

UNDP-GEF Midterm Review Terms of Reference

Standard Template 1: Formatted for attachment to [UNDP Procurement Website](#)

1. INTRODUCTION

This is the Terms of Reference (ToR) for the UNDP-GEF Midterm Review (MTR) of the full-sized project titled Promoting climate-resilient development and enhanced adaptive capacity to withstand disaster risks in Angolan's Cuvelai River Basin (PIMS #5166) implemented through the Ministry of Environment of the Government of Angola, which is to be undertaken in 2018. The project started on February 11th, 2016 and is in its second year of implementation. In line with the UNDP-GEF Guidance on MTRs, this MTR process was initiated before the submission of the second Project Implementation Report (PIR). This ToR sets out the expectations for this MTR. The MTR process must follow the guidance outlined in the document Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects (http://web.undp.org/evaluation/documents/guidance/GEF/mid-term/Guidance_Midterm%20Review%20_EN_2014.pdf).

2. PROJECT BACKGROUND INFORMATION

The project is funded by the Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF) to implement a Full-Size Project in Angola, specifically in the region of Cuvelai River Basin (province of Cunene). The project focuses on two of the national priorities presented in Angola's National Adaptation Programme of Action (NAPA) submitted to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), namely priorities 7 (Create an early warning system for flooding and storms) and 13 (Climate monitoring and data management system).

Angola, particularly the Southern region of Cunene Province, is vulnerable to increasing frequency and severity of droughts, floods and severe storms and these events impact sectors such as agriculture and livestock, water resources, rural development and food security, as well as soil erosion, built infrastructures and livelihoods. Of particular concern are the Cuvelai River Basin communities and sectors such as agriculture, livestock and water resources which are an important component of the economy in the region and form the basis of rural livelihoods in Cuvelai Basin.

The development of the Province of Cunene's capacity to adapt to climate-related hazards is therefore an urgent priority to mitigate the negative impacts of climate change and address the region's socio-economic and developmental challenges effectively. A large proportion of Cunene Province's population is ill-equipped to adapt to climate change. Climate change impacts are likely to be particularly negative on Cuvelai's rural population because of their high dependence on rain-fed agriculture and natural resource-based livelihoods. One way to support effective adaptation planning – in particular for an increase in intensity and frequency of droughts, floods and severe storms – is to improve climate monitoring and early warning systems. For Angola's region of the Province of Cunene to improve the management of these climate-related hazards it is necessary to:

- Enhance the capacity of hydro-meteorological services and networks to predict climatic events and associated risks;

- Develop a more effective and targeted delivery of climate information including flood and drought forecast early warnings;
- Build skilled human resources to guarantee long-term sustainability of hydro-meteorological services and the Flood Forecasting and Early Warning System;
- Support improved and timely responses to forecasted climate-related risks by strengthening the capacity of the Civil Protection Services; and
- Strengthen the technical capacity of the agriculture extension services to increase resilience of smallholder farmer communities in the Basin.

Barriers that need to be overcome to establish an effective FFEWS in the Province of Cunene and promote climate-resilient development to enhance adaptive capacity of Communities to withstand disaster risks include the following: i) limited knowledge and capacity to fully assess risks posed by climate change to disaster risks in the Province of Cunene; ii) lack of capacity of the extension network to enhance responsiveness and adaptability of subsistence agriculture in the Province of Cunene; and iii) poor intersectoral coordination and weak policy framework to respond to change risks.

Other obstacles in the path include obsolete and inadequate weather and climate monitoring infrastructure, which limits data collection, analysis and provision of meteorological and hydrological services and the absence of an operational Climate Change Environmental Information System in Angola to allow systematic storage and mainstreaming of digital information to support decision making in sector planning. This LDCF-financed project, implemented by the Ministry of Environment, is:

- enhancing the capacity of national and local hydro-meteorological services, civil authorities and environmental institutions to monitor extreme weather and climate change in the Province of Cunene;
- increasing the resilience of smallholder farmer communities in the Basin to climate-induced risks and variabilities via access to locally-appropriate climate data and germplasm resources;
- strengthening local institutional capacities for coordinated, climate-resilient planning; and
- improving the capacity for effective community-based climate change adaptation (including traditional knowledge practices) at local level.

The project is articulated around three components:

- Component 1: Transfer of appropriate technologies and related capacity building for climate and environmental monitoring infrastructure;

- Component 2: Enhanced human and institutional capacity for increased sustainable rural livelihoods among those communities' areas most prone to extreme weather events (flooding and drought) in the region;
- Component 3: Increased understanding of climate change adaptation and practices in climate-resilient development planning at the local community and government levels.

The Project duration is 4 years starting on 11 February 2016 and ending on 10 January 2020 with an overall budget of US\$8,200,000 and co-financed by UNDP (\$517,000 (cash) + \$400,000 (in-kind); MINAMB (\$2,000,000); MINEA – PIP (\$39,037,712); MINEA-NDHR (\$1,000,000); INAMET (\$968,292); USAID (\$1,800,000); DWA (\$950,000).

The project is nationally implemented (NIM) by the Ministry of Environment (MINAMB) with UNDP Country Office support, in line with the Standard Basic Assistance Agreement (SBAA of 18 February 1977) and the UNDP Country Programme Action Plan (CPAP 2009-2013 of 14 May 2009) signed between the UNDP and the Government of Angola. The project is implemented in close collaboration with the Government of the Cunene Province, the Ministry of Energy and Water through the National Institute of Water Resources (INRH) and the Cabinet for the Administration of the Cunene River Basin (GABHIC), the Ministry of Telecommunications and Information Technologies (MTTI) through the National Institute for Meteorologist (INAMET), the Ministry of Interior through the Civil Protection (SPCB), the Ministry of Agriculture (MINAGRI) through the Agrarian Development Institute (IDA), the Institute of Agronomic Research (IIA), The University Agostinho Neto through the Center for Phytogenetic Resources (CRF), and the Center for Tropical Ecology and Climate Change (CETAC).

3. OBJECTIVES OF THE MTR

The MTR will assess progress towards the achievement of the project objectives and outcomes as specified in the Project Document, and assess early signs of project success or failure with the goal of identifying the necessary changes to be made in order to set the project on-track to achieve its intended results. The MTR will also review the project's strategy, its risks to sustainability.

4. MTR APPROACH & METHODOLOGY

The MTR must provide evidence based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The MTR consultant will review all relevant sources of information including documents prepared during the preparation phase (i.e. PIF, UNDP Initiation Plan, UNDP Environmental & Social Safeguard Policy, the Project Document, project reports including Annual Project Review/PIRs, project budget revisions, lesson learned reports, national strategic and legal documents, and any other materials that the team considers useful for this evidence-based review). The MTR consultant will review the baseline GEF focal area Tracking Tool submitted to the GEF at CEO endorsement, and the midterm GEF focal area Tracking Tool that must be completed before the MTR field mission begins.

The MTR consultant is expected to follow a collaborative and participatory approach¹ ensuring close engagement with the Project Team, government counterparts (the GEF Operational Focal Point), the UNDP Country Office(s), UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Advisers, and other key stakeholders.

Engagement of stakeholders is vital to a successful MTR.² Stakeholder involvement should include interviews with stakeholders who have project responsibilities, including but not limited to MINAMB; INRH; GABHIC; INAMET; SPCB; IDA; IIA; CRF; CETAC; executing agencies, senior officials and task team/ component leaders, key experts and consultants in the subject area, Project Board, project stakeholders, academia, local government and CSOs, etc. Additionally, the MTR consultant is expected to conduct field missions to Ondjiva town (Cunene Province, Angola), including project sites (i.e. Cuvelai, Cunhama and Namacunde municipalities).

The final MTR report should describe the full MTR approach taken and the rationale for the approach making explicit the underlying assumptions, challenges, strengths and weaknesses about the methods and approach of the review.

5. DETAILED SCOPE OF THE MTR

The MTR team will assess the following four categories of project progress. See the Guidance for Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects for extended descriptions.

i. Project Strategy

Project design:

- Review the problem addressed by the project and the underlying assumptions. Review the effect of any incorrect assumptions or changes to the context to achieving the project results as outlined in the Project Document.
- Review the relevance of the project strategy and assess whether it provides the most effective route towards expected/intended results. Were lessons from other relevant projects properly incorporated into the project design?
- Review how the project addresses country priorities. Review country ownership. Was the project concept in line with the national sector development priorities and plans of the country (or of participating countries in the case of multi-country projects)?
- Review decision-making processes: were perspectives of those who would be affected by project decisions, those who could affect the outcomes, and those who could contribute information or other resources to the process, taken into account during project design processes?
- Review the extent to which relevant gender issues were raised in the project design. See Annex 9 of Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects for further guidelines.
- If there are major areas of concern, recommend areas for improvement.

¹ For ideas on innovative and participatory Monitoring and Evaluation strategies and techniques, see [UNDP Discussion Paper: Innovations in Monitoring & Evaluating Results](#), 05 Nov 2013.

² For more stakeholder engagement in the M&E process, see the [UNDP Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results](#), Chapter 3, pg. 93.

Results Framework/Logframe:

- Undertake a critical analysis of the project’s logframe indicators and targets, assess how “SMART” the midterm and end-of-project targets are (Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Relevant, Time-bound), and suggest specific amendments/revisions to the targets and indicators as necessary.
- Are the project’s objectives and outcomes or components clear, practical, and feasible within its time frame?
- Examine if progress so far has led to, or could in the future catalyse beneficial development effects (i.e. income generation, gender equality and women’s empowerment, improved governance etc...) that should be included in the project results framework and monitored on an annual basis.
- Ensure broader development and gender aspects of the project are being monitored effectively. Develop and recommend SMART ‘development’ indicators, including sex-disaggregated indicators and indicators that capture development benefits.

ii. Progress Towards Results

Progress Towards Outcomes Analysis:

- Review the logframe indicators against progress made towards the end-of-project targets using the Progress Towards Results Matrix and following the Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects; colour code progress in a “traffic light system” based on the level of progress achieved; assign a rating on progress for each outcome; make recommendations from the areas marked as “Not on target to be achieved” (red).

Table. Progress Towards Results Matrix (Achievement of outcomes against End-of-project Targets)

Project Strategy	Indicator ³	Baseline Level ⁴	Level in 1 st PIR (self-reported)	Midterm Target ⁵	End-of-project Target	Midterm Level & Assessment ⁶	Achievement Rating ⁷	Justification for Rating
------------------	------------------------	-----------------------------	--	-----------------------------	-----------------------	---	---------------------------------	--------------------------

³ Populate with data from the Logframe and scorecards

⁴ Populate with data from the Project Document

⁵ If available

⁶ Colour code this column only

⁷ Use the 6 point Progress Towards Results Rating Scale: HS, S, MS, MU, U, HU

<p>Project Objective: To reduce the climate-related vulnerabilities facing the inhabitants of Angola's Cuvelai River Basin through targeted investments and capacity building.</p>	<p>Indicator: Percentage change in vulnerability of local community to climate risks.</p>	<p>The vulnerability of the site is high. The baseline will be determined at project onset during the inception phase.</p>	<p>Off track</p>		<p>At mid-term 35% increase of VRA score; at end-of-project 70% of VRA score.</p>			
<p>Outcome 1: Enhanced capacity of national and local hydro-meteorological services, civil authorities and environmental institutions to monitor extreme weather and climate change in the Cuvelai Basin.</p>	<p>1.1A Flood Forecasting & EWS that is useful to communities developed and forecasts disseminated to target communities in Province of Cunene.</p>	<p>1.1 Currently no Flood Forecasting & EWS established in Province of Cunene.</p>	<p>On track</p>		<p>1.1 By the end of the project a Flood Forecasting & EWS is developed and forecasts are being disseminated to target communities in Province of Cunene.</p>			

Outcome 2: Increased resilience of smallholder farmer communities in the Basin to climate-induced risks and variabilities .	2.1 Percentage change in gender disaggregated household income in the 7 targeted comunas as a result of project intervention via perception based survey (VRA)	2.1 N/A at present – project will undertake a gender disaggregated VRA at project onset.	Off track		2.1 At mid-term 25% gender disaggregated increase of VRA score; By the end of the project 50% gender disaggregated increase of VRA score			
	2.2. No. of household in targeted comunas engaged in climate resilient farming methods and livelihoods Etc.	2.2 Few households have access to resilient livelihood assets and methods (Score=2)	Off track		2.2 Score improved to 4: By the end of the project, at least 50% of targeted households have engaged in climate resilient farming methods and livelihoods introduced/strengthened in the project.			

Outcome 3: Local institutional capacities for coordinated, climate-resilient planning strengthened & Capacity for effective community-based climate change adaptation (including traditional knowledge practices) improved at local level	3.1 CC-Environmental Information System of Angola (CC-ENISA) is established, risk assessed and vulnerability maps developed for the Cunene Province and the Cuvelai in particular.	3.1 Climate Change risks have not been modelled Angola and no vulnerability maps have been developed so far for Cunene Province and the Cuvelai in particular.	Off track		3.1 By the end of the project CC-ENISA has been running Risk modelling and Vulnerability maps for the Cunene Province and the Cuvelai in particular have been developed.			
	3.2 Number of National or Provincial relevant plans and/or policy documents that integrate climate change flood and drought risks	3.2 Currently, no plans and policies that explicitly integrate climate change flood and drought risks are in place.	Off track		3.2 By the end of the project CC flood and drought risk/vulnerability are integrated into at least one National and one Provincial disaster preparedness and management Plans.			

Indicator Assessment Key

Green= Achieved	Yellow= On target to be achieved	Red= Not on target to be achieved
-----------------	----------------------------------	-----------------------------------

In addition to the progress towards outcomes analysis:

- Compare and analyse the GEF Tracking Tool at the Baseline with the one completed right before the Midterm Review.

- Identify remaining barriers to achieving the project objective in the remainder of the project.
- By reviewing the aspects of the project that have already been successful, identify ways in which the project can further expand these benefits.

iii. Project Implementation and Adaptive Management

Management Arrangements:

- Review overall effectiveness of project management as outlined in the Project Document. Have changes been made and are they effective? Are responsibilities and reporting lines clear? Is decision-making transparent and undertaken in a timely manner? Recommend areas for improvement.
- Review the quality of execution of the Executing Agency/Implementing Partner(s) and recommend areas for improvement.
- Review the quality of support provided by the GEF Partner Agency (UNDP) and recommend areas for improvement.

Work Planning:

- Review any delays in project start-up and implementation, identify the causes and examine if they have been resolved.
- Are work-planning processes results-based? If not, suggest ways to re-orientate work planning to focus on results?
- Examine the use of the project's results framework/ logframe as a management tool and review any changes made to it since project start.

Finance and co-finance:

- Consider the financial management of the project, with specific reference to the cost-effectiveness of interventions.
- Review the changes to fund allocations as a result of budget revisions and assess the appropriateness and relevance of such revisions.
- Does the project have the appropriate financial controls, including reporting and planning, that allow management to make informed decisions regarding the budget and allow for timely flow of funds?
- Informed by the co-financing monitoring table to be filled out, provide commentary on co-financing: is co-financing being used strategically to help the objectives of the project? Is the Project Team meeting with all co-financing partners regularly in order to align financing priorities and annual work plans?

Project-level Monitoring and Evaluation Systems:

- Review the monitoring tools currently being used: Do they provide the necessary information? Do they involve key partners? Are they aligned or mainstreamed with national systems and UNDP requirements? Do they use existing information? Are they efficient? Are they cost-effective? Are additional tools required? How could they be made more participatory and inclusive?

- Examine the financial management of the project monitoring and evaluation budget. Are sufficient resources being allocated to monitoring and evaluation? Are these resources being allocated effectively?

Stakeholder Engagement:

- Project management: Has the project developed and leveraged the necessary and appropriate partnerships with direct and tangential stakeholders?
- Participation and country-driven processes: Do local and national government stakeholders support the objectives of the project? Do they continue to have an active role in project decision-making that supports efficient and effective project implementation?
- Participation and public awareness: To what extent has stakeholder involvement and public awareness contributed to the progress towards achievement of project objectives?

Reporting:

- Assess how adaptive management changes have been reported by the project management and shared with the Project Board.
- Assess how well the Project Team and partners undertake and fulfil UNDP/GEF reporting requirements (i.e. how have they addressed poorly-rated PIRs, if applicable?)
- Assess how lessons derived from the adaptive management process have been documented, shared with key partners and internalized by partners.

Communications:

- Review internal project communication with stakeholders: Is communication regular and effective? Are there key stakeholders left out of communication? Are there feedback mechanisms when communication is received? Does this communication with stakeholders contribute to their awareness of project outcomes and activities and investment in the sustainability of project results?
- Review external project communication: Are proper means of communication established or being established to express the project progress and intended impact to the public (is there a web presence, for example? Or did the project implement appropriate outreach and public awareness campaigns?)
- For reporting purposes, write one half-page paragraph that summarizes the project's progress towards results in terms of contribution to sustainable development benefits, as well as global environmental benefits.

iv. Sustainability

- Validate whether the risks identified in the Project Document, Annual Project Review/PIRs and the ATLAS Risk Management Module are the most important and whether the risk ratings applied are appropriate and up to date. If not, explain why.
- In addition, assess the following risks to sustainability:

Financial risks to sustainability:

- What is the likelihood of financial and economic resources not being available once the GEF assistance ends (consider potential resources can be from multiple sources, such as

the public and private sectors, income generating activities, and other funding that will be adequate financial resources for sustaining project's outcomes)?

Socio-economic risks to sustainability:

- Are there any social or political risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project outcomes? What is the risk that the level of stakeholder ownership (including ownership by governments and other key stakeholders) will be insufficient to allow for the project outcomes/benefits to be sustained? Do the various key stakeholders see that it is in their interest that the project benefits continue to flow? Is there sufficient public / stakeholder awareness in support of the long term objectives of the project? Are lessons learned being documented by the Project Team on a continual basis and shared/ transferred to appropriate parties who could learn from the project and potentially replicate and/or scale it in the future?

Institutional Framework and Governance risks to sustainability:

- Do the legal frameworks, policies, governance structures and processes pose risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project benefits? While assessing this parameter, also consider if the required systems/ mechanisms for accountability, transparency, and technical knowledge transfer are in place.

Environmental risks to sustainability:

- Are there any environmental risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project outcomes?

Conclusions & Recommendations

The MTR consultant will include a section of the report setting out the MTR's evidence-based conclusions, in light of the findings.⁸

Recommendations should be succinct suggestions for critical intervention that are specific, measurable, achievable, and relevant. A recommendation table should be put in the report's executive summary. See the Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects for guidance on a recommendation table.

The consultant should provide specific findings, lessons learned and recommendations for accelerating the implementation of the project and for ensuring that project deliverables can be achieved by the end of the project.

The MTR team should make no more than 15 recommendations total.

Ratings

The MTR team will include its ratings of the project's results and brief descriptions of the associated achievements in a MTR Ratings & Achievement Summary Table in the Executive Summary of the MTR report. See Annex E for ratings scales. No rating on Project Strategy and no overall project rating is required.

⁸ Alternatively, MTR conclusions may be integrated into the body of the report.

Table. MTR Ratings & Achievement Summary Table for Promoting climate-resilient development and enhanced adaptive capacity to withstand disaster risks in Angolan’s Cuvelai River Basin

Measure	MTR Rating	Achievement Description
Project Strategy	N/A	
Progress Towards Results	Objective Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale)	
	Outcome 1 Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale)	
	Outcome 2 Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale)	
	Outcome 3 Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale)	
	Etc.	
Project Implementation & Adaptive Management	(rate 6 pt. scale)	
Sustainability	(rate 4 pt. scale)	

6. TIMEFRAME

The total duration of the MTR will be approximately 30 days over a time period of 12 of weeks starting August, and shall not exceed five months from when the consultant(s) are hired. The tentative MTR timeframe is as follows:

TIMEFRAME	ACTIVITY
8 August 2018	Prep the MTR Team (handover of Project Documents)
9 – 11 August 2018 (3 days)	Document review and preparing MTR Inception Report
15 August 2018 (1 day)	Finalization and Validation of MTR Inception Report- latest start of MTR mission
29 August – 10 September 2018 (12 days of which 5 days in Luanda and 7 days in Cunene province)	MTR mission: stakeholder meetings, interviews, field visits
10 September 2018	Mission wrap-up meeting & presentation of initial findings-earliest end of MTR mission
12 - 17 September (5 days)	Preparing draft report
30 September - 01 October 2018 (2 days)	Incorporating audit trail from feedback on draft report/Finalization of MTR report
2 October – 16 October 2018	Preparation & Issue of Management Response
31 October 2018	Expected date of full MTR completion

Options for site visits should be provided in the Inception Report.

7. MIDTERM REVIEW DELIVERABLES

#	Deliverable	Description	Timing	Responsibilities
1	MTR Inception Report	MTR team clarifies objectives and methods of Midterm Review	No later than 2 weeks before the MTR mission: 15 August 2018	MTR team submits to the Commissioning Unit project management and RBM Unit
2	Presentation	Initial Findings	End of MTR mission: 10 September 2018	MTR Team presents to project management the Commissioning Unit and RBM Unit
3	Draft Final Report	Full report (using guidelines on content outlined in Annex B) with annexes	Within 3 weeks of the MTR mission: 01 October 2018	Sent to the Commissioning Unit, RBM Unit, reviewed by RTA, Project Coordinating Unit, GEF OFP
4	Final Report*	Revised report with audit trail detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final MTR report	Within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft: 31 October 2018	Sent to the Commissioning Unit

*The final MTR report must be in English. If applicable, the Commissioning Unit may choose to arrange for a translation of the report into a language more widely shared by national stakeholders.

8. MTR ARRANGEMENTS

The principal responsibility for managing this MTR resides with the Commissioning Unit. The Commissioning Unit for this project's MTR is UNDP Angola.

The commissioning unit will contract the consultants and ensure the timely provision of per diems and travel arrangements within the country for the MTR consultant. The Project Team will be responsible for liaising with the MTR consultant to provide all relevant documents, set up stakeholder interviews, and arrange field visits.

9. TEAM COMPOSITION

An independent consultant will conduct the MTR - (with experience and exposure to projects and evaluations in other regions globally). The consultant cannot have participated in the

project preparation, formulation, and/or implementation (including the writing of the Project Document) and should not have a conflict of interest with project's related activities.

The selection of consultant will be aimed at maximizing the overall qualities in the following areas:

- Criteria A: Work experience in climate change adaptation, disaster risk reduction, capacity development or environment, economics and/or development related field for at least 7 years – max points: 10;
- Criteria B: Recent experience with result-based management evaluation methodologies – max points: 10;
- Criteria C: Experience working with the GEF or GEF-evaluations and experience applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios – max points: 10;
- Criteria D: A Master's degree in environmental sciences, environmental policies, social sciences, economics, business administration, international relations, or other closely related field – max points: 10;
- Criteria E: Fluency in English and Portuguese – max points: 10;
- Criteria F: Experience in southern-central Africa – max points: 10;
- Criteria G: Experience in gender sensitive evaluation and climate change analysis – max points: 10;

10. PAYMENT MODALITIES AND SPECIFICATIONS

20 % of payment upon approval of the final MTR Inception Report and approval of work plan
30% upon submission of the draft MTR report
50% upon finalization of the MTR report

Or, as otherwise agreed between the Commissioning Unit and the MTR team.

11. APPLICATION PROCESS⁹

Recommended Presentation of Proposal:

- a) **Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability** using the [template](#)¹⁰ provided by UNDP;
- b) **CV and a Personal History Form** ([P11 form](#)¹¹);
- c) **Brief description of approach to work/technical proposal** of why the individual considers him/herself as the most suitable for the assignment, and a proposed methodology on how they will approach and complete the assignment; (max 1 page)

⁹ Engagement of the consultants should be done in line with guidelines for hiring consultants in the POPP: <https://info.undp.org/global/popp/Pages/default.aspx>

¹⁰

<https://intranet.undp.org/unit/bom/pso/Support%20documents%20on%20IC%20Guidelines/Template%20for%20Confirmation%20of%20Interest%20and%20Submission%20of%20Financial%20Proposal.docx>

¹¹ http://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/corporate/Careers/P11_Personal_history_form.doc

- d) **Financial Proposal** that indicates the all-inclusive fixed total contract price and all other travel related costs (such as flight ticket, per diem, etc), supported by a breakdown of costs, as per template attached to the Letter of Confirmation of Interest template. If an applicant is employed by an organization/company/institution, and he/she expects his/her employer to charge a management fee in the process of releasing him/her to UNDP under Reimbursable Loan Agreement (RLA), the applicant must indicate at this point, and ensure that all such costs are duly incorporated in the financial proposal submitted to UNDP.

All application materials should be submitted to the address Edifício Rosalinda, Luanda, Angola in a sealed envelope indicating the following reference “MTR Consultant for Promoting climate-resilient development and enhanced adaptive capacity to withstand disaster risks in Angolan’s Cuvelai River Basin Midterm Review” or by email at the following address ONLY: Aguiar Cuiundana aguiar.cuiundana@undp.org before the announced deadline. Incomplete applications will be excluded from further consideration.

Criteria for Evaluation of Proposal: Only those applications which are responsive and compliant will be evaluated. Offers will be evaluated according to the Combined Scoring method – where the educational background and experience on similar assignments will be weighted at 70% and the price proposal will weigh as 30% of the total scoring. The applicant receiving the Highest Combined Score that has also accepted UNDP’s General Terms and Conditions will be awarded the contract.

ToR ANNEX A: List of Documents to be reviewed by the MTR consultant

1. PIF
2. UNDP Initiation Plan
3. UNDP Project Document
4. UNDP Environmental and Social Screening results
5. Project Inception Report
6. All Project Implementation Reports (PIR’s)
7. Quarterly progress reports and work plans of the various implementation task teams
8. Audit reports
9. Finalized GEF focal area Tracking Tools at CEO endorsement and midterm
10. Oversight mission reports
11. All monitoring reports prepared by the project
12. Financial and Administration guidelines used by Project Team

The following documents will also be available:

13. Project operational guidelines, manuals and systems
14. UNDP country/countries programme document(s)
15. Minutes of the Promoting climate-resilient development and enhanced adaptive capacity to withstand disaster risks in Angolan’s Cuvelai River Basin Board Meetings and other meetings (i.e. Project Appraisal Committee meetings)
16. Project site location maps
17. Angola National Development Plan- 2013-2017
18. PDNA
19. UNDP environment outcome evaluation report

ToR ANNEX B: Guidelines on Contents for the Midterm Review Report¹²

- i.** Basic Report Information (for opening page or title page)
 - Title of UNDP supported GEF financed project
 - UNDP PIMS# and GEF project ID#
 - MTR time frame and date of MTR report
 - Region and countries included in the project
 - GEF Operational Focal Area/Strategic Program
 - Executing Agency/Implementing Partner and other project partners
 - MTR team members
 - Acknowledgements
- ii.** Table of Contents
- iii.** Acronyms and Abbreviations
- 1.** Executive Summary (3-5 pages)
 - Project Information Table
 - Project Description (brief)
 - Project Progress Summary (between 200-500 words)
 - MTR Ratings & Achievement Summary Table
 - Concise summary of conclusions
 - Recommendation Summary Table
- 2.** Introduction (2-3 pages)
 - Purpose of the MTR and objectives
 - Scope & Methodology: principles of design and execution of the MTR, MTR approach and data collection methods, limitations to the MTR
 - Structure of the MTR report
- 3.** Project Description and Background Context (3-5 pages)
 - Development context: environmental, socio-economic, institutional, and policy factors relevant to the project objective and scope
 - Problems that the project sought to address: threats and barriers targeted
 - Project Description and Strategy: objective, outcomes and expected results, description of field sites (if any)
 - Project Implementation Arrangements: short description of the Project Board, key implementing partner arrangements, etc.
 - Project timing and milestones
 - Main stakeholders: summary list
- 4.** Findings (12-14 pages)
 - 4.1** Project Strategy
 - Project Design
 - Results Framework/Logframe

¹² The Report length should not exceed 40 pages in total (not including annexes).

- 4.2 Progress Towards Results
 - Progress towards outcomes analysis
 - Remaining barriers to achieving the project objective
- 4.3 Project Implementation and Adaptive Management
 - Management Arrangements
 - Work planning
 - Finance and co-finance
 - Project-level monitoring and evaluation systems
 - Stakeholder engagement
 - Reporting
 - Communications
- 4.4 Sustainability
 - Financial risks to sustainability
 - Socio-economic to sustainability
 - Institutional framework and governance risks to sustainability
 - Environmental risks to sustainability
- 5. Conclusions and Recommendations (4-6 pages)
 - 5.1 Conclusions
 - Comprehensive and balanced statements (that are evidence-based and connected to the MTR's findings and lessons learned) which highlight the strengths, weaknesses and results of the project
 -
 - 5.2 Recommendations
 - Corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project
 - Actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the project
 - Proposals for future directions underlining main objectives
- 6. Annexes
 - MTR ToR (excluding ToR annexes)
 - MTR evaluative matrix (evaluation criteria with key questions, indicators, sources of data, and methodology)
 - Example Questionnaire or Interview Guide used for data collection
 - Ratings Scales
 - MTR mission itinerary
 - List of persons interviewed
 - List of documents reviewed
 - Co-financing table (if not previously included in the body of the report)
 - Signed UNEG Code of Conduct form
 - Signed MTR final report clearance form
 - Annexed in a separate file: Audit trail from received comments on draft MTR report
 - Annexed in a separate file: Relevant midterm tracking tools (METT, FSC, Capacity scorecard, etc.)

ToR ANNEX C: Midterm Review Evaluative Matrix Template

Evaluative Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
Project Strategy: To what extent is the project strategy relevant to country priorities, country ownership, and the best route towards expected results?			
(include evaluative question(s))	(i.e. relationships established, level of coherence between project design and implementation approach, specific activities conducted, quality of risk mitigation strategies, etc.)	(i.e. project documents, national policies or strategies, websites, project staff, project partners, data collected throughout the MTR mission, etc.)	(i.e. document analysis, data analysis, interviews with project staff, interviews with stakeholders, etc.)
Progress Towards Results: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved thus far?			
Project Implementation and Adaptive Management: Has the project been implemented efficiently, cost-effectively, and been able to adapt to any changing conditions thus far? To what extent are project-level monitoring and evaluation systems, reporting, and project communications supporting the project's implementation?			
Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, socio-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?			

ToR ANNEX D: UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluators/Midterm Review Consultants¹³

Evaluators/Consultants:

1. Must present information that is complete and fair in its assessment of strengths and weaknesses so that decisions or actions taken are well founded.
2. 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.
3. 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.
4. Sometimes uncover evidence of wrongdoing while conducting evaluations. 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.
5. 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.
6. 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.
7. Should reflect sound accounting procedures and be prudent in using the resources of the evaluation.

MTR Consultant Agreement Form

Agreement to abide by the Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN System:

Name of Consultant: _____

Name of Consultancy Organization (where relevant): _____

I confirm that I have received and understood and will abide by the United Nations Code of Conduct for Evaluation.

Signed at _____ (Place) on _____ (Date)

Signature: _____

¹³ www.undp.org/uneqcodeofconduct

ToR ANNEX E: MTR Ratings

Ratings for Progress Towards Results: (one rating for each outcome and for the objective)		
6	Highly Satisfactory (HS)	The objective/outcome is expected to achieve or exceed all its end-of-project targets, without major shortcomings. The progress towards the objective/outcome can be presented as “good practice”.
5	Satisfactory (S)	The objective/outcome is expected to achieve most of its end-of-project targets, with only minor shortcomings.
4	Moderately Satisfactory (MS)	The objective/outcome is expected to achieve most of its end-of-project targets but with significant shortcomings.
3	Moderately Unsatisfactory (HU)	The objective/outcome is expected to achieve its end-of-project targets with major shortcomings.
2	Unsatisfactory (U)	The objective/outcome is expected not to achieve most of its end-of-project targets.
1	Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)	The objective/outcome has failed to achieve its midterm targets, and is not expected to achieve any of its end-of-project targets.

Ratings for Project Implementation & Adaptive Management: (one overall rating)		
6	Highly Satisfactory (HS)	Implementation of all seven components – management arrangements, work planning, finance and co-finance, project-level monitoring and evaluation systems, stakeholder engagement, reporting, and communications – is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management. The project can be presented as “good practice”.
5	Satisfactory (S)	Implementation of most of the seven components is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management except for only few that are subject to remedial action.
4	Moderately Satisfactory (MS)	Implementation of some of the seven components is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management, with some components requiring remedial action.
3	Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)	Implementation of some of the seven components is not leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive, with most components requiring remedial action.
2	Unsatisfactory (U)	Implementation of most of the seven components is not leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management.
1	Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)	Implementation of none of the seven components is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management.

Ratings for Sustainability: (one overall rating)

4	Likely (L)	Negligible risks to sustainability, with key outcomes on track to be achieved by the project's closure and expected to continue into the foreseeable future
3	Moderately Likely (ML)	Moderate risks, but expectations that at least some outcomes will be sustained due to the progress towards results on outcomes at the Midterm Review
2	Moderately Unlikely (MU)	Significant risk that key outcomes will not carry on after project closure, although some outputs and activities should carry on
1	Unlikely (U)	Severe risks that project outcomes as well as key outputs will not be sustained

ToR ANNEX F: MTR Report Clearance Form

(to be completed by the Commissioning Unit and UNDP-GEF RTA and included in the final

Midterm Review Report Reviewed and Cleared By:	
Commissioning Unit	
Name: _____	
Signature: _____	Date: _____
UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Advisor	
Name: _____	
Signature: _____	Date: _____

document)

UNDP-GEF Midterm Review

Terms of Reference

Standard Template 2: Formatted information to be entered in [UNDP Jobs website](#)¹⁴

BASIC CONTRACT INFORMATION

Location: Republic of Angola

Application Deadline: before the announced deadline

Category: Energy and Environment

Type of Contract: Individual Contract

Assignment Type: International Consultant

Languages Required: English and Portuguese

Starting Date: 8 August 2018

Duration of Initial Contract: August 2018

Expected Duration of Assignment: 12 of weeks

BACKGROUND

A. Project Title:

Promoting climate-resilient development and enhanced adaptive capacity to withstand disaster risks in Angolan’s Cuvelai River Basin

B. Project Description

This is the Terms of Reference for the UNDP-GEF Midterm Review (MTR) of the full-sized project titled “Promoting climate-resilient development and enhanced adaptive capacity to withstand disaster risks in Angolan’s Cuvelai River Basin” (PIMS 5166) implemented through the Ministry of Environment of the Government of Angola, which is to be undertaken in 2018. The project started on the February 11th, 2016 and is in its second year of implementation. In line with the UNDP-GEF Guidance on MTRs, this MTR process was initiated before the submission of the second Project Implementation Report (PIR). The MTR process must follow the guidance outlined in the document Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects (see Annex).

The project was designed to:

- Reduce the climate-related vulnerabilities facing the inhabitants of Angola’s Cuvelai River Basin through targeted investments and capacity building. The intervention is articulated around three components:
 - Component 1: Transfer of appropriate technologies and related capacity building for climate and environmental monitoring infrastructure;

¹⁴ <https://jobs.undp.org/>

- Component 2: Enhanced human and institutional capacity for increased sustainable rural livelihoods among those communities' areas most prone to extreme weather events (flooding and drought) in the region;
- Component 3: Increased understanding of climate change adaptation and practices in climate-resilient development planning at the local community and government levels.

DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

C. Scope of Work and Key Tasks

The MTR consultant will consist of one independent consultant that will conduct the MTR (with experience and exposure to projects and evaluations in other regions globally).

The MTR consultant will first conduct a document review of project documents (i.e. PIF, Project Document, Project Inception Report, PIRs, Finalized GEF focal area Tracking Tools, Project Appraisal Committee meeting minutes, Financial and Administration guidelines used by Project Team, project operational guidelines, manuals and systems, etc.) provided by the Project Team and Commissioning Unit. Then s/he will participate in a MTR inception workshop to clarify their understanding of the objectives and methods of the MTR, producing the MTR inception report thereafter. The MTR mission will then consist of interviews and site visits to Luanda and project sites (i.e. Cuvelai, Cunhama and Namacunde municipalities).

The MTR consultant will assess the following four categories of project progress and produce a draft and final MTR report. See the Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects (http://web.undp.org/evaluation/documents/guidance/GEF/mid-term/Guidance_Midterm%20Review%20EN_2014.pdf).) for requirements on ratings. No overall rating is required.

1. Project Strategy

Project Design:

- Review the problem addressed by the project and the underlying assumptions. Review the effect of any incorrect assumptions or changes to the context to achieving the project results as outlined in the Project Document.
- Review the relevanced of the project strategy and assess whether it provides the most effective route towards expected/intended results.
- Review how the project addresses country priorities
- Review decision-making processes

Results Framework/Logframe:

- Undertake a critical analysis of the project's logframe indicators and targets, assess how "SMART" the midterm and end-of-project targets are (Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Relevant, Time-bound), and suggest specific amendments/revisions to the targets and indicators as necessary.

- Examine if progress so far has led to, or could in the future catalyse beneficial development effects (i.e. income generation, gender equality and women’s empowerment, improved governance etc...) that should be included in the project results framework and monitored on an annual basis.

2. Progress Towards Results

- Review the logframe indicators against progress made towards the end-of-project targets; populate the Progress Towards Results Matrix, as described in the Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects; colour code progress in a “traffic light system” based on the level of progress achieved; assign a rating on progress for the project objective and each outcome; make recommendations from the areas marked as “not on target to be achieved” (red).
- Compare and analyse the GEF Tracking Tool at the Baseline with the one completed right before the Midterm Review.
- Identify remaining barriers to achieving the project objective.
- By reviewing the aspects of the project that have already been successful, identify ways in which the project can further expand these benefits.

3. Project Implementation and Adaptive Management

Using the Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects; assess the following categories of project progress:

- Management Arrangements
- Work Planning
- Finance and co-finance
- Project-level monitoring and evaluation systems
- Stakeholder Engagement
- Reporting
- Communications

4. Sustainability

Assess overall risks to sustainability factors of the project in terms of the following four categories:

- Financial risks to sustainability
- Socio-economic risks to sustainability
- Institutional framework and governance risks to sustainability
- Environmental risks to sustainability

The MTR consultant will include a section in the MTR report setting out the MTR’s evidence-based **conclusions**, in light of the findings.

Additionally, the MTR consultant is expected to make **recommendations** to the Project Team. Recommendations should be succinct suggestions for critical intervention that are specific, measurable, achievable, and relevant. A recommendation table should be put in the report’s executive summary. The MTR consultant should make no more than 15 recommendations total.

D. Expected Outputs and Deliverables

The MTR consultant shall prepare and submit:

- MTR Inception Report: MTR consultant clarifies objectives and methods of the Midterm Review no later than 2 weeks before the MTR mission. To be sent to the Commissioning Unit and project management. Approximate due date: 15 August 2018
- Presentation: Initial Findings presented to project management and the Commissioning Unit at the end of the MTR mission. Approximate due date: 10 September 2018
- Draft Final Report: Full report with annexes within 3 weeks of the MTR mission. Approximate due date: 01 October 2018
- Final Report*: Revised report with annexed audit trail detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final MTR report. To be sent to the Commissioning Unit within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft. Approximate due date: 31 October 2018

*The final MTR report must be in English. If applicable, the Commissioning Unit may choose to arrange for a translation of the report into a language more widely shared by national stakeholders.

E. Institutional Arrangement

The principal responsibility for managing this MTR resides with the Commissioning Unit. The Commissioning Unit for this project's MTR is UNDP Angola.

The Commissioning Unit will contract the consultant and ensure the timely provision of per diems and travel arrangements within the country for the MTR consultant. The Project Team will be responsible for liaising with the MTR team to provide all relevant documents, set up stakeholder interviews, and arrange field visits.

F. Duration of the Work

The total duration of the MTR will be approximately 30 days over a period of 12 weeks starting August, and shall not exceed five months from when the consultant(s) are hired. The tentative MTR timeframe is as follows:

- 8 August 2018: Prep the MTR Team (handover of project documents)
- 9 – 10 August 2018 (3 days): Document review and preparing MTR Inception Report
- 15 August 2018 (1 day): Finalization and Validation of MTR Inception Report- latest start of MTR mission
- 29 August – 10 September 2018 (12 days of which 5 days in Luanda and 7 days in Cunene province): MTR mission: stakeholder meetings, interviews, field visits
- 10 September 2018: Mission wrap-up meeting & presentation of initial findings- earliest end of MTR mission
- 12 – 17 September 2018 (5 days): Preparing draft report
- 30 September – 01 October (2 days): Incorporating audit trail on draft report/Finalization of MTR report

- 2 October – 16 October 2018: Preparation & Issue of Management Response
- 31 October 2018: Expected date of full MTR completion

The date start of contract is the signature date.

G. Duty Station

Travel:

- International travel will be required to Angola during the MTR mission;
- The Basic Security in the Field II and Advanced Security in the Field courses must be successfully completed prior to commencement of travel;
- Individual Consultants are responsible for ensuring they have vaccinations/inoculations when travelling to certain countries, as designated by the UN Medical Director.
- Consultants are required to comply with the UN security directives set forth under <https://dss.un.org/dssweb/>
- All related travel expenses will be covered and will be reimbursed as per UNDP rules and regulations upon submission of an F-10 claim form and supporting documents.

REQUIRED SKILLS AND EXPERIENCE

H. Evaluation of Applicants

Individual consultants will be evaluated based on a cumulative analysis taking into consideration the combination of the applicants' qualifications and financial proposal. The award of the contract should be made to the individual consultant whose offer has been evaluated and determined as: 1) Responsive/ compliant/acceptable; 2) Having received the highest score out of a pre-determined set of weighted technical (P11 desk reviews) and financial criteria specific to the solicitation.

Only the highest ranked candidates who would be found qualified for the job will be considered for the Financial Evaluation.

Technical Criteria - 70% of total evaluation – max. 70 points:

- Criteria A: Work experience in climate change adaptation, disaster risk reduction, capacity development or environment, economics and/or development related field for at least 7 years – max points: 10;
- Criteria B: Recent experience with result-based management evaluation methodologies – max points: 10;
- Criteria C: Experience working with the GEF or GEF-evaluations and experience applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios – max points: 10;
- Criteria D: A Master's degree in environmental sciences, environmental policies, social sciences, economics, business administration, international relations, or other closely related field – max points: 10;
- Criteria E: Fluency in English and Portuguese – max points: 10;

- Criteria F: Experience in southern-central Africa – max points: 10;
- Criteria G: Experience in gender sensitive evaluation and climate change analysis – max points: 10;

Financial Criteria - 30% of total evaluation – max. 30 points.

Consultant Independence:

The consultants cannot have participated in the project preparation, formulation, and/or implementation (including the writing of the Project Document) and should not have a conflict of interest with project’s related activities.

APPLICATION PROCESS

I. Scope of Price Proposal and Schedule of Payments

Financial Proposal:

- Financial proposals must be “all inclusive” and expressed in a lump-sum for the total duration of the contract. The term “all inclusive” implies all cost (professional fees, travel costs, living allowances etc.);
- For duty travels, the UN’s Daily Subsistence Allowance (DSA) rates are US\$ 400 for Luanda and US\$ 159 for Cunene Province, which should provide indication of the cost of living in a duty station/destination (Note: Individuals on this contract are not UN staff and are therefore not entitled to DSAs. All living allowances required to perform the demands of the ToR must be incorporated in the financial proposal, whether the fees are expressed as daily fees or lump sum amount.)
- Transportation in the Cunene Province will be provided by the project coordination;
- The lump sum is fixed regardless of changes in the cost components.

Schedule of Payments:

20% of payment upon approval of the MTR Inception Report and approval of work plan
 30% upon submission of the draft MTR Report
 50% upon finalization of the MTR Report

Or, as otherwise agreed between the Commissioning Unit and the MTR consultant.

J. Recommended Presentation of Offer

- a) Completed **Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability** using the [template](#) provided by UNDP;
- b) **Personal CV or a [P11 Personal History form](#)**, 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;
- c) **Brief description of approach to work/technical proposal** of why the individual considers him/herself as the most suitable for the assignment, and a proposed methodology on how they will approach and complete the assignment; (max 1 page)

- d) **Financial Proposal** that indicates the all-inclusive fixed total contract price, supported by a breakdown of costs, as per template provided. If an applicant is employed by an organization/company/institution, and he/she expects his/her employer to charge a management fee in the process of releasing him/her to UNDP under Reimbursable Loan Agreement (RLA), the applicant must indicate at this point, and ensure that all such costs are duly incorporated in the financial proposal submitted to UNDP. See Letter of Confirmation of Interest template for financial proposal template.

Incomplete applications will be excluded from further consideration.

K. Criteria for Selection of the Best Offer

The award of the contract will be made to the Individual Consultant who has obtained the highest Combined Score and has accepted UNDP's General Terms and Conditions. Only those applications which are responsive and compliant will be evaluated. The offers will be evaluated using the "Combined Scoring method" where:

- a) The educational background and experience on similar assignments will be weighted a max. of 70%;
- b) The price proposal will weigh as 30% of the total scoring.

L. Annexes to the MTR ToR

Include Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects and other existing literature or documents that will help candidates gain a better understanding of the project situation and the work required.

Possible annexes include: (reference ToR Annexes in Annex 3 of Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects)

- List of documents to be reviewed by the MTR consultant
- Guidelines on Contents for the Midterm Review Report
- UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluators/Midterm Review Consultants
- MTR Required Ratings Table and Ratings Scales
- MTR Report Clearance Form
- Sample MTR Evaluative Matrix
- Progress Towards Results Matrix and MTR Ratings & Achievement Summary Tables (in Word)