

## Terms of Reference

**Consultancy/Position Title:** SIWSAP MTR Evaluation Specialist

**Project Name:** Solomon Islands Water Sector Adaptation Project (SIWSAP)

**Duty Station:** Honiara, Solomon Islands with travel to 4 SIWSAP provincial sites

**Duration of the Contract:**

- Duration: 8 Weeks
- Days: 35 days (35 days to be spread over 2 months period excluding weekends & travelling dates)
- Tentative start date: 3<sup>rd</sup> February 2017
- Contract Tentative end date: 31<sup>st</sup> March 2017

**Objectives:** *SIWSAP Evaluation Specialist key objectives*

This is the Terms of Reference (ToR) for the UNDP-GEF Midterm Review (MTR) of the full-sized project titled 'Solomon Islands Water Sector Adaptation Project' (SIWSAP) (PIMS: 4568) implemented through the Government of Solomon Islands, Ministry of Mines, Energy and Rural Electrification (MMERE), Water Resource Division, which is to be undertaken in year 2016. The project started on July 2014 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](#).

The MTR will assess progress towards the achievement of the SIWSAP 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.

The MTR must provide evidence based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The MTR team 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 team 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 team is expected to follow a collaborative and participatory approach 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. Stakeholder involvement should include interviews with stakeholders who have project responsibilities, including but not limited to (list); 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 team is expected to conduct field missions to Temotu, Choiseul, Western and Markira Province of Solomon Islands, including the following project sites; Tuwo community, Taro Township, Gizo Township and Santa Catalina community (refer to annex F).

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.

#### Background:

The Solomon Islands Water Sector Project (SIWSAP) was design out of one of the priority issues of the Solomon Island's National Adaptation Programme of Action (NAPA) to improve the resilience of water resources to the impacts of climate change and improve health, sanitation and quality of life, so that livelihoods can be enhanced and sustained in the targeted vulnerable areas. The project's executing entity, is the Solomon Islands Government's (SIG), Ministry of Mines, Energy and Rural Electrification (MMERE), in partnership with Ministry of Environment, Climate Change, Disaster Management and Meteorology (MECDM), Ministry of Health and Medical Services – Environmental Health Division, Ministry of Development, Planning, and Aid Coordination (MDPAC) and United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). SIWSAP will work with these partners to achieve this objective through delivery of its four (4) outcomes; 1) formulating, integrating, and mainstreaming water sector-climate change adaptation response plans in the water-related sectors as well as broader policy and development frameworks, 2) increasing the reliability and improving the quality of water supply in targeted areas, 3) investing in cost-effective and adaptive water management interventions and technology transfer, and 4) improving governance and knowledge management for climate change adaptation in the water sector at the local and national levels.

According to SIWSAP Project document, the Solomon Island Government (SIG) has committed in-kind Co-financing of USD\$ 37,222,462 while UNDP parallel funding amounts to USD\$6,400,000, totaling to USD\$ 43,622,462. These are parallel in-kind contributions and not cash contributions. The Global Environment Facility (GEF) Least Developed Country Fund (LDCF) contributed USD\$ 6,850,000 million in cash towards the implementation of SIWSAP project activities. This is a four year (June 2014 – July 2018) implementation project. At the end of the four years, the Government of Solomon Island will have enhanced systems, tools, and knowledge for water resource resilience at the national and local levels, which will contribute to the implementation and achievement of national priorities outlined in various policies and strategies, including the National Adaptation Program of Action (NAPA) 2008, National Development Strategy (NDS) 2011 – 2020, National Water and Sanitation Sector Plan (2007).

Its pilot sites covers 3 township (Taro in Choiseul Province, Gizo in Western Province and Tiggoa in Rennell and Bellona Province) and 3 rural communities (Ferafalu in Malaita Province, Santa Catalina in Markira Province and Tuwo in Temotu Province). These pilot sites are selected using national agreed criteria developed at the Stakeholder Inception Workshop and based on their known vulnerabilities to Climate Change impacts on water resource. It was clear during the National Inception workshop discussion that the sites are known for regularly running out of water, and had written specifically to the government in the past to ask for support during period of no rain fall.

#### Scope of work/Expected Output

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.

#### 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 <sup>1</sup>	Baseline Level <sup>2</sup>	Level in 1 <sup>st</sup> PIR (self-reported)	Midterm Target <sup>3</sup>	End-of-project Target	Midterm Level & Assessment <sup>4</sup>	Achievement Rating <sup>5</sup>	Justification for Rating
Objective:	Indicator (if applicable):							
Outcome 1:	Indicator 1:							
	Indicator 2:							
Outcome 2:	Indicator 3:							
	Indicator 4:							
	Etc.							

<sup>1</sup> Populate with data from the Logframe and scorecards

<sup>2</sup> Populate with data from the Project Document

<sup>3</sup> If available

<sup>4</sup> Colour code this column only

<sup>5</sup> Use the 6 point Progress Towards Results Rating Scale: HS, S, MS, MU, U, HU

Etc.								
<b>Indicator Assessment Key</b>								
Green= Achieved			Yellow= On target to be achieved			Red= Not on target to be achieved		
<p>In addition to the progress towards outcomes analysis:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Compare and analyse the GEF Tracking Tool at the Baseline with the one completed right before the Midterm Review.</li> <li>• Identify remaining barriers to achieving the project objective in the remainder of the project.</li> <li>• By reviewing the aspects of the project that have already been successful, identify ways in which the project can further expand these benefits.</li> </ul> <p>iii. Project Implementation and Adaptive Management</p> <p><u>Management Arrangements:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• Review the quality of execution of the Executing Agency/Implementing Partner(s) and recommend areas for improvement.</li> <li>• Review the quality of support provided by the GEF Partner Agency (UNDP) and recommend areas for improvement.</li> </ul> <p><u>Work Planning:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Review any delays in project start-up and implementation, identify the causes and examine if they have been resolved.</li> <li>• Are work-planning processes results-based? If not, suggest ways to re-orientate work planning to focus on results?</li> <li>• Examine the use of the project's results framework/ logframe as a management tool and review any changes made to it since project start.</li> </ul> <p><u>Finance and co-finance:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consider the financial management of the project, with specific reference to the cost-effectiveness of interventions.</li> <li>• Review the changes to fund allocations as a result of budget revisions and assess the appropriateness and relevance of such revisions.</li> <li>• 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?</li> <li>• 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?</li> </ul> <p><u>Project-level Monitoring and Evaluation Systems:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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? 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?</li> <li>• 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?</li> </ul>								

#### 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 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 team will include a section of the report setting out the MTR's evidence-based conclusions, in light of the findings.<sup>6</sup>

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 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 Rating & 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.

**Table. MTR Ratings & Achievement Summary Table for 'Solomon Islands Water Sector Adaptation Project (SIWSAP)'**

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)	

**Timeframe**

<sup>6</sup> Alternatively, MTR conclusions may be integrated into the body of the report.

The total duration of the MTR will be approximately 35 days over a time period of 7 weeks, starting 25<sup>th</sup> July 2016, and shall not exceed five months from when the consultant(s) are hired. The tentative MTR timeframe is as follows:

TIMEFRAME	ACTIVITY
5 <sup>th</sup> August 2016	Application closes
2 <sup>nd</sup> December 2016	Select MTR Team
3 <sup>rd</sup> February 2017	Prep the MTR Team (handover of Project Documents)
(5 <sup>th</sup> February 2017) 3 days	Document review and preparing MTR Inception Report
(10 <sup>th</sup> February 2017) 2 days	Finalization and Validation of MTR Inception Report- latest start of MTR mission
(12 <sup>th</sup> – 25 <sup>th</sup> February 2017) 15 days	MTR mission: stakeholder meetings, interviews, field visits
(28 <sup>th</sup> February 2017)	Mission wrap-up meeting & presentation of initial findings- earliest end of MTR mission
(10 <sup>th</sup> March 2017) 5 days (r: 5-10)	Preparing draft report
(17 <sup>th</sup> March 2017) 2 days (r: 1-2)	Incorporating audit trail from feedback on draft report/Finalization of MTR report (note: accommodate time delay in dates for circulation and review of the draft report)
(24 <sup>th</sup> March 2017)	Preparation & Issue of Management Response
(28 <sup>th</sup> March 2017)	(optional) Concluding Stakeholder Workshop (not mandatory for MTR team)
31 <sup>st</sup> March 2017	Expected date of full MTR completion

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

#### **Deliverables:**

The evaluation team is expected to deliver the following:

#	Deliverable	Description	Timing	Responsibilities	International Consultant	National Consultant
1	MTR Inception Report	MTR team clarifies objectives and methods of Midterm Review	No later than 2 weeks before the MTR mission: (8th February 2017)	MTR team submits to the Commissioning Unit and project management team and Regional Technical Advisor	Evaluator provides clarifications on timing and method	Background report
2	Presentation	Initial Findings	End of MTR mission: (28th February 2017)	MTR Team presents to project management and the	Preliminary Report	Consultation Field Mission Report

				Commissioning Unit		
3	<b>Draft Final Report</b>	Full report (using guidelines on content outlined in Annex B) with annexes	Within 3 weeks of the MTR mission: (10th March 2017)	Sent to the Commissioning Unit, reviewed by RTA, Project Coordinating Unit, GEF OFF, and implementing partner (MOMERE).	Synthesis draft report, (per annexed template) with annexes	Stakeholder Consultation Report
4	<b>Final Report*</b>	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 <sup>st</sup> March 2017)	Sent to the Commissioning Unit	Revised report	Revised report

\*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.

#### Resources Provided

The applicant is required to have his/her own computer/laptop and other necessary resources that may be required to support the assignment.

#### Reporting and Supervision

##### Report to:

The principal responsibility for managing this MTR resides with the Commissioning Unit. The Commissioning Unit for this project's MTR is the UNDP Pacific Solomon Islands Office.

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

#### Requirement for Qualifications & Experience:

A team of two independent consultants will conduct the MTR - one international Team Leader (with experience and exposure to projects and evaluations in other regions globally) and one national Team Expert, within Solomon Islands. 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.

##### International Consultant (Team Leader)

The International Consultant shall be responsible for completing and delegating tasks as appropriate for the Terminal Evaluation to the National Counterpart. He/she will ensure the timely submission of the first draft and the final version of the Terminal Evaluation Report with incorporated comments from UNDP and others.

##### National Consultant (Team member)

The National Consultant will, jointly with, and under the supervision of the International Consultant, support



the evaluation. He/she will be responsible to review documents, translate necessary documents and interpret interviews, meetings and other relevant events for the International Consultant. He/she will work as a liaison for stakeholders of the project and ensures all stakeholders of the project are aware of the purposes and methods of the evaluation and ensures all meetings and interviews take place in a timely and effective manner. Provide logistical support for the evaluation mission as per travel schedule.

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

***Minimum educational qualifications (10%):***

- The contractor must be qualified with an advanced degree (Post graduates or Master level) with academic and professional background in fields related to Natural Resource Management, Climate Change Adaptation, and Environmental Science, Hydrology or other related field.

***Experience & skills (50%):***

- Experience working with the GEF or GEF-evaluations in relevant technical areas above for at least 10 years;
- Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender and climate change; experience in gender sensitive evaluation and analysis.
- Recent experience with result-based management evaluation methodologies;
- Experience working in Pacific Islands region.
- Good knowledge of the UNDP Evaluation Policy, experience applying UNDP Results Based Evaluation Policies and Procedures, good knowledge of the UNDP NDM/DIM Guidelines and Procedures, knowledge of Result Based Management Evaluation methodologies and knowledge of participatory monitoring approaches.
- Project evaluation/review experiences within United Nations system will be considered an asset;

***Functional Competencies (10%):***

- Competence in adaptive management, as applied to GEF focal area of Climate Change;
- Experience applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios;
- Excellent communication skills;
- Demonstrable analytical skills;

**Proposal Requirements**

***a) Technical Proposal***

The applicant should submit the following documents:

- Technical proposal including a P11 form (available on the UNDP website; [www.undp.org/f](http://www.undp.org/f)), an updated current CV, contact details of at least three referees and a cover letter setting out how the applicant meets the selection criteria, and a proposed approach and methodology)
- Letter confirming availability and Interest using UNDP template (available on the UNDP website: [www.undp.org/f](http://www.undp.org/f))

***b) Financial Proposal***

The consultant is requested to provide a quotation or the fees/cost (in USD) for the services which will be rendered using the following format.

Daily consultancy rates	
Air Ticket Estimate (UNDP will reimburse based on actual costs)	
Living Allowance	
Other miscellaneous expense	

#### Travel;

All envisaged travel costs must be included in the financial proposal. This includes all travel to join duty station/repatriation travel. In general, UNDP should not accept travel costs exceeding those of an economy class ticket. Should the IC wish to travel on a higher class he/she should do so using their own resources.

In the case of unforeseeable travel, payment of travel costs including tickets, lodging and terminal expenses should be agreed upon, between the respective business unit and Individual Consultant, prior to travel and will be reimbursed.

#### Lump sum contracts:

The financial proposal shall specify a total lump sum amount, and payment terms around specific and measurable (qualitative and quantitative) deliverables (i.e. whether payments fall in instalments or upon completion of the entire contract). Payments are based upon output, i.e. upon delivery of the services specified in the TOR. In order to assist the requesting unit in the comparison of financial proposals, the financial proposal will include a breakdown of this lump sum amount (including travel, living expenses, and number of anticipated working days).

Financial proposal to be submitted separate from technical proposal

#### Payment Schedule & Deliverable :

Percentage (%)	Deliverables	Target
10%	• Upon submission and approval of the final MTR Inception Report	8th March 2017
10%	• Upon presentation of initial findings at the end of MTR missions	28 <sup>th</sup> March 2017
30%	• Upon submission and approval of the draft MTR report	10 <sup>th</sup> March 2017
50%	• Upon acceptance and approval of the final MTR report	31 <sup>st</sup> March 2017

#### Evaluation :

The proposals will be evaluated using the cumulative analysis method with a split 70% technical and 30% financial scoring. The proposal with the highest cumulative scoring will be awarded the contract. Applications will be evaluated technically and points are attributed based on how well the proposal meets the requirements of the Terms of Reference using the guidelines detailed in the table below. When using this weighted scoring

method, the award of the contract should be made to the individual consultant whose offer has been evaluated and determined as:

- a) responsive/compliant/acceptable, and
- b) Having received the highest score out of a pre-determined set of weighted technical and financial criteria specific to the solicitation.

\* Technical Criteria weighting, 70%

\* Financial Criteria weighting, 30%

Only candidates obtaining a minimum of 70% out of 100% in technical evaluation would be considered for the Financial Evaluation

Criteria		Weight
<b>Technical</b>		<b>70%</b>
<b>Education:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• An advanced degree (Post graduates or Master level) with academic and professional background in fields related to Natural Resource Management, Climate Change Adaptation, Environmental Science, Hydrology or other related field.</li> </ul>	10%
<b>Experience:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Experience working with the GEF or GEF-evaluations in relevant technical areas above for at least 10 years;</li> <li>• Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender and climate change; experience in gender sensitive evaluation and analysis.</li> <li>• Recent experience with result-based management evaluation methodologies;</li> <li>• Experience working in Pacific Islands region.</li> <li>• Good knowledge of the UNDP Evaluation Policy, experience applying UNDP Results Based Evaluation Policies and Procedures, good knowledge of the UNDP NIM/DIM Guidelines and Procedures, knowledge of Result Based Management Evaluation methodologies and knowledge of participatory monitoring approaches.</li> <li>• Project evaluation/review experiences within United Nations system will be considered an asset;</li> </ul>	50%
<b>Functional Competency:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Written and verbal skills;</li> <li>• Competence in adaptive management, as applied to GEF focal area of Climate Change;</li> <li>• Experience applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios;</li> <li>• Excellent communication skills;</li> <li>• Demonstrable analytical skills;</li> </ul>	10%
<i>**If necessary interviews shall also be conducted as part of the technical evaluation to ascertain best value for money.</i>		
<b>Financial Proposal</b>		<b>30%</b>
<b>Cumulative</b>		<b>100%</b>

**Proposal Submission :**

- Closing date of all applications will be on 12<sup>th</sup> August 2016 @4:00 pm local time (GMT +11)

- All applications must be submitted either electronically to [eddie.meke@undp.org](mailto:eddie.meke@undp.org), or addressed under confidential cover to:

SIWSAP MTR Evaluation Specialist  
Attention: Eddie Meke, SIWSAP Procurement Assistant  
UNDP Pacific Solomon Islands Office,  
Ground Floor ANZ Building, Ranadi, Honiara, Solomon Islands

All proposal should be submitted to the above email, failure to submit on this email address, will result in disqualification of proposals. No proposals will be accepted if submitted on Jobshop/ on this site

All proposal should be submitted to the above email, failure to submit on this email address, will result in disqualification of proposals. No proposals will be accepted if submitted on Jobshop/ on this site

Incomplete application will not be considered and only candidates for whom there is further

- For further information concerning this Terms of Reference, contact Eddie Meke on email [eddie.meke@undp.org](mailto:eddie.meke@undp.org) or / telephone +677 27446 at United Nations Development Programme, Honiara Sub-office, 1st Floor City Centre Building, Mendana Avenue, Honiara