the speed, at which the project is implemented. More specifically, the evaluation should assess:  This Terminal Evaluation of the Project is initiated by UNDP as the GEF Implementing Agency. It aims to determine the achievement of the intended outcomes. It aims to provide the Implementation Agency (HCENR), UNDP-Sudan Country Office and UNDP-GEF at all levels with strategy and policy options and lessons for replicating the results.  The Terminal Evaluation will highlight lessons learned about project design, implementation and management.  The evaluators will assess the project design. They should review the problem addressed by the project and the project strategy, encompassing an assessment of the appropriateness of the objectives, outcomes, outputs, planned activities and inputs as compared to cost-effective alternatives. in relation to:  a) Development priorities at the national level;  b) Stakeholders – assess if the specific needs were met;  c) Country ownership /drivenness – participation and commitments of government, states, local authorities, and communities;  d) UNDP mission to promote assisting the country to build its capacities in the focal area of adaptation to climate change;  e) Meeting the GEF adaptation guidelines: Demonstrating increases in adaptive capacity and resilience for climate change and assess whether and how the engagement of communities has had a particular contribution and added value to community adaptation to climate change;   * Develop a lesson-learning and replication strategy, and a strategy to integrate project results and lessons learnt into the wider dissemination and scale up plans.   The evaluation will assess the outcomes, outputs, and indicators achieved by the project as well as the likely inroads to sustainability of project results. This should encompass the following:  Attainment of objectives and planned results:   * Evaluate how, and to what extent, the stated project objectives are being achieved; taking into account the “achievement indicators”. In addition, the team will assess the indicators matrix as to its utility for determining sustainability and replicability impact. * Assess the level to which the project has followed guidelines of the GEF Strategic Priority on Adaptation and recommend ways to further strengthen this linkage.   Achievement of outputs and activities:   * Assess the scope, quality and usefulness of the project outputs produced so far in relation to its expected results. * Assess the feasibility and effectiveness of the work plan in implementing the components of the project.   Assess the quality, appropriateness and timeliness of the project with regard to satisfying the following GEF objectives;   * + Delivering global environmental benefits; and   + Achieving financial and environmental sustainability for the project intervention.   The evaluation must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful. It must be easily understood by project partners and applicable to the remaining period of project duration. The evaluation should provide as much gender disaggregated data as possible.  The evaluation will take place mainly in the field. The Consultant will also be accompanied a National Consultant forming a team. The evaluation team is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with the UNDP Country Office, states’ governments, Higher Council for Environment and Natural Resources, the Ministry of Environment, Natural Resources and Physical Development, Project Board, project team, and other key stakeholders.  The evaluation team is expected to consult all relevant sources of information, such as the project document, project reports – including Annual Reports, project budget revision, progress reports, project files, national strategic and legal documents, and any other material that the team may consider useful for evidence based assessment.  The evaluation team is expected to use interviews as a means of collecting data on the relevance, performance and success of the project. The evaluation team is also expected to visit the project sites.  The methodology to be used by the evaluation team should be presented in the report in detail. It shall include information on:   * Documentation reviewed; * Interviews; * Field visits; * Questionnaires; * Participatory techniques and other approaches for the gathering and analysis of data.   Although the evaluation team should feel free to discuss with the authorities concerned, all matters relevant to its assignment, it is not authorized to make any commitment or statement on behalf of UNDP, GEF, or the project management.  The evaluation team should reflect sound accounting procedures and be prudent in using the resources of the evaluation.  **D. Expected Outputs and Deliverables**  The output of the mission will be the Evaluation Report in English. The length of the Report should not exceed 30 pages in total (not including the annexes).  Initial draft of the Evaluation Report will be circulated for comments to UNDP (both CO and Istanbul Regional Office), and the Project Manager. After incorporation of comments, the Evaluation Report will be finalized.  The Evaluation Report template following the GEF requirements is attached in [Annex 1](#Annex1) of this TOR.  **Deliverables/ Outputs**   |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **Deliverables / Outputs** | **Estimated Duration to Complete** | **Due Dates** | **Submission Requirements** | **% of Payment** | **Review and Approvals Required** | | preparation and pre-reading of project document and Project’s Annual Reports | 2 working days | 26th-27th Feb. | **----** | Nil | **----** | | Conduct the filed mission | 8 working days | 28th Feb. – 7th March | **---** | 40% | **----** | | Report writing and Submission of Draft Report | 4 working Days | 8th – 11th March | Draft evaluation report | Nil | PC; Team Leader Sustainable Livelihoods Cluster; UNDP/GEF Regional Advisor - Climate Change Adaptation. | | Amend and revise the report until Final Report is accepted by UNDP | 2 working days | 18th -19th March | Final evaluation report | 60% | PC; Team Leader Sustainable Livelihoods Cluster; UNDP/GEF Regional Advisor - Climate Change Adaptation. |     **E. Institutional Arrangement**  This is mainly a Home based Consultancy but requiring 8 days of field work in Sudan. The International Consultant, assisted by a National Consultant will perform his duties under the overall guidance of the Team Leader of the Sustainable Livelihoods Cluster of UNDP Sudan Country Office and in coordination as informed by the technical guidance from the UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Advisor.  The consultant should liaise with the following institutions:   * The Ministry of Environment, Forests and Physical Development; * GEF- Operational Focal Point; * Agricultural Research corporations (ARC); * The State Ministries of Agriculture; * The Higher Council for Environment and Natural Resources (HCNER); * Ministry of International Cooperation.   The role of these institutions is to avail their relevant information, reflect their views and participate in the consultative meetings and review of the evaluation document.  **F**. **Duration of the Work**  The consultancy service is expected to start in February 2017 and be completed by the end of March 2017. However, given the amount of deliverables and it is home-based consultancy, the entire milestones mentioned in Section D above must be completed in 20 working days.  **G. Duty Station**  It is a home-based consultancy, but the consultant is required to travel to Sudan and stay for 12 working days for conducting the field surveys and counterparts interviews. For such a reason, the Consultant is required to consider cost of ticket, terminal expenses, insurance, and Living allowance to meet the expenditures in Sudan. |
| **H. Qualifications of the Successful Individual Contractor** |
|  |
|  |
| i. Postgraduate University degree in economics, social sciences or environmentally related fields;  ii. Extensive expertise in the field of climate change adaptation and natural resource management issues;  iii. 15- 25 years of work experience in the evaluation of GEF and donors driven development projects. Project evaluation experiences within United Nations system will be considered an asset;  iv. Ability to analyze large amounts of data to identify key messages and indicators for easy visualization of complex analyses;  v. Demonstrated experience with result-based management evaluation methodologies.  **I.** Corporate Competencies Functional Competencies:   * Corporate Competencies   + Demonstrates integrity by modeling 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;   + Ability to work with a multi-cultural and diverse team. * Functional Competencies:   + Demonstrated experience in technical issues related climate change adaptation.   + Demonstrated experience in conducting project evaluation.   + Ability to analyze large amounts of complex and diversified data related to adaptation to climate change.   + Demonstrated strong coordination and facilitation skills;   + Strong interpersonal skills and the ability to initiate discussions with rural communities and technical governmental officials.   **I**. **Scope of Price Proposal and Schedule of Payments:**  The consultancy will be remunerated through two payments which is “all-inclusive”. The clearance of final products must be obtained by the persons identified in section D above. This contract price is fixed regardless of changes in the cost components.  **J. Recommended Presentation of Offer**   1. **Personal CV or P11**, indicating all past experience from similar projects, as well as the contact details (email and telephone number) of the Candidate and at least three (3) professional references; 2. **Brief description** of why you consider yourself as the most suitable for the assignment, and a methodology, on how you will approach and complete the assignment.   **K. Criteria for Selection of the Best Offer**  The offers received from the candidates will be evaluated using combined scoring method. The Combined Scoring method assesses the offers with technical merits of the proposals – where the qualifications and methodology will be weighted a maximum of 70%, and later combined with the price offer which will be weighted a max of 30%.  **Technical Scoring Grid (700 Points, Pass Marks 490):**   |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | Assessment Criteria: | Maximum Obtainable Points | Weightage (%) | Evaluated Points Obtained by the Offerors | | | | A | B | C | | Postgraduate University degree in economics, social sciences or environment related fields | 150 | 21.5% |  |  |  | | Extensive expertise in the field of climate change adaptation and natural resource management issues | 150 | 21.5% |  |  |  | | Minimum of 7 years of work experience in the evaluating GEF and donors driven development projects. Project evaluation experiences within United Nations system or equivalent will be considered an asset | 200 | 29% |  |  |  | | Ability to analyze large amounts of data to identify key messages and indicators for easy visualization of complex analyses | 100 | 14% |  |  |  | | Demonstrated experience with result-based management evaluation methodologies | 100 | 14% |  |  |  | | TOTAL | 700 | 100% |  |  |  |   The price proposals of candidates obtaining 490 points and higher (or 70% or above) will only be technically qualified; they will be reviewed and compared for the assessment of overall ranking of the proposals. Those obtaining lower than 490 points (or lesser than 70%) will be technically non-responsive proposals, price proposals of such candidate will not be compared.  **Assessment of the Price Proposals (300 Points) or 30%**  The lowest priced bid from among the technically qualified Offerors will obtain the full marks of 300 points in the price proposal. Price proposals of remaining qualified bidders will be prorated against the lowest priced bid using the following formula to derive the marks in their price proposal:  Marks obtained by a Bidder = Lowest Priced Bid (amount) / Bid of the Offeror (amount) X 300 (Full Marks)  **Award of the Contract/Award Criteria**:    The contract will be awarded to the candidate (bidder) whose proposal obtains the highest cumulative marks (points) when the marks obtained in technical and price proposals are aggregated together.  The contract award, however, is dependent on the conditions mentioned “Offerors Letter to UNDP – Confirming Interest and Availability for the Individual Contractor (IC) Assignment”. Candidates disagreeing to fulfill the applicable conditions will not be eligible for contract award and signing.  The key criteria for rating the qualification and methodology has been stated together with their equivalent percentage weight, so that Offerors can be evaluated objectively. Therefore, candidates are required to pay highest attention to these requirement while preparing the technical and price proposals.  **L. Annexes to the TOR (not included here)**   1. The Evaluation Report template following the minimum GEF requirements (Annex 1); 2. Explanation on terminology provided in the GEF guidelines to terminal Evaluations (Annex 2); 3. Ethical code of conduct for UNDP Evaluations (Annex 3) 4. Sample IC Contract; 5. General Conditions of Contract for IC; 6. Offerors Letter to UNDP – Confirming Interest and Availability for the Individual Contractor (IC) Assignment” |

**Annex 2 – Key Evaluation Questions**

| **Key Question** | **Source of Information** | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Doc. review** | **Meeting with project team** | **Brainstorm within Evaluation team** | **Key stakeholder interviews** | **Site visits** | **Self-Assessment Tool** |
| **Design and document and basics** | | | | | | |
| The project design | XX |  |  |  |  |  |
| Have the indicators/objective/outputs been delivered? | X | X | XX |  | XX |  |
| The overall project financial information – both LDCF and co-financing. We need to get them onto this. |  | XXX |  |  |  |  |
| **Local benefits** | | | | | | |
| How many ordinary people really benefitted, and to what extent? Does this equate to good value for each LDCF US$? – We need a good way to assess this. |  | Xx | XX |  |  | XXXXX |
| Is there *adequate* sustainability at site level? Again we need some way to measure this. (i) the technical inputs, are they sustainable, and was the follow-up reports enough (ii) Presence and viability of RFs and VDCs? Truly. |  | Xx | XX |  | XX | XX |
| **Broader impacts** | | | | | | |
| Is there *adequate* ‘up-linking’ – to Region and National governments/expertise/departments? How are their work programmes affected. Is there a policy aspect? How has ARC been affected? What is the point of all these late reports? How viable are the regional technical committees? |  |  |  | XX | XX | XXX |
| Humanitarian vs. development? A list of small help-outs? Or a model or a strategy? |  |  | XX | XX | XX |  |
| **MDG** | | | | | | |
| Any sufficiently meaningful on gender been achieved, even monitoring it? |  |  |  | X |  |  |
| **Knowledge capture and management** | | | | | | |
| Why so many documents that just list, list and list ‘achievements’? |  | XX |  | XX | XX |  |
| Have lessons been learnt, has knowledge been captured, in any way? Which? What are they? The knowledge products – do they exist, are they any good, are they used, are they fit for purpose? |  | XX |  | XX | XX |  |
| Adaptive management – UNDP, PSC, HNCER – have they been learning and adapting the project? And impact of our MTE? |  | XX |  |  |  |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **And specifically from the ToR (to be assessed):** |  |
| * Implementation approach * LFM used during implementation * Presence of effective partnerships? * Financial planning * Monitoring and evaluation * UNDP * Identification and management of risks * Contribution to upgrading skills of the national staff | Go through with Project team first, and then follow up. |