## UNDP-GEF Midterm Review Terms of Reference

**Title:** Midterm Review of Adaptation to Climate Change in the Coastal Zone in Vanuatu (VCAP)

**Position Title:** VCAPMidterm Review Consultant

**Location:** Home-based and selected duty station

**Duration of contract:** 45 dayswithin 14 weeks period

**Application closure date:** 28th Feb 2018

**Starting date:**  21st March 2018

1. **INTRODUCTION**

This is the Terms of Reference (ToR) for the UNDP-GEF Midterm Review (MTR) of the full-sized project titled *Adaptation to Climate Change in the Coastal Zone in Vanuatu – VCAP* (PIMS# 4866) (Atlast#00082472) implemented through Ministry for Climate Change Adaptation, Meteorology, Geo-hazards, Environment, Energy and Disaster Management(MCCMGEEDM) which is to be undertaken in March 21st 2018. The project started on the 17 November 2014and is in its 4th year of implementation. This ToR follows the UNDP-GEF Guidance on MTRs. 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*](mailto:http://web.undp.org/evaluation/documents/guidance/GEF/mid-term/Guidance_Midterm%2520Review%2520_EN_2014.pdf)*.* (*http://web.undp.org/evaluation/documents/guidance/GEF/midterm/Guidance\_Midterm%20Review%20\_EN\_2014.pdf*).

**2. PROJECT BACKGROUND INFORMATION**

The Government of Vanuatu has been proactive in global and regional dialogues on climate change and finalised its National Adaptation Programme of Action (NAPA) in 2007. For this reason, the VCAP project was developed to explicitly address three of eleven priorities identified in the NAPA including: 1) community-based marine resource management, 2) integrated coastal zone management, and 3) mainstreaming climate change into policy and national planning processes.

The Vanuatu Coastal Adaptation (VCAP) project is providing valuable opportunities to the Vanuatu Government to increase the resilience of its communities to future climate change induced risks such as declining coastal and marine resources and intensifying climate related hazards. To address the priorities of NAPA, VCAP is focusing on five of the adaptation options including: i) development of provincial / local adaptation and ICM plans, ii) climate proofing of infrastructure design and development planning, iii) development of an efficient early warning system, iv) awareness raising and capacity building, and v) coastal re-vegetation and rehabilitation.

The overall objective of VCAP is improve the resilience of the coastal zone and its communities to the impacts of climate change to sustain livelihoods, food production and preserve and improve the quality of life in targeted vulnerable areas.

VCAP has been focusing on improving community level adaptation to climate change to address major environmental and associated socio-economic problems facing coastal communities impacts by climate change such as land degradation, biodiversity loss and reef destruction, all of which severely undermines prospects for sustainable development and threaten the food security of communities.

VCAP has supported information and early warning systems on coastal hazards to address the current lack of systematic analysis and predictions of climate-related events. This is to allow coastal communities to be less vulnerable to the effects of climate change with improved information management and data dissemination systems in place.

Below in summary is the objective and outcome; the progress towards these is measured through the following indicators:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Objective/Outcomes** | **Indicators** | **Target by end of project relative to the baseline (unless specified otherwise)** |
| Project Objective:  To improve the resilience of the coastal zone to the impacts of climate change in order to sustain livelihoods, food production and preserve and improve the quality of life in targeted vulnerable areas | Number of vulnerable communities/villages/areas with enhanced resilience to climate change through effective planning and action for climate change  Percentage of the population in target sites covered by effective the 24/7 early warning system  Policies in place to support Climate change adaptation enabling policies and supportive institutions in place | 30 villages in 8 Local Area councils designing and implementing effective CC adaptation plans to enhance CC resilience  100% of Vanuatu population receives high quality early warning in a timely manner using of the multiple communication lines  Integrated coastal zone management framework incorporating resilience though climate change adaptation supported by appropriate sectoral and cross sectoral policy and legislation |
| **Outcome 1**  1.1 Integrated CC-Adaptation plans mainstreamed in the coastal zone  1.2 Improved climate resilience of coastal areas through integrated approaches | Development of Community CC-Development Adaption Strategies (CCCADS) at the village level using common indicators across all project sites  Community Disaster Committees established and operational with specific plans developed in targeted communities and at Area Council level  Length of coastline placed under improved integrated coastal management to improve ecosystem-based adaptation  Enhanced resilience of terrestrial coastal areas to minimize erosion, provide clean water resources to both communities and ecosystems enhancing the livelihoods of coastal communities  Number of public conveyances climate proofed to provide long-term use by vulnerable coastal communities | 30 Community CC-Development Adaption Strategies (CCCADS) at the village level using common indicators across all project sites  CDC established and operational in at least 30 communities, 8 Area Councils & 1 District  8 Area Councils with operational Disaster Plans and equipped to respond to enhance resilience to climate related natural disasters  Community Integrated Coastal Zone Management Plans (CICZM Plans) established integrating “kustom tabu” areas to enhance ecosystem resilience food production and livelihood support for local communities in 30 locations  Six additional 6 additional Community Conservation Areas (CCAs) to national PA network  Tabu areas / CCAs/ MPAs linked together through Area Council ICZM Plans to ensure integration of planning processes  Knowledge sharing and integrated development of coastal areas.  Community, including women and youth, participating in the monitoring, evaluation and management of CICZM Plans in 30 sites  Improve ecosystem resilience and health  Development of 30 Upland Management CCA Plans (UMCCAP) for coastal catchment with actions to reduce run-off resulting in improved turbidity of rivers, streams and coastal waters and a reduction of nutrient-rich sediment reaching the coastal area  20 Erosion “hotspots” with action resulting in reduced erosion  Reduction in cases of water borne illnesses in communities affected by improved catchments  Enhanced agricultural productivity  Increased water security for 2,000 people  10 pedestrian bridges established  4 water crossings rehabilitated  10 km of road rehabilitated  6 pedestrian walking paths “climate proofed”  Total of 10,000 community members with better access to markets, education and health |
| **Outcome 2**  Information and early warning systems on coastal hazards | Better quality accuracy and timeliness in weather forecasting, particularly for extreme events such as extreme rainfall events, storm surges, tropical depressions and cyclones informing EWS  Strengthened capacity within VMGD to deliver timely climate related information to all communities in Vanuatu | By the end of the project at least 100% of targeted V-CAP communities receiving timely and accurate early warnings of coastal hazards including floods, cyclones and other natural disasters and respond to early warnings and take the appropriate actions following the warning (disaggregated by gender and age)  Better quality meteorological forecasting available for all people of Vanuatu  Higher quality data available for meteorological forecasting available for all people of Vanuatu  Better quality metrological forecasting in Vanuatu, particularly in relation to extreme climate events |
| **Outcome 3**  3.1 Climate change adaptation enabling policies and supportive institutions in place  3.2 Human resources in place at the national, provincial and community levels | Number of sectoral policies, plans and strategies explicitly recognising approaches to climate change adaption and a reform agenda adopted  Number of trained staff with sufficient resources to implement CC resilience and adaptation at the national, provincial and community levels | Reform agenda established to incorporate climate change into key sectors  NICZM Framework is finalised and approved  Revised EIA policy and legislation  1 additional sectoral policy recognising and incorporating CC inclusive of gender and social inclusion considerations;  60 staff trained and implementing approaches to planning for integration of climate change into local level planning at provincial and community levels (gender-disaggregated data will be presented) |
| **Outcome 4.0**  Increased awareness and ownership of climate risk reduction processes at the national and local levels. | Practices demonstrated and shared by the project adopted by other parties (replication) and adopted by local communities  Development of 10 sets of training and awareness materials | Traditional conservation practices strengthened and implemented in climate change adaptation plans, policies and action (10 sites) to enhance R2R resilience to CC  Increased awareness and action incorporating the role of “natural solutions” natural resource plans and management (10 sites)  Specific exchange programs for field staff, women’s and youth groups on identified climate change resilience topics  Increased private sector awareness and identification of opportunities to engage in building CCA resilience.  Approaches demonstrated by V-CAP shared by and adopted by other local communities (replication)  Secondary schools in V-CAP sites undertaking climate awareness and capacity building activities |

**3. OBJECTIVES OF THE MTR**

The modified MTR will assess progress towards the achievement of the project objectives and outcomes as specified in the Project Document[[1]](#footnote-1), 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 and its risks to sustainability.

**4. MTR APPROACH & METHODOLOGY**

The MTR should provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The MTR reviewer will review 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 reviewer considers useful for this evidence-based review). The MTR reviewer 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 by the Project Team before the MTR field mission begins.

The MTR reviewer is expected to follow a collaborative and participatory approach[[2]](#footnote-2) 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.[[3]](#footnote-3) Stakeholder involvement should include interviews with stakeholders who have project responsibilities, including but not limited to Annex 1 list provided; 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 reviewer is expected to conduct field missions to Vanuatu to meet with those key stakeholders involved in the project and visit at least 3 project sites (Epi, Torres and Aniwa) as selected by Vanuatu government where project activities are currently being implemented. The consultant will also be expected to present initial findings and draft report during the Board meeting in June 2018.

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 reviewer 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 participating countries?
* 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. Make suggestions for how relevant gender issues can be better incorporated and monitored in the project. 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[[4]](#footnote-4)** | **Baseline Level[[5]](#footnote-5)** | **Level in 1st PIR (self- reported)** | **Midterm Target[[6]](#footnote-6)** | **End-of-project Target** | **Midterm Level & Assessment[[7]](#footnote-7)** | **Achievement Rating[[8]](#footnote-8)** | **Justification for Rating** |
| **Objective:** | Indicator (if applicable): |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Outcome 1:** | Indicator 1: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Indicator 2: |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Outcome 2:** | Indicator 3: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Indicator 4: |  |  |  |  |  |
| Etc. |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Etc.** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**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 Implementing Agency/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? 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? Do stakeholders have appropriate capacity developed to properly manage the project?
* 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 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 reviewer will include a section of the report setting out the MTR’s evidence-based conclusions, in light of the findings.[[9]](#footnote-9)

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 reviewer should make no more than 15 recommendations total. Recommendations should outline corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project and should focus on actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the project.

**Ratings**

The MTR reviewer 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.

**Table. MTR Ratings & Achievement Summary Table for**

**Adaptation to Climate Change in the Coastal Zone in Vanuatu**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **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) |  |

1. **TIMEFRAME**

The total duration of the MTR will be approximately (26) *days* over a time of *approximately 13 weeks* starting *(March 2018),* and shall not exceed five months from when the reviewer is contracted. The tentative MTR timeframe is as follows:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **TIMEFRAME** | **ACTIVITY** |
| *28 February 2018* | Application closure |
| *10 days after application closure* | Select MTR Team |
| *21 March 2018* | Contract signing |
| *28 March 2018* | Preparation of the MTR Team (handover of Project Documents) |
| *4 April 2018* | *Inception Meeting with UNDP* |
| *16 April 2018* | Document review and preparing MTR Inception Report |
| *18 April 2018* | Submission of Inception Report |
| *9 May 2018* | MTR mission (15 days): stakeholder meetings, interviews, field visits |
| *6 June 2018* | Presentation of initial findings to UNDP and VCAP Board |
| *13 June 2018* | Submission of Draft MTR Report |
| *20 June 2018* | Finalization of MTR report incorporating audit trail from feedback on draft report. |
| *27 June 2018* | Submission of Final MTR Report |
| *30 June 2018* | End of Contract |

1. **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 (18 April 2018) | MTR team submits to the Commissioning Unit and project management |
| **2** | **Presentation** | Initial Findings | End of MTR mission (6 June 2018) | MTR reviewer presents to project management and the Commissioning Unit |
| **3** | **Draft Final Report** | Full report (using guidelines on content outlined in Annex B) with annexes | Within 3 weeks of the MTR mission (13 June 2018) | Sent to the Commissioning 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 (27 June 2018) | Sent to the Commissioning Unit |

1. **MTR ARRANGEMENTS**

The principal responsibility for managing this MTR resides with the Commissioning Unit. The Commissioning Unit for this project’s MTR is UNDP Pacific Office in Fiji

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

1. **TEAM COMPOSITION**

The evaluation team will consist of 1 international consultant. The consultant shall have prior experience in evaluating similar projects. Experience with GEF financed projects is an advantage. The evaluator selected should not have participated in the project preparation and/or implementation and should not have conflict of interest with project related activities.

The required qualifications for the consultant include the following:

Education (5%):

* A Master’s degree (MA or MSc. or higher) in natural resource management or climate change adaptation or other closely related field.

Experience (65%):

* Recent experience with result-based management evaluation methodologies;
* Experience applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios;
* Competence in adaptive management, as applied to climate change adaptation projects and ecosystems management;
* Experience working with the GEF or GEF-evaluations;
* Experience working in Asia and the Pacific and has a good understanding of the fisheries sector in the Pacific;
* Work experience in relevant technical areas for at least 7 years;
* Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender and climate change adaptation projects and ecosystems management; experience in gender sensitive evaluation and analysis.
* Excellent communication skills;
* Demonstrable analytical skills;
* Project evaluation/review experiences within United Nations system will be considered an asset;

A 30% rating is given to the financial proposal. Financial proposal must include:

* Daily Consultancy Fee (No fee range to be stated)
* Living Expenses while living in duty station for the period of work (only for those applicants living outside of duty station. Do not state UN DSA rate)

1. **PAYMENT MODALITIES AND SPECIFICATIONS**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| % | Milestone |
| *20%* | On submission of Inception Report |
| *20%* | On completion of Mission and presentation of initial findings to stakeholders |
| *30%* | On submission and acceptance (by UNDP-CO and UNDP RTA) of the final draft mid-term review report |
| *30%* | On submission and acceptance (by UNDP-CO and UNDP RTA) of the final mid-term review report |

1. **APPLICATION PROCESS[[10]](#footnote-10)**

**Recommended Presentation of Proposal:**

1. **Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability** using the [template](https://intranet.undp.org/unit/bom/pso/Support%20documents%20on%20IC%20Guidelines/Template%20for%20Confirmation%20of%20Interest%20and%20Submission%20of%20Financial%20Proposal.docx)[[11]](#footnote-11) provided by UNDP;
2. **CV** or a **Personal History Form** ([P11 form](http://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/corporate/Careers/P11_Personal_history_form.doc)[[12]](#footnote-12));
3. **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)
4. **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](http://procurement-notices.undp.org/view_file.cfm?doc_id=29916). 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.

Applicants are requested to submit an application letter with a technical and financial proposal by **28th February 2018**. Qualified women and members of social minorities are encouraged to apply.

**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.

**ANNEX A: List of Documents to be reviewed by the MTR Reviewer**

1. PIF
2. UNDP Initiation Plan
3. UNDP Project Document
4. UNDP Environmental and Social Screening results
5. Project Inception Report
6. All annual Project Implementation Reports (PIRs)
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 (CC Adaptation Tracking Tool*)*
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:

1. Project operational guidelines, manuals and systems
2. UNDP country/countries programme document(s)
3. Minutes of the Project Board Meetings and other meetings (i.e. Project Appraisal Committee meetings)
4. Project site location maps

**ANNEX B: Guidelines on Contents for the Midterm Review Report**[[13]](#footnote-13)

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **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 reviewer name * 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 with their roles | | |
| **4.** | Findings *(12-14 pages)* | | |
| **4.1** | Project Strategy   * Project Design * Results Framework/Logframe | |
| **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) 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 Scope of Work (excluding 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 | | |

**ANNEX C: Midterm Review Evaluative Matrix Template**

This Midterm Review Evaluative Matrix must be fully completed/amended by the consultant and included as an Annex to the MTR report.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **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?** | | | |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

**ANNEX D: UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluators/Midterm Review Consultants[[14]](#footnote-14)**

**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: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**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 |

**ANNEX F: MTR Report Clearance Form**

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

**Midterm Review Report Reviewed and Cleared By:**

**Commissioning Unit**

Name: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Advisor**

Name: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**ANNEX G: Audit Trail Template**

*Note:* The following is a template for the MTR reviewer to show how the received comments on the draft MTR report have (or have not) been incorporated into the final MTR report. This audit trail should be included as an annex in the final MTR report.

**To the comments received on (*date*) from the Midterm Review of** Adaptation to Climate Change in the Coastal Zone in Vanuatu **(*PIMS #* 4866)**

*The following comments were provided to the draft Midterm Review report; they are referenced by institution (“Author” column) and comment number (“#” column):*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Author** | **#** | **Para No./ comment location** | **Comment/Feedback on the draft MTR report** | **MTR reviewer’s**  **response and actions taken** |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

1. The Project Board may have approved minor changes in the project document. Such changes are reflected in Board minutes and in the PIRs. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. For ideas on innovative and participatory Monitoring and Evaluation strategies and techniques, see [UNDP Discussion Paper: Innovations in Monitoring & Evaluating Results](http://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/librarypage/capacity-building/discussion-paper--innovations-in-monitoring---evaluating-results/), 05 Nov 2013. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. For more stakeholder engagement in the M&E process, see the [UNDP Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results](http://www.undg.org/docs/11653/UNDP-PME-Handbook-(2009).pdf), Chapter 3, pg. 93. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. Populate with data from the Logframe and scorecards [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. Populate with data from the Project Document [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. If available [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. Colour code this column only [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. Use the 6 point Progress Towards Results Rating Scale: HS, S, MS, MU, U, HU [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. Alternatively, MTR conclusions may be integrated into the body of the report. [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. 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> [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
11. <https://intranet.undp.org/unit/bom/pso/Support%20documents%20on%20IC%20Guidelines/Template%20for%20Confirmation%20of%20Interest%20and%20Submission%20of%20Financial%20Proposal.docx> [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
12. <http://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/corporate/Careers/P11_Personal_history_form.doc> [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
13. The Report length should not exceed *40* pages in total (not including annexes). [↑](#footnote-ref-13)
14. <http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/100> [↑](#footnote-ref-14)