Annex 1MTR Terms of Reference

* **Ref: PN/FJI-04-19**

**Terms of Reference**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Location** | Suva, Fiji |
| **Tittle** | Mid Term Review Consultant |
| **Type of Contract** | Individual Contractor |
| **Post Level** | International Consultant |
| **Languages required:** | English |
| **Duration of Initial Contract:** | 15 working days |

* **BACKGROUND**

The Disaster Resilience in the Pacific SIDS (RESPAC) is funded by the Russian Federation, that aims to build the overall resilience of PIC to address the negative impacts of climate change. RESPAC has

3 main components as outlined below, which are in addition to the Project Management component:

* Strengthened early warning systems and climate monitoring capacity in selected PICS;
* Preparedness and planning mechanisms and tools to manage disaster recovery processes strengthened at regional, national and local level; and
* Increased use of financial instruments to manage and share disaster related risk and fund post disaster recovery efforts.

The initiation phase of the project started in June 2016 and the project is intended to complete its activities by December 2019. Fourteen countries and one territory in the Pacific Islands region are eligible for support from this project: Cook Islands, Federated States of Micronesia (FSM), Fiji, Niue, Republic of the Marshall Islands (RMI), Samoa, Tonga, Tuvalu, Vanuatu, Palau, Kiribati, Papua New Guinea (PNG), Nauru and Solomon Islands and Tokelau. In terms of which countries get which funding and support, this was flagged for further discussion and approval of the Project Board. Some of the allocation funding and in-kind support will be available to all PICs (i.e. technical assistance in recovery); other activities such as Climate Early Warning Systems (CLEWS) and national recovery planning anticipate targeting selected countries in each respective output area, according to exposure and incidence of disasters, project criteria and where the project would add maximum value. The target countries have been identified during the inception phase based on hazard and vulnerability criteria.

The project stages interventions at *a) regional* and *b) national* levels and has built on the existing institutional strengths and at the same time contribute approaches, mechanisms and tools to further national development. Using UNDP’s presence at the global, regional, and national levels, RESPAC provides strong working relationships with key stakeholders across the Pacific. Through RESPAC, UNDP has forged stronger partnerships at the national level as well as with regional and international agencies such as International Federation of the Red Cross, the Secretariat of the Pacific Community (SPC), the Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environment Programme (SPC), the World Meteorological Organisation (WMO), Global Facility for Disaster Reduction and Recovery, United Nations International Strategy for Disaster Reduction and the United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs to enable project implementation that builds on respective regional strengths and initiatives.

* **OBJECTIVE**

The primary objective of a mid-term review in a project context is to evaluate the overall performance and viability of the project as well as to what extent it has contributed to its primary goals i.e., as written in the original project document and how it has managed to be flexible and relevant to the needs of its core stakeholders. In this regard, the mid-term review of the Disaster Resilience in the Pacific project must be able to respond to 3 fundamental questions:

1. Has the project, thus far, able to deliver on its key objectives and goals as defined in the RESPAC Project Document (PRODOC);
2. Is the project relevant to its stakeholders and beneficiaries and is there acknowledgement and appreciation of the work carried out by the project;
3. What if any, are changes required in the project design and scope so that it may strategically develop and deliver more sustainable results for its core stakeholders.
* **APPROACH & METHODOLOGY**

Noting that the eventual candidate selected to carry out the MTR will need to, as part of the selection criteria, define an acceptable approach and methodology, the objective of this paragraph is simply to define some of the fundamental tenets which the MTR will have to observe. These tenets (in no order of priority are:

1. **Consultation:** A primary and overarching concern is that given the size of the Pacific and the number of potential stakeholders across the Pacific and the 15 participating countries, the candidate for the MTR should be able to consult with stakeholders concerned and provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful. Where face to face interaction is not feasible, then Consultant needs to provide innovative suggestion to overcome barriers.
2. **Desk Research:** The Consultant should review all relevant sources of information including documents prepared during the project preparation phase and its 2 years of implementation.
3. **Participatory Approach:** The Consultant is expected to follow a collaborative and participatory approach1 ensuring close engagement with the Project Team, government counterparts (the RESPAC Operational Focal Points), relevant UNDP Offices and other key stakeholders.
4. **Final Report:** The final MTR report should include descriptions of the approach and methodologies and the rationales for such including making explicit the underlying assumptions, challenges, strengths and weaknesses.
* **DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES**

**Scope of Work**

The consultancy will include, but not necessarily be limited to the following activities:

1. Identify potential project design problems, including the planned strategy;
2. Assess progress towards the achievement of the project objectives and outcomes as specified in the Project Document;
3. Identify early signs of project success or failure;
4. Review the project’s de facto strategy and recommend changes to such if/as required;

1 For ideas on innovative and participatory Monitoring and Evaluation strategies and techniques, see [UNDP Discussion Paper:](http://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/librarypage/capacity-building/discussion-paper--innovations-in-monitoring---evaluating-results/) [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.

* 1. Assess continued relevance of the expected results;
	2. Compare the current management arrangements with arrangements laid out in the Project Document and recommend changes to current arrangements if/as required;
	3. Make recommendations regarding specific actions that might be taken to improve the project, including new or revised activities and outputs, taking the time limitation of the project into account;
	4. Assess the quality of UNDP support to the project;
	5. Identify and document lessons learned;
	6. Review sustainability risks; and,
	7. Assess the need for a possible (non-cost) extension.
* **Key Deliverables and Timelines:**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Deliverable** | **Description** | **Timeline** |
| **Inception Report** | Consultant clarifies objectives andmethods of Midterm Review | No later than 1 week beforethe MTR mission |
| **PowerPoint****Presentation** | Initial Findings | End of MTR mission |
| **Draft Mid-term Review Report** | Full draft report (using guidelines on content outlined in Annex B) withannexes | Within 2 weeks of the MTR mission |
| **Final Mid-term Review Report** | Revised final report with audit trail detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressedin the final MTR report | Within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft |

**Institutional Arrangement**

The RESPAC Project Manager will act as the primary supervisor for this consultancy and will be the first point of contact for the assignment. The Associate Project Managers and the Programme Support IC will provide necessary support to the Consultant.

* **Duration of the Work**

The consultant is expected to work on a full-time basis for 15 working days tentatively commencing in January 2019.

* **Duty Station:**

7 days in Suva, Fiji, and 8 days home based.

* **COMPETENCIES**
* Strong interpersonal and communication skills for varied cultural contexts.
* Ability to work independently with minimal supervision.
* Displays gender, religion, race, nationality and age sensitivity and adaptability.
* Computer literacy (e.g. Microsoft Word, Excel, PowerPoint) is a prerequisite.
* Additional skills and knowledge of prototyping tools and technology will be useful.

**REQUIRED SKILLS AND EXPERIENCE**

**Educational Qualifications:**

Minimum Advanced degree (Post Graduate Diploma or Master) in Environmental or Climate Science, Development Studies, Project Management or related disciplines.

* **Experience:**
* 10 years in Climate Early Warning, climate change Adaptation, DRM, Data Analysis and/or Information Management.
* Substantial, relevant and practical working experience with the design and implementation of international development projects and/or programs. Working experience with multi- country/regional projects and projects supported by UNDP would be an asset.
* Substantial, relevant and practical working experience undertaking external reviews/evaluations of international development projects and/or programs.
* Substantial, relevant and practical working experience in Small Island Developing States (SIDS). Working experience in Pacific Island Countries would be an asset.
* **Language requirements**

Strong verbal and written skills in English.

* **Price Proposal and Schedule of Payments**

**Daily Fee.** Consultant shall quote an all-inclusive Daily Fee for the contract period. The term “all- inclusive” implies that all costs (professional fees, communications, consumables, etc.) that could be incurred by the IC in completing the assignment are already factored into the daily fee submitted in the proposal. If applicable, travel or daily allowance cost (if any work is to be done outside the IC’s duty station) should be identified separately. Payments shall be done based on actual days worked, upon verification of completion of deliverables and approval by the IC’s supervisor of a Time Sheet indicating the days worked in the period.

In general, UNDP shall 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 event of unforeseeable travel not anticipated in this TOR, payment of travel costs including tickets, lodging and terminal expenses should be agreed upon, between the respective business unit and the Individual Consultant, prior to travel and will be reimbursed.

* **Evaluation Method and Criteria**

Individual consultants will be evaluated based on the following methodology.

* **Cumulative analysis**

The award of the contract shall 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 set of **weighted technical criteria (70%)**. and **financial criteria (30%).** Financial score shall be computed as a ratio of the proposal being evaluated and the lowest priced proposal received by UNDP for the assignment.

* **Criteria for Evaluation for evaluation of technical proposal (Maximum 70 points)**
	+ Criteria 1 - Relevance of Education – (**Max 5 points)**
	+ Criteria 2 - Substantial, relevant and practical working experience with the design and implementation of international development projects and/or programs. **(Max 15 points)**
	+ Criteria 3 - Substantial, relevant and practical working experience undertaking external reviews/evaluations of international development projects and/or programs **(Max 15 points)**
	+ Criteria 4 - Substantial, relevant and practical working experience in Small Island Developing States (SIDS). (**Max 10 points)**
	+ Criteria 5 - Relevance of proposed approach and methodology – (**Max 25 points)**

Only candidates obtaining a minimum technical score of 49 points (70% of the total technical points) would be considered further for the Financial Evaluation.

* **Documentation required**

Interested individual consultants must submit the following documents/information to demonstrate their qualifications.

* **Technical Proposal**
* **CV** indicating all experience from similar projects, as well as the contact details (email and telephone number) of the bidder and at least three (3) professional references.
* **Proposed Methodology** which includes a brief description methodology (this should not be more than 3 pages) outlining how he/she intends to consult all stakeholders and complete the review within the allocated time.
* **Financial Proposal**
* **Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability** as per template provided in Annex II
* **Financial proposal**, as per template provided in Annex II