

Terms of Reference

I. POSITION INFORMATION

Title:	Individual Consultant for Mid-term Evaluation of the project “Japan-Caribbean Climate Change Partnership (J-CCCP)”
Supervisor:	J-CCCP Project Manager
Duty Station:	Home based with missions to Barbados, Saint Lucia and Suriname
Expected Duration of Assignment:	34 Actual Working days periodically
Period:	June - July 2017

II. BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT

The Japan-Caribbean Climate Change Partnership (J-CCCP) was launched officially in January 2016 for three years, with a total budget of USD 15 million equivalent. It is a regional project, participated by eight countries including Belize, the Commonwealth of Dominica, Grenada, the Republic of Guyana, Jamaica, Saint Lucia, St. Vincent and the Grenadines, and the Republic of Suriname.

The project aims to support eight Caribbean countries in advancing the process of low-emission risk-resilient development by improving energy security and integrating medium to long-term planning for adaptation to climate change. The project has three components (Outcomes):

Outcome 1: NAMAs and NAPs to promote alternative low emission and climate resilient technologies that can support energy transformation and adaptation in economic sectors are formulated and institutionalised

- Output 1.1. Technical support towards national and sub-national institutional and coordination arrangements in Caribbean countries to support the formulation of national roadmaps on the NAP process, including elements for monitoring the progress of their implementation.
- Output 1.2. National teams are trained in the use of tools, methods and approaches to advance the NAP process and budgeting.
- Output 1.3. Business-as-usual greenhouse gas emission baselines established, and climate change mitigation options for selected sectors relevant for the Caribbean region identified.
- Output 1.4. Design and implementation of NAMAs in the Caribbean with MRV systems and NAMA registries in place to monitor their execution.

Outcome 2: Selected mitigation and adaptation technologies transferred and adopted for low emission and climate resilient development in the Caribbean

- Output 2.1 Affordable climate-resilient community-based water harvesting, storage and distribution systems designed, built and rehabilitated in selected target areas (e.g. communal reservoirs, rooftop catchment, rainwater storage tanks and conveyance systems)
- Output 2.2 Crop diversification practices tested for their ability to improve resilience of farmers to climate change impacts.
- Output 2.3 Community-based water capacity and irrigation systems improved or developed to test their ability to raise agricultural productivity.
- Output 2.4 Climate resilient agro-pastoral practices and technologies (e.g. water management and soil fertility) demonstrated in selected target areas.
- Output 2.5 Small-scale infrastructure implemented to reduce climate change and disaster induced losses
- Output 2.6 Energy pilot demonstrations applied to selected adaptation, mitigation and disaster risk management interventions to catalyse low emission climate resilient technology transfer, development and investments in the Caribbean.

Outcome 3: Knowledge Network created in Caribbean to foster South-South and North-South cooperation through sharing of experiences, and knowledge in the area of climate change

- Output 3.1 High level policy events and financial tools to support the implementation of a mitigation actions programs in selected sectors (e.g. fiscal incentives, feed in tariffs, credits and guarantees) and to look at effective practices in NAPs and Community Based Adaptation.
- Output 3.2 Communication campaign on the benefits of mitigation and adaptation, mitigation and disaster risk management interventions to catalyse low emission technologies for sustainable cities in island towns and communities
- Output 3.3 Japan-Caribbean transfer of technical and process-orientated information on experiences, good practice, lessons and examples of relevance to medium to long-term national, sector and local planning and budgeting processes

The project is funded by the Government of Japan and is implemented directly by United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). UNDP Barbados and OECS Country Office serves as lead office for the project, where the Project Management Unit (PMU) therefore sits. The Barbados Sub Regional Office (SRO) is responsible for implementing Outcomes 1 and 3 of the project and Outcome 2 related to OECS countries (Dominica, Grenada, Saint Lucia and Saint Vincent and the Grenadines) under outcome 2. UNDP other country offices in Belize, Guyana, Jamaica and Suriname are responsible for implementing Outcome 2 in their respective countries. Outcome 2 currently has approximately forty (40) pilot projects in the pipeline in all eight countries and related to all six (6) outputs. UNDP Panama Regional Hub is providing a technical advisory and oversight role to the PMU.

III. EVALUATION PURPOSE

In accordance with the Project Document of the J-CCCP, a Mid-term Evaluation by an independent evaluator should be conducted so as to assess progress towards achieving the J-CCCP identified outcomes and the extent to which interventions/activities completed and planned have been and will contribute to these project outcomes. The evaluation will also identify any changes that may be needed to achieve the stated outcomes.

Under the direction of the J-CCCP Project Manager and working closely with the J-CCCP Monitoring and Evaluation Analyst the evaluator is expected to conduct a Mid-term evaluation and prepare an evaluation report which should outline the progress the project has made toward achieving the intended project outcomes. Recommendations on how J-CCCP and UNDP could better align/improve the current interventions, structure and processes in order to achieve intended outcomes should also be included in this evaluation.

IV. EVALUATION SCOPE AND OBJECTIVES

The evaluator will review all (outcomes) project activities (past, current and planned) to assess the alignment of these interventions with intended outcomes as well as to assess how management structure (capacity), and work processes affect the achievement of these outcomes. More specifically, the midterm evaluation will seek to:

- Review the status of the outcomes and the key factors that affect (both positive and negative) to the outcomes;
- Review and assess the project's partnerships with stakeholders - governments, civil society, other international organisations and provide recommendations for how these partnerships can be strengthened;
- Review and assess the project's interventions as it relates to the Project Document and Quality Assurance Assessment; UNDP Barbados and OECS Evaluation Plan; UNDP Strategic Plan; UNDP Gender Strategy and the UNDP Youth Strategy, and provide recommendations for the future direction interventions/activities which can better enable the project to contribute to the achievement of the stated outcomes in these strategy documents. (In cases where interventions have already commenced, provide recommendations on any amendments that may be necessary)
- Review current Monitoring Tools, Reporting templates and roles and provide recommendations for better alignment if necessary
- Assess how the project has targeted and met (will meet) current beneficiary needs (as dictated by project document and updated Results Framework) and as disaggregated as recommended

- Identify any amendments in process, activities and reporting necessary and provide recommendations on best practices

V. EVALUATION QUESTIONS

The following key evaluation criteria should be utilized and applied with specifics to the project:

1. Relevance
 - a. To what extent is the project in line with UNDP's mandate, national priorities and the requirements of targeted women and men?
 - b. How has the project been contributing to its expected outcomes?
 - c. How has the gender questions been taken into account in the project?
 - d. How has the project contributed to the priorities of UNDP?
2. Effectiveness
 - a. Has there been progress towards achieving the outputs?
 - b. What factors have been contributing to achieving or not achieving intended outputs?
 - c. What has been the contribution of partners and other organizations to the outcome, and how effective have UNDP partnerships been in contributing to achieving the outcome?
 - d. To what extent are the current and planned results benefitting women and men equally?
 - e.
3. Efficiency
 - a. Are the strategies being utilized adequate? How have they contributed to the maximum intervention efficiency?
 - b. Has the use of recourses been efficient? Is there economic use of resources?
 - c. To what extent are quality outputs delivered on time?
 - d. To what extent are partnership modalities conducive to the delivery of outputs?
 - e. How is monitoring used to manage the project?
4. Sustainability
 - a. What strategies and mechanisms have been incorporated to the implementation of the project to guarantee the sustainability of expected outputs after the project?
 - b. To what extent has a sustainability strategy, including capacity development of key national stakeholders, been developed or implemented?
 - c. To what extent are policy and regulatory frameworks in place that will support the continuation of benefits?

- d. To what extent have partners committed to providing continuing support?
 - e. How will concerns for gender equality, human rights and human development be taken forward by primary stakeholders?
5. Lessons learnt and best practices
- a. What are the most important lessons learnt being identified during the project? And best practices?

VI. METHODOLOGY

The project evaluation is to be undertaken in accordance with UN evaluation norms and policies, including UN Standards and Norms for Evaluations and UNDP Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation for Development Results. Evaluation methods should be selected for their rigor in producing empirically based evidence to address the evaluation criteria, to respond to the evaluation questions, and to meet the purpose of the evaluation.

The type of information and methods selected must produce evidence, and they should combine both qualitative and quantitative aspects. The evaluation findings should not rely only on perceptions, but the evidence should be validated by triangulation of different data sources /or methods) The evaluation should use primary and secondary data, and should include a presentation of the results matrix of the initiative, updated with the new indicator status, but delimited by the possible restrictions identified in the analysis of the evaluation. The central focus of the evaluation is the contribution to outcomes, but should also include output level results.

It is expected that the review, findings and recommendations would be derived from the following methods:

- Desk review of related documents such as project related documents such as Project Document,; Annual Work Plans (AWPs), Progress reports and Monitoring Tool
- Consultation with stakeholders and counterparts (interviews and focus groups);
- Consultation with beneficiaries (interviews and focus groups);
- Technical consultation with the Regional Programme Officer at RBLAC
- Field visits to meet regional partners, beneficiaries and other stakeholders, other regional and international key stakeholders. The evaluation methods and parties to be consulted should be selected so that all the participation countries will be covered in the evaluation. This may require use of electronic survey and complement to the other data collection tools.
- Consultation meetings with J-CCCP project staff, project staff and senior management as appropriate.
- Surveys, interviews and questionnaires

VII. ETHICS

UNDP evaluations will be conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG “Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation” available at <http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/102>

VIII. IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS

The evaluator will report directly to the J-CCCP Project Manager assisted by the M&E Analyst. The consultant is required to travel to two representative project countries (St. Lucia and Suriname) as well as the lead country office in Barbados. The project’s National Focal Points (NFPs) will assist in setting up meetings as necessary and support travel logistics. Provision regarding office space can be made at the UNDP Barbados office (if necessary). The meeting schedule will be determined in collaboration with the Project Management Unit and the relevant UNDP country offices.

IX. DELIVERABLES

The evaluator will conduct a preliminary scoping exercise and design an inception report (containing an evaluation matrix, evaluation protocols for different stakeholders and a description of the methodology (using quantitative and qualitative data and means of collection), to be discussed with J-CCCP Project Manager and M & E Analyst, before the evaluation commences and before the field mission.

1. Inception Report - Evaluation framework/design and implementation plan

An inception report should be prepared by the evaluator prior to conducting any full evaluation exercise. The report should contain an evaluation matrix that displays for each of the evaluation criteria, the questions and sub questions 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 (all based on the evaluation criteria outlined). It should also include a proposed schedule of tasks/activities and deliverables and a table of contents for the final evaluation report

This information shall be reflected in an evaluation matrix, for example:

SAMPLE EVALUATION MATRIX						
Criteria/ Sub- criteria	(Examples of) questions to be addressed by outcome-level evaluation	What to look for	Data sources	Data collection methods	Indicators/Success Standards	Methods for Analysis

2. Presentation of the preliminary findings

The evaluator should present the preliminary findings of the evaluation. The outline of the presentation should form part of the inception report.

3. Draft evaluation report

The draft report will be circulated to all with any responsibility in oversight regarding the project as well as key government counterparts and other key stakeholders to ensure that the evaluation needs are met based on the quality criteria, as well as validate the finding, recommendations and lessons identified in the report.

4. Final Evaluation Report and Power Point Presentation

The key product (deliverable) expected from this outcome evaluation is a comprehensive analytical report that should include the following content:

- Executive summary
- Introduction (Background and approach/methodology, Evaluation Scope and Objectives, Evaluation Criteria, Evaluation Approach and Methods)
- Description of the project and its response/work
- An in-depth analysis of the situation with regard to the outcomes and development results (Presentation of findings based on evaluation criteria)
- Key findings
- Forward-looking analysis and Lessons Learned
- Conclusions and Recommendations
- Annexes: TOR, field visits, list of stakeholders interviewed, documents reviewed, etc.

The power point presentation should include the key findings, forward-looking analysis and recommendations.

The annexes to the TOR to be provided to the consultant will include:

- Project Document
- Results Framework (updated)
- List of partners and key stakeholders
- Preliminary List of key documents to consult

Please note detailed deliverable schedule below:

**J-CCCP Mid-term Evaluation Delivery
Schedule - June – August 2017**

No.	Deliverables	Sub-tasks	Number of w/days	Tentative dates	Expected result
1	Inception Report	Desk review of project documents, reports and other background documents	8	5 - 14 July	Inception report containing work plan, key findings of desk review and evaluation methodology
		Development of evaluation methodology/inception report			
		Comments on Inception Report by Management			
		Final Inception Report			
2	Presentation of the Preliminary Findings	Meetings and interviews with stakeholders, beneficiaries and Partners; (site visits)	10	26 July – 4 August	Data from major stakeholders collected;
		Debriefing (last day of the mission)			
3	Draft Evaluation Report	Data analysis and preparation of the draft report	8	16 - 25 August	Draft evaluation report with findings, lessons learned and results submitted to UNDP for review
4	Final Evaluation Report	Collecting comments on draft report from UNDP	5	4 - 8 September	Evaluation report
		Finalization of the report on the basis of comments received			
		Presentation of final evaluation report	1	14 September	Evaluation report presented
	Total working days(incl. travel)		32		

X. REQUIRED COMPETENCIES

- MSc degree in Environmental Management, Economic, Public Administration, Regional development/planning, Statistics or any other related social sciences.
- Minimum of 8 years professional experience in project management or quantitative and qualitative monitoring and related reporting.
- 7 years of proven and documented practical skill and experience in design of M+E systems, based upon Logical Framework and outcome evaluations.

- Solid foundation and experience in results based management/logical framework approach and other strategic planning approaches, evaluation methods and approaches (qualitative and quantitative)
- Practical experience in UN-related projects and knowledge of UN system and procedures preferable.
- Working experience in the Caribbean/SIDS is an asset, particularly on climate change or community-level interventions.
- Working experience of evaluating regional projects is an asset.
- Ability to transfer analytical results into simple and workable solutions.
- Excellent conceptual and analytical skills.

X. a. Selection Criteria

1. Technical Capacity and Related Qualifications		Points Obtainable (40 points max.)
1.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MSc degree in Environmental Management, Economic, Public Administration, Regional development/planning, Statistics or any other related social sciences. 	10
1.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 8 years professional experience in project management or quantitative and qualitative monitoring and related reporting 	8
1.3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 7 years of proven and documented practical skill and experience in design of M+E systems, based upon Logical Framework and outcome evaluations • Experience in results based management/logical framework approach and other strategic planning approaches, evaluation methods and approaches (qualitative and quantitative) 	10
1.4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Practical experience in UN-related projects and knowledge of UN system 	4
1.5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Working experience in the Caribbean/SIDS on climate change or community-level interventions • Working experience of evaluating regional projects is an asset 	4
1.6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrated analytical, communication and report writing skills. 	4

2. Methodology		Points Obtainable (30 points max.)
1.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To what degree does the Proposer understand the task? 	10
1.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Have the important aspects of the task been addressed in sufficient detail? 	10
1.3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is the scope of task well defined and does it correspond to the TOR? 	10

X. b. Evaluation Method

- Only those applications which are responsive and compliant will be evaluated;
- Offers will be evaluated according to the Combined Scoring method – where the technical criteria will be weighted at 70% and the financial offer will be weighted at 30%;
- The technical criteria (education, experience, language [max 40 points], proposed methodology [30 points]) will be based on maximum 70 points. Only candidates scoring 49 points or higher from the review of education, experience, language and methodology will be considered for the financial evaluation;
- Financial score (max 30 points) shall be computed as a ratio of the proposal being evaluated and the lowest priced proposal of those technically qualified;
- The financial proposal shall specify a total lump sum amount, including breakdown per deliverable. In order to assist the requesting unit in the comparison of financial proposals, the financial proposal must additionally include a breakdown of this lump sum amount (including all foreseeable expenses for this assignment);
- Applicant receiving the Highest Combined Score and has accepted UNDP's General Terms and Conditions will be awarded the contract.
- Shortlisted applicants may be interviewed

XI. PAYMENT

Payments would be made upon submission and approval of the following deliverables as highlighted in Section VI above:

1. Final Inception Report – 10%
2. Presentation of Preliminary Findings – 15%
3. Draft evaluation report and presentation of findings, conclusions and recommendations – 50%
4. Final evaluation report – 25%

XII. OTHER

Candidates will submit their **CV and P11 form** together with **financial proposals** with a per day rate. Applications must be submitted in English, and incomplete proposals will not be considered.

Documents to be included when submitting the proposals

- **Proposed Methodology for the Completion of Services.** The applicant must describe how s/he will address/deliver the demands of the assignment;
- **P11 form**, including past experience in similar projects and at least 3 professional references (please make sure to include email and phone number of each reference). and
- **CV** in alignment with the required qualifications and relevant experience.

- **Financial Proposal/ Daily Rate**

All envisaged travel costs must be included in the Offeror's financial proposal. This includes all duty travels, travels to join duty station and repatriation.

XIII. ANNEXES

1. Project Document
2. Results Framework (updated)
3. List of partners and key stakeholders
4. Preliminary List of key documents and databases to consult