

TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR THE TEAM LEADER

INTERNATIONAL INDIVIDUAL CONSULTANT

MID TERM REVIEW OF THE JOINT PROGRAMME FOR SUSTAINABLE CHARCOAL REDUCTION AND ALTERNATIVE LIVELIHOODS (PROSCAL).

A. Project Description

The Federal of Somalia Government has received support from the UN Multi-Partner Trust Fund (UN MPTF) and United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), under a project entitled “Joint Programme for Sustainable Charcoal Reduction and Alternative Livelihoods (PROSCAL)”. The project objective is to promote energy security and more resilient livelihoods through a gradual reduction of unsustainable charcoal production, trade and use. The project is being implemented through three components:

- Component 1: Capacity building and regional cooperation;
- Component 2: Development of alternative energy sources
- Component 3: Alternative livelihoods for Charcoal Value Chain Beneficiaries.

The project is focused on charcoal production hub cities in Somaliland, Puntland, Galmudug, Banadir, Jubaland, South West, and Hir-Shabelle region of Somalia with the view of undertaking an integrated intervention that addresses the root causes of charcoal production at national and regional levels. The regions were chosen because of the high rates of deforestation and degradation resulting from unsustainable and increased production, trade and use of Charcoal. Hargeisa, Sheikh, and Burao districts of Somaliland, Garowe, Gardo, and Baran of Puntland, Adado of Galmudug, Baidoa of South West, Jowar of Hir-Shabelle, Kismayo of Jubaland and Hodan of Mogadishu were chosen within which on-the-ground activities under component 1, 2 and 3 were undertaken. The selection followed a comprehensive stakeholder consultative process.

The Charcoal Programme is in line with the New Deal processes culminating in the Somali Compact, which puts sustainable development of natural resources at the forefront of the agenda for revitalizing the economy while protecting the environment. The Compact aims to foster confidence between people, communities, the state and international partners through: transparency; risk sharing; use and strengthening of country systems; strengthening government capacity; and timely and predictable aid. It also, contributes to the objectives of the National Development Plan (2017-2019) to protect the Natural Resources and reverse the trend of land degradation of productive lands due to unsustainable production of charcoal. Furthermore, the proposed programme will contribute to several targets: PSG 4, Priority 3: “Promote the sustainable development and management of natural resources by developing legal and regulatory frameworks and building capacity in key Natural Resources Management (NRM) institutions;”; SDG, Goal 7.1: “By 2030, ensure universal access to affordable, reliable and modern energy services”; SDG12: “responsible consumption and production”; and SDG15: “life on land”.

In terms of management arrangements, the execution modality followed the Direct Implementation Modality (DIM). The Implementing Partners (IPs) for the project are UNDP, FAO and UNEP. Furthermore, other partners engaged includes the Federal Ministry of Livestock, Forest and Range (MoLFR) as the lead Ministry for South and Central regions (Galmudug, Hir-Shabelle, South West, Jubaland and Mogadishu) and Environments Ministries in Somaliland and Puntland. The Programme Management Team (PMT), headed by the Programme Coordinator is responsible for project management and coordination. The Programme Steering Committee (PSC) is responsible for reviewing and approving project milestones, activities and reports. It also provides guidance for proper

implementation of the project. It draws membership from Federal Government of Somalia, regional member states, Resident Coordination Office (RCO), UNDP, FAO and UNEP. In close collaboration with the PMT, the PSC plays a critical role in project monitoring and evaluation by quality assuring processes and products and using evaluations performance improvement, accountability and learning.

B. Scope of Work

The Mid-term evaluation will be carried out by an international consultant in collaboration with a national consultant. The review will be conducted according to the guidance, rules and procedures established by UNDP and as reflected in the UNDP Evaluation Guidelines: https://drive.google.com/open?id=1KerL_1rddnqbUp17I_UVK7YNfgev0ash

The overall objective of the Mid Term Evaluation (MTE) is to 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 MTE will also review the project's strategy and its risks to impacts and sustainability. Evaluation of a Joint Programme should be undertaken in accordance with the guidance from the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) (e.g., relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability) with an emphasis on impact at outcome level, sustainability of the results. See attached: https://drive.google.com/open?id=11LcYAdPGIncmFVoy34nj37ofIBU_fJlu; and [UNEG Norms & Standards for Evaluation English-2017.pdf](#).

Furthermore, the Mid-term evaluation seeks **to generate knowledge, identifying best practices and lessons learned, accountability, transparency and improve implementation of the programmes during their remaining implementation and will guide the design of the next phase of the programme**. As a result, the conclusions and recommendations generated by this evaluation will be addressed to its main users: The Programme Counterparts, Management Committee and the Project Steering Committee.

This mid-term evaluation has the following **specific Goals**:

1. To discover the programme's **design quality and internal coherence** (needs and problems it seeks to solve) and its external coherence with the CPD, UNSF, UNDAF, the NDP and the **Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs)**, and find out the degree of national ownership of the programme.
2. To understand how the joint programme **operates** and assess the **efficiency of its management model** in planning, coordinating, managing and executing resources allocated for its implementation, through an analysis of its procedures and institutional mechanisms. This analysis will seek to uncover the factors for success and limitations in inter-agency tasks as envisaged in the programme.
3. To assess outcome level impacts, required level of political engagement and course correction for implementation of the programme.
4. To identify the programme's **degree of effectiveness** among its participants, its contribution to the objectives of the Sustainable Charcoal Reduction and Alternative Livelihoods in the country including resource mobilization and effective use of resources in line with the aid effectiveness principals, and value for money.

The Evaluator will assess the following four categories of project progress. *See the UNDP Guidance for Conducting Evaluations for extended description:* http://web.undp.org/evaluation/guideline/documents/PDF/UNDP_Evaluation_Guidelines.pdf

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.
- Review how the project addresses country priorities. Review country ownership. Review decision-making processes.
- Review the extent to which relevant gender issues were raised in the project design.
- Review the major areas of concern and 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, as well as the theory of change.
- 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 : (<https://drive.google.com/open?id=1LcccEMRLvqoZ3yPkY2jJwQeXT-0Wvca>) and following the *Guidelines of UNDP and UNEP For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UN MPTF funded projects with 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).*

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 Participating UN Organizations (UNDP, FAO & UNEP) 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?
- 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 the UN MPTF 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?)
- Demonstrate 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 MPTF reports Project 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 financial, social-economic, institutional framework, governance, and environmental risks to sustainability

The evaluation approach will combine methods such as documentation review (desk study); interviews; and field visits. All relevant project documentation will be made available to the team by the project management team, facilitated by UNDP. After studying the documentation, the team will conduct interviews with all relevant partners including the beneficiaries, i.e. Liquefied Petroleum Gas franchise models (women groups) and Alternative Livelihoods. Validation of preliminary findings with stakeholders will happen through circulation of initial reports for comments or other types of feedback mechanisms.

Throughout the period of the evaluation, the consultant will liaise closely with the UNDP Somalia Resilience and Climate Change Portfolio Manager, implementing partners, the respective Government counterparts, and the counterpart staff assigned to the project. The consultant can raise or discuss any issue or topic it deems necessary to fulfill the task, the consultant however is not authorized to make any commitments to any party on behalf of UNDP or the Government.

The methodology and techniques to be used in the evaluation should be described in detail in the inception report and the final evaluation report, and should contain, at a minimum, information on the instruments used for data collection and analysis, whether these be documents, interviews, field visits, questionnaires or participatory techniques.

The evaluator is expected to conduct a field mission to Somaliland, Puntland and Mogadishu and engage with the project stakeholders including:

- Participating UN Organizations (UNDP, FAO and UNEP)
- Federal Ministry of Livestock, Forest and Range
- Environment Ministries in Somaliland, Puntland, Galmudug, Hir-Shabelle, South West and Jubaland State.

D. Expected Outputs and Deliverables

The International Consultant is expected to deliver the following:

Deliverables/ Outputs	Timings	Review and Approvals Required	Estimated Duration to Complete
Inception Report	No later than 2 weeks before the evaluation mission.	UNDP Resilience and Climate Change, Portfolio Manager.	4 working days
Presentation Initial Findings	End of evaluation mission	UNDP Resilience and Climate Change, Portfolio Manager.	10 working days
Draft Final Report	Within 3 weeks of the evaluation mission	UNDP Resilience and Climate Change, Portfolio Manager; reviewed by programme Oversight and Quality Assurance Unit (POQA)	5 working days
Final Evaluation Report	Within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft	UNDP Resilience and Climate Change for uploading to UNDP Ethical Research Committee (ERC.)	5 working days
Total working days			24 days

*When submitting the final evaluation report, the evaluator is required also to provide an 'audit trail', detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final evaluation report. Also, UNDP Somalia Resilience and Climate Change

Portfolio will engage the UNDP Programme Oversight and Quality Assurance Unit, FAO, and UNEP focal points in the review of all the reports.

E. Institutional Arrangement

The primary responsibility for managing this evaluation resides with the UNDP Country Office in Somalia. The UNDP CO will contract the evaluators and ensure the timely provision of per diems and travel arrangements within the country for the evaluation team. The consultant shall work under the direct supervision of the UNDP Resilience and Climate Change, Portfolio Manager. The Project Team will be responsible for liaising with the Evaluators team to set up stakeholder interviews, arrange field visits, coordinate with the Government counterparts including the Federal Ministry of Livestock, Forest and Range, and Environment Ministries in Somaliland, Puntland, Galmudug, Hir-Shabelle, South West and Jubaland.

The Consultant shall work under the UNDP duty of care and will comply with all UNDP security regulations whilst travel and living allowance costs for field mission will be borne by UNDP based on prior approval by the UNDP Portfolio Manager. If unforeseen travel outside the Duty Station not required by the Terms of Reference is requested by UNDP, and upon prior written agreement, such travel shall be at UNDP’s expense and the Individual Contractor shall receive a *per diem* not to exceed United Nations daily subsistence allowance rate in such other location(s). Furthermore, the Consultant will be required to have a personal lap top computer.

F. Duration of the Work:

The total duration of the evaluation will be 24 days according to the following plan:

Activity	Timings (working days)	Completion Date
Preparation/Inception Report	4 days	16 June 2019 to 19 June 2019
Evaluation Mission	10 day	20 June 2019 to 3 July 2019
Draft evaluation Report	5 days	4 July 2019 to 10 July 2019
Final Report	5 days	11 July 2019 to 17 July 2019

G. Duty Station

Home based with travel to Mogadishu, Somaliland, and Puntland region. Its mandatory for the consultants to have completed SSAFE training. The consultant shall work under the direct supervisor of the UNDP Resilience and Climate Change Portfolio Manager.

H. Required Skills and Qualifications of the Individual Consultant

Academic Qualifications:

A Master’s degree in economics, environmental management, strategic planning and natural resource managements or related fields.

Combination of required expertise:

- A Minimum of 10 years of relevant professional experience of conducting or managing evaluations, assessments, audits, research or review of Sustainable development projects and programmes in fragile context
- Experience in evaluating environment programs in fragile context or conflict countries particularly in Somalia and other IGAD Member Countries.

- Experience in Livelihood, energy and policy formulation
- Experience in evaluating UN Joint Programmes in fragile setting
- Excellent English writing and communication skills
- Sound knowledge in result-based management
- Full computer literacy

I. Scope of Price Proposal and Schedule of Payments

UNDP shall pay the Individual Consultant upon certification by the Resilience and Climate Change, Portfolio Manager that services have been satisfactorily performed and outputs delivered:

Deliverables	Deliverable Estimated	Percentage
Inception Report Evaluator provides clarifications on timing and method	4 days	16.6
Presentation Initial Findings	10 day	41.6
Draft terminal Evaluation Report Full report, (per annexed template) with annexes	5 days	20.8
Final Terminal Evaluation Report* Revised report	5 days	20.8
Total	24 days	100

J. Recommended Presentation of Offer

Interested Offerors are required to apply via the UNDP jobsite system at <https://jobs.undp.org> on or before **16th May 2019**. The application must include the following documents in **ONE SINGLE PDF DOCUMENT**:

1. Duly accomplished Letter of **Confirmation of Interest and Availability** using the template provided by UNDP (Annex II);
2. **Personal CV** indicating all experience from similar projects and specifying the relevant assignment period (from/to) as well as the email and telephone contacts of at least three (3) professional references;
3. **Technical Proposal:**
 - a) Brief description of why the individual considers him/herself as the most suitable for the assignment.
 - b) A brief methodology not exceeding five pages on how you will approach and complete the assignment.
4. Financial Proposal: the financial proposal shall be based on an all-inclusive daily professional fee. To assist UNDP in the comparison of financial proposals, the financial proposal shall include a breakdown of this lump sum amount, including a daily fee for the tasks and any other costs (if any) in separate lines as per the template provided (Annex II). Please do not include costs related to mission travel during the assignment as these will be borne by UNDP.

Any request for clarification/additional information on this consultancy shall be communicated to UNDP in writing

via email at procurement.so@undp.org .

K. Criteria for Selection of the Best Offer

Applicants will be evaluated based on the combined scoring method using the 70%-30% distribution whereby the technical proposal will be weighted at a maximum of 70% and combined with a price offer which will be weighted at 30%.

A two-stage procedure will be used to evaluate offers whereby the technical evaluation will be completed prior to price comparison.

Technical Qualification Evaluation Criteria: (70% of total evaluation; Maximum 70 points)

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

Technical Evaluation Criteria	Maximum Obtainable Score
A minimum of a master’s degree in economics, environmental management, strategic planning and natural resource managements or related fields.	10
<p>Assessment of the technical proposal – methodology and approach to complete the assignment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quality of writing and of the presentation = 10 points maximum 	10
<p>Experience, and knowledge of the assignment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Over 10 years of experience in conducting or managing evaluations, assessments, audits, research or review of Sustainable development projects and programmes) = 15 points maximum • Experience in evaluating environment programs in fragile context =10 points maximum • Competence in evaluating Livelihood, energy and policy formulation projects= 10 points maximum • Experience in evaluating UN Joint Programmes in fragile setting= 10 points maximum 	45
<p>Regional Experience</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Experience of working in fragile context or conflict countries particularly in Somalia and other IGAD Member Countries= 5 points maximum 	5
Total	70

Only proposals obtaining a minimum of 49 points (70% of the total technical points) shall be considered for price comparison.

Financial Evaluation Criteria: (30% of total evaluation; Maximum 30 points)

The maximum number of points assigned to the financial proposal is allocated to the lowest price proposal. All other proposals receive points in inverse proportion. The following formula will be used to evaluate financial proposal:

$p = y (\mu/z)$, where

p = points for the financial proposal being evaluated

y = maximum number of points for the financial proposal

μ = price of the lowest priced proposal

z = price of the proposal being evaluated

Final Score

The final score will be the sum of the two scores obtained for the technical and financial criteria;

L. Contract Award

The award of the contract shall be made to the proposer whose offer has been evaluated and determined as:

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

M. Annexes to the TOR

- Annex I - Individual Contract and General Terms and Conditions
- Annex II - Offeror’s Letter to UNDP confirming Interest and Availability for the Individual Contract including financial proposal template

Due to the large number of applications we receive, only short-listed applicants shall be notified of the outcome.

This TOR is approved by: *[indicate name of Approving Manager]*

Signature _____
 Name and Designation _____
 Date of Signing _____

Annex

Evaluation Report: Sample Outline

Executive summary

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

Introduction

- Purpose of the evaluation
- Key issues addressed
- Methodology of the evaluation
- Structure of the evaluation

The project and its development context

- Project start and its duration
- Problems that the project seek to address
- Immediate and development objectives of the project
- Main stakeholders
- Results expected

Findings and Conclusions

- Project formulation
- Implementation approach
- Country ownership/Drivenness

- Stakeholder participation
- Replication approach
- Cost-effectiveness
- Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector
- Indicators
- Management arrangements
- Implementation
 - Financial Planning
 - Monitoring and evaluation
 - Execution and implementation modalities
 - Management by the UNDP country office
 - Coordination and operational issues
 - Results
 - Attainment of objectives
 - Sustainability
 - Contribution to upgrading skills of the national staff

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

Lessons learned

- Best and worst practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance and success

Annexes

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