

Terms of Reference

Mid Term Review: Enhancing Climate Resilience of the Vulnerable Communities and Ecosystems in Somalia

Project Title: “Enhancing Climate Change Resilience of the Vulnerable Communities and Ecosystems in Somalia”

Country: Somalia

UNDP GEF PIMS No: 5268

UNDP ATLAS ID: 00084974

UNDP Project ID: 00092743

Project Duration: (2015 – 2018)

Date of Entry into the GEF Work Program: 18 November 2014

Project Document Signature Date: 04 December 2014

Original Planned Closing Date: 31 December 2018

Date of First Disbursement: 09 Jan 2015

Executing Agency: UNDP Somalia – Direct Implementation Modality

GEF Focal Area: Climate Change

PURPOSE:

In accordance with applicable policies for UNDP/GEF projects, all GEF-funded projects implemented by UNDP are subjective to a mid-term review and a final independent evaluation. The purpose for this independent Mid-Term Review is to undertake at the end of the second year of implementation, a review to determine progress being made towards the achievement of outcomes and to identify course correction if needed. The MTR will focus on the effectiveness, efficiency and timeliness of project implementation; 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 remainder of the project’s term. The review 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)

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The project is being co-funded by the Global Environment Facility - Least Developed Countries Fund (GEF-LDCF) for Adaptation to Climate Change (USD 8,000,000), and UNDP Somalia Core Resources (USD 1,500,000) and in kind support from the government of Somalia (USD 8,000,000). Other in-kind and parallel co-financing from the European Union and UNDP amounts to USD 55,320,000. The project is being implemented through the Direct Implementation Modality (DIM) by the UNDP Somalia Country Office. In terms of project ‘Implementation’, UNDP is the GEF Implementing Agency and provides strategic, technical and administrative support to the National and regional focal points. In addition, for ‘Supervision’, the UNDP-GEF Staff (led by the Regional Technical Advisor) provides an additional layer of oversight, and participates in regular project team calls to monitor progress and oversee project implementation.

The project is currently implementing NAPA priority interventions to enhance climate change resilience of the vulnerable communities and ecosystems in Somalia which aims to minimize climate change impacts and strengthen adaptive resilience capacity at national and regional levels (Somaliland, Puntland and Southern Central Somalia). The project has an implementation period of four years, having started in January 2015 with holding of Inception Workshop.

The project objective is to enhance resilience and improve adaptive capacity of vulnerable Somali communities in pilot areas, and the ecosystems on which they depend, to the adverse impacts of climate change. The project's Theory of Change¹ is to set the foundation to mainstream Climate Change Adaptation and Natural Resource Management into Somalia's nascent national and community governance structures. Policy development will create an enabling environment for sustainable land management to combat the deleterious impacts caused by extensive deforestation and over-grazing. Institutions will be created and reinforced to have the capacity to manage and prepare for floods and droughts, helping to reduce Somalia's dependency on humanitarian aid. Women will become agents of change, having the capacity to make decisions on the use, management and protection of natural resources. Based on this solid foundation, communities will have access to improved ecosystem services and will be able to develop more climate-resilient livelihoods. Women and youth will also be empowered with climate change knowledge so that they can seize employment and business opportunities.

The project design is structured around two main outcomes:

Outcome 1: Policies, plans and tools reviewed, revised, developed, adopted and implemented by government to mainstream and enhance adaptive capacity and mitigate the risks of climate change on vulnerable communities and critical ecosystem services

Outcome 2: Models of community and ecosystem resilience developed and implemented in pilot areas selected in consultation with government and community stakeholders.

AUDIENCE

This Mid-term Review of the project is initiated by UNDP as the GEF Implementing Agency. It aims to determine progress being made towards the achievement of outcomes and will identify corrective actions, if needed. It aims to provide managers, the project team, the Implementation Agency (UNDP-Somalia Country Office), Implementing partners and UNDP-GEF at all levels with strategy and policy options for more effectively and efficiently achieving the project's expected results and for replicating the results. It also provides the basis for learning and accountability for managers and stakeholders.

The Review will highlight issues requiring decisions and actions; and will present initial lessons learned about project design, implementation and management.

MID-TERM REVIEW OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE

The overall purpose of the review is to measure the effectiveness and efficiency of project activities in relation to the stated objective, and come up with futuristic recommendations

¹ *Review of the use of 'Theory of Change' in International Development* Review Report, Isabel Vogel, April 2012

within the context of operational realities of Somalia during the remainder implementation period of the project. The Mid-term Review serves as an agent of change and plays a critical role in supporting accountability and transparency. The review will aim:

- To strengthen the project adaptive management and monitoring functions of the project
- To review project design in line with evolving administrative problems, assess progress towards the achievement of objectives and make recommendations regarding specific actions that might be taken to improve the project
- To provide the opportunity to assess early signs of project success or failure and prompt necessary adjustments
- To ensure accountability for the achievement the GEF objective.
- To strengthen organizational and development learning through the identification and documentation of lessons learned (including lessons that might improve design and implementation of other UNDP/GEF projects)
- To review the project's strategy and sustainability risks.
- To document project gender impacts and gender desegregated data

Particular emphasis should be put on the current project results and the possibility of achieving all the outcomes in the given timeframe, taking into consideration the speed, at which the project is proceeding. More specifically, the review should assess:

1. Project design and its relevance 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 / obligation – participation and commitments of government, regional 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 demands of the cross-cutting issues i.e. gender mainstreaming
- f) Meeting the LDCF 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 and resilience to climate change;

2. Project outcomes, outputs and indicators

The review 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 LDCF 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:
 - Adherence to the committed GEF objectives;
 - Delivering global environmental benefits; and
 - Achieving financial and environmental sustainability for the project intervention.

3. Management arrangements focused on project implementation:

- a) General implementation and management: evaluate the adequacy of the project, implementation structure, including the effectiveness of the Project Board, partnership strategy and stakeholder involvement from the aspect of compliance to UNDP/GEF requirements and also from the perspective of “good practice model” that could be used for replication;

Financial accountability and efficiency - assess efficiency against the so far achieved results, including an assessment of the National Implementation Modality and the cost effectiveness of the utilization of LDCF resources and actual UNDP co-financing for the achievement of project results; Assess the contribution of in-kind co-financing to project implementation and to what extent the project has been able to leverage additional funding so far.

- b) Monitoring and evaluation on project level: assess the adoption of the monitoring and evaluation system during the project implementation, focusing to relevance of the performance indicators, that are Specific; Measurable; Achievable and Attributable; Relevant and Realistic and time bound (SMART indicators)

4. Timeframe: Considering the time left till the project’s foreseen termination, the difficulties faced by it in its first two years of implementation and the resources effectively available for programming, is the timeframe set still realistic? If applicable, outline recommendations for revising this timeframe with proposed benchmarks for the remainder of the project implementation time.

- **Overall success** of the project with regard to the following criteria:
 - a) *Sustainability* - assessment of the prospects for benefits/activities continuing after the end of the project,
 - b) *Changes:* Assess any changes that may have resulted from the project implementation and its impact.
 - c) *Contribution to capacity development* - extent to which the project has empowered target groups and have made possible for the government and local institutions to use the positive experiences; ownership of projects’ results;
 - d) *Replication* – analysis of replication potential of the project positive results in country and in the region,
 - e) *Synergies:* with other similar projects, funded by the government or other donors.

In addition to a descriptive assessment, all criteria should be rated using the following divisions: Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S), Moderately Satisfactory (MS), Unsatisfactory (US) with an explanation of the rating.

Issues of special consideration

The Report will present the experience and recommendations for the benefit of design and implementation of other LDCF-funded adaptation projects. Especially, the aspects of developing ecosystem resilience will be looked into, including the ways of improving the protection modalities to enhance the ecosystem functions and maintain its services in the face of climate change risks. Identification of nature-based solutions to improve coastal resilience to sea level rise, increasing storminess and flood events will be learned, based on this review. capacity for adaptation, communication and awareness-raising to support climate change adaptation, integration of climate change risk considerations and adaptation into policy and planning processes, as well as the specific management practices for natural resources to support adaptation to climate change, shall be assessed.

For future development support in the region, UNDP is especially interested in the assessment of the support model applied in the project, its implications for the long-term impact and sustainability of the project results.

The Report will present recommendations and lessons of broader applicability for follow-up and future support of UNDP and/or the Government, highlighting the best and worst practices in addressing issues relating to the evaluation scope.

5. EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

An outline of the approach is provided below; however, it should be made clear that the evaluator is responsible for revising the approach as necessary. Any changes should be in-line with international criteria and professional norms and standards (as adopted by the UN Evaluation Group – [Annex 3](#)). They must be also cleared by UNDP before being applied by the review team.

The review 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 review should provide as much gender disaggregated data as possible and should document project gender impacts.

The review team is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with the UNDP Country Office, national government, regional states' governments and their environment docket ministries, disaster management institutions, Project Board, project team, and key stakeholders.

The team is expected to consult all relevant sources of information, such as the project document, project reports – incl. Annual Reports (PIRs), 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 team is expected to use interviews as a means of collecting data on the relevance, performance and success of the project. The team is also expected to visit the following project sites.

- a. Puntland-Garowe, Gardo, Bandar-bayla, and Burtinle districts
- b. Somaliland-Hargeisa, Sheikh, and Burao districts
- c. Southern Central-Guriel, Balanbale, Jowhar and Afgoye districts

The methodology to be used by the 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 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, LDCF or the project management.

The team should reflect sound accounting procedures and be prudent in using the resources.

6. DELIVERABLES

The output of the mission will be the Mid-term Review Report in English. The length of the Report should not exceed 35 pages in total (not including the annexes).

Initial draft of the Report will be circulated for comments to UNDP (both CO and UNDP GEF Regional Office), and the Project Manager. After incorporation of comments, the Report will be finalized.

The Mid-term Report template following the GEF requirements is attached in [Annex 1](#) of this TOR.

7. TIMING AND DURATION

The review will be conducted by three evaluators (One international consultant and two national consultants. Under the guidance and leadership of the international consultant, one national consultant would cover Puntland and Somaliland while the other will cover Federal Government, Jubaland, Galmudug, Hir-Shabelle and South West State. International consultant will prepare an action plan for the nationals for data collection, stakeholders meetings and initial analysis of the information collected. The total duration of the review will be 15 days for the International consultant, to start February 2017 according to the following plan:

- (i) 2 days preparation and pre-reading
- (ii) 6 working days on the mission, including travel
- (iii) 5 days report writing
- (iv) 2 days to amend and revise report

(Home based desk review (2 working days):

- Collection of and acquaintance with the project document and other relevant materials

- with information about the project;
- Familiarization with relevant policy framework in Somalia;
- Design the detailed scope and methodology for the review (including the methods for data collection and analysis);
- Set up the mission dates and detailed mission Programme preparation in cooperation with the Project manager and UNDP CO. The Project manager will organize the schedule of the mission and will arrange transportation for the consultant; will arrange for translation/interpretation when necessary
- Communication with the project staff to clarify matters
 - a. Mission to Somalia (6 working days)
 - briefing with the stakeholders
 - visits to project sites
 - meeting with the National Project Manager, project Board members and stakeholder groups
 - Presentation of main findings to UNDP and project management on the final day of the field visit.
 - b. Elaboration of the draft report -home based:
 - Additional desk review
 - c. The write up will be lead up by the International Consultant (5working days) with support from the national consultant.
 - Completing of the draft report
 - Sharing the draft report for comments and suggestions
 - additional information and further clarification with UNDP, project management and project staff
 - Report finalization will be the sole responsibility of the International consultant
 - Incorporation of comments and additional findings into the draft report
 - Finalization of the report

The draft report shall be submitted to UNDP for review within **15 working days after the mission**. UNDP and the stakeholders will submit comments and suggestions within **7 working days** after receiving the draft.

The finalized Evaluation Report shall be submitted latest March 2017

8. REQUIRED QUALIFICATION

International Consultant:

- University degree in technical, economics or environment related issues;
- Recent experience with result-based management evaluation methodologies;
- Recent experience in monitoring and evaluation of international donor driven projects;
- Recognized expertise in the field of natural resource management and climate change adaptation issues.
- Work experience in relevant areas for at least 8 years;
- Conceptual thinking and analytical skills;

- Project monitoring and evaluation experiences within United Nations system will be considered an asset;
- Excellent English communication skills;
- Computer literacy;

National Consultants: Referenced in [Annex 4](#)

The review team must be independent from both the policy-making process and the delivery and management of assistance. Therefore, applications will not be considered from candidates who have had any direct involvement with the design or implementation of the project, or have conflict of interest with project related activities. This may apply equally to team members who are associated with organizations, or entities that are, or have been, involved in the delivery of the project. Any previous association with the project, the Executing of national implementing Agency or other partners/stakeholders must be disclosed in the application. This applies equally to firms submitting proposals as it does to individual evaluators.

If selected, failure to make the above disclosures will be considered just grounds for immediate contract termination, without recompense. In such circumstances, all notes, reports and other documentation produced by the evaluator will be retained by UNDP.

9 APPLICATION PROCESS

Applicants are requested to send in electronic versions:
current and complete C.V. in English with indication of the e-mail and phone contact
price offer indicating the total cost of the assignment (including the daily fee, per diem and travel costs)

to:

Dahir Hassan
Procurement Analyst
UNDP Somalia, Mogadishu Office.
dahir.hassan@undp.org

Due to the large number of applicants, UNDP regrets that it is unable to inform unsuccessful candidates about the outcome or status of the recruitment process.

UNDP is an equal opportunity employer and all qualified candidates are encouraged to apply.

10 ANNEXES

- [Annex 1](#) Evaluation Report: Sample Outline – Minimum GEF Requirements
- [Annex 2](#) Ethical Code of Conduct for UNDP Projects Reviews or Evaluations
- [Annex 3](#) UNEG Norms and Standards for Evaluation
- [Annex 4](#) [National Consultants TORs](#)



XQHJ #Qrup v##
Vwdqgdugv#iru#Hydα<

MID-TERM REVIEW REPORT: SAMPLE OUTLINE Minimum GEF Requirements

Executive summary

- Brief description of the project
- Context and purpose of the review
- Main conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned

Introduction

- Project background
- Purpose of Mid-term Review
- Key issues addressed
- The outputs of the review and how will they be used
- Methodology of the review
- Structure of the review

The Project and its development context

- Project start and its duration
 - Implementation status
 - Problems that the project seek to address
 - Immediate and development objectives of the project
 - Main stakeholders
 - Results expected
- An analysis of the situation with regard to the outcomes, the outputs and the partnership strategy;

FINDINGS

Project formulation

- Implementation approach
- Analysis of Logical Framework Matrix- LFM (Project logic/strategy, indicators)
- Country ownership/Drivenness
- Stakeholder participation
- Replication approach
- Cost-effectiveness
- UNDP comparative advantage
- Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector
- Management arrangements

Implementation

- Implementation approach
- Results Framework during implementation as a management and M&E tool
- Effective partnership arrangements established for implementation
- Feedback from M&E activities used for adaptive management
- Financial planning
- Monitoring and evaluation
- Execution and implementation modalities
- Management by the UNDP country office
- Coordination and operation issues

- Identification and management of risks (adaptive management)

Results

- Attainment of objective
- Prospects of sustainability
- Contribution to upgrading skills of the national staff

Conclusions and recommendations

- Corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project
- Actions to strengthen or reinforce benefits from the project
- Proposals for future directions underlining main objectives
- Suggestions for strengthening ownership, management of potential risks

Lessons learned

- Good and bad practices and lessons learned in addressing issues relating to effectiveness, efficiency and relevance.

Annexes

- TOR
- Itinerary
- List of persons interviewed
- Summary of field visits
- List of documents reviewed
- Questionnaire used and summary of results

ETHICAL CODE OF CONDUCT FOR UNDP EVALUATIONS

Evaluations of UNDP-supported activities need to be independent, impartial and rigorous. Each evaluation or review should clearly contribute to learning and accountability. Hence evaluators must have personal and professional integrity and be guided by propriety in the conduct of their business.

Evaluators:

Must present information that is complete and fair in its assessment of strengths and weaknesses so that decisions or actions taken are well founded

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.

Should protect the anonymity and confidentiality of individual informants. They should provide maximum notice, minimize demands on time, and: respect people's right not to engage. Evaluators must respect people's right to provide information in confidence, and must ensure that sensitive information cannot be traced to its source. Evaluators are not expected to evaluate individuals, and must balance an evaluation of management functions with this general principle.

Evaluations sometimes uncover evidence of wrongdoing. Such cases must be reported discreetly to the appropriate investigative body. Evaluators should consult with other relevant oversight entities when there is any doubt about if and how issues should be reported.

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, evaluators must be sensitive to and address issues of discrimination and gender equality. They should avoid offending the dignity and self-respect of those persons with whom they come in contact in the course of the evaluation. Knowing that evaluation might negatively affect the interests of some stakeholders, evaluators should conduct the evaluation and communicate its purpose and results in a way that clearly respects the stakeholders' dignity and self-worth.

Are responsible for their performance and their product(s). They are responsible for the clear, accurate and fair written and/or oral presentation of study limitations, findings and recommendations.

Should reflect sound accounting procedures and be prudent in using the resources of the evaluation.

Annex 3



XQHJ #Qrup v##
Vwdqgdugv#iru#fydax<



QFbWR U#hJ hqghu#
IrfxvbJP WUj534: 1j



QFbWR U#hJ dwlrqdd#
H{shw#bJP WUj534: :i