**TERMS OF REFERENCE**

**Terminal Evaluator for the Multi Country Project:**

**“Strengthening climate information and early warning systems in Eastern and Southern Africa for climate resilient development and adaptation to climate change (CIRDA)”**

.

**Type of Contract:** Individual Consultant

**Duty Station:** Home Based

**Starting date:** 28 October 2019

**Duration:** Twenty working days through 31 December 2019

**Supervisor:** Regional Technical Advisor Climate Change Adaptation- Africa

**Background**

UNDP’s Multi Country CIRDA Project was developed in response to a request for assistance by a number of Least Developed Countries (LDCs), to provide regional support to African LDC’s in their efforts in improving climate information and early warning systems to significantly improve lives an build resiliency. The Multi Country Project was designed to complement national projects developed in eleven African countries (Benin, Burkina Faso, the Gambia, Liberia, Sierra Leone, Sao Tome and Principe, Ethiopia, Uganda, Tanzania, Malawi and Zambia) for enhancing national climate information and early warning systems with through funding from the GEF’s Least Developed Country Fund (LDCF). Given limitations in the number of weather, climate and hydrological monitoring stations per country, a regional approach to collecting observations was considered a means to help improve the use and sharing of data between countries as well as ensuring natural efficiencies and economies of scale in the delivery of technical assistance, and skill building, and in enhancing knowledge management and knowledge sharing among partner countries. The national CI/EWS initiatives, were endorsed in September 2013, with the UNDP Multi Country CIRDA Proramme being formed in 2014.

Improving climate information and early warning systems across Africa has the potential to significantly improve lives, build resiliency and support global efforts to achieve the Sustainable Development Goals. UNDP’s CIRDA Project was designed to respond to national and international priorities in improving capacities to manage and respond to the uncertainties of climate change in line with GEF LDCF/SCCF focal area objective 2 (“Increase adaptive capacity to respond to the impacts of climate change, including variability, at local, national, regional and global level”) and objective 3 (“Promote transfer and adoption of adaptation technology”).

For over 30 years, the international development community has made substantial investments in climate information systems for Africa, nevertheless, according to the World Bank, “most hydromet services are unable to meet the needs for weather and climate information.” This lack of quality information is costing African nations dearly. With effectively structured public-private partnerships, new technology, strengthened institutions, increased regional cooperation and continued capacity building, sustainable climate and weather information solutions are a realistic and attainable goal.

The project’s specific objective was to assist partner countries in successfully implementing all components of their national CI/EWS projects in alignment with their approved outcomes. Technical assistance was to be delivered in the in the context of:

1. Enhanced capacity to monitor and forecast extreme weather, hydrology and climate change;
2. Efficient and effective use of hydro-meteorological information for generating early warnings and supporting long-term development plans.

The Project hence looked to provide capacity building and technology transfer, providing the 11 participating African LDCs access to international experts on meteorology, hydrology, forecasting, innovative technologies and public-private partnerships. Support was also delivered through in-country support missions, capacity building workshops and knowledge products and platforms, to promote innovative approaches for providing and sustaining long-term local weather and climate services and facilitate South-South Cooperation to maximize the return on investments in end-to-end early warning and climate information systems. In this light, UNDP-GEF is seeking the service of an evaluation expert to conduct the final evaluation of the Project.

**Scope of the assignment**

The evaluation must provide evidence‐based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The evaluator is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with government counterparts, in particular the GEF operational focal point, UNDP Country Office, project team, UNDP-GEF Technical Adviser based in the region and key stakeholders.

The evaluator will review all relevant sources of information, such as the project document, project reports – including board meeting minutes, project budget revisions, progress reports from national projects and from the CIRDA Project, project files, national strategic and legal documents, and any other materials that the evaluator considers useful for this evidence-based assessment. All these documents will be provided.

The evaluator is expected to frame the evaluation effort using the criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and impact as defined and explained in the [UNDP Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-supported Projects](http://web.undp.org/evaluation/documents/guidance/GEF/UNDP-GEF-TE-Guide.pdf). An overall approach and method for conducting project terminal evaluations of UNDP-supported projects can be found in the [Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results](http://web.undp.org/evaluation/guidance.shtml#handbook).

Evaluation consultants will be held to the highest ethical standards and are required to sign a Code of Conduct upon acceptance of the assignment. UNDP evaluations are conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the [UNEG 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluations'](http://www.unevaluation.org/ethicalguidelines).

**Project evaluation criteria and questions**

The evaluator will evaluate Project monitoring and evaluation, Project execution, the outcome of the Project’s outcomes and sustainability. An assessment of project performance will be carried out, based against expectations set out in the Project Logical Framework/Results Framework, which provides performance and impact indicators for project implementation along with their corresponding means of verification.

The evaluation in the assessment of the Project’s outcomes will at a minimum cover the following criteria: **relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact.**

* **Relevance:** Relevance looks at the relationship between the needs and problems identified and the objectives of the intervention. The extent to which the objectives of a development intervention are consistent with beneficiaries’ requirements, country needs, global priorities and partners’ and donors’ policies.
* **Effectiveness**: The extent to which the development intervention’s objectives were achieved. The evaluation should form an opinion on the progress made to date and the role of UNDP’s CIRDA Project delivering the observed changes. If the objectives have not been achieved, an assessment should be made of the extent to which progress has fallen short of the target and what factors have influenced why something hasn't been successful or why it has not yet been achieved.
* **Efficiency**: A measure of how economically resources/inputs (funds, expertise, time, etc.) are converted into results.
* **Sustainability:** The continuation of benefits after the project ends. The probability of continued long-term benefits, assessing i) sustainability of financial resources, ii) socio-political sustainability, iii) sustainability of institutional framework and governance, iv) environmental sustainability, and v) a final rating of overall sustainability
* **Impact:** The evaluator will assess the extent to which the project is achieving impacts or progressing towards the achievement of impacts. Key findings that should be brought out in the evaluations include mainsteaming. The evaluation will assess the extent to which the project was successfully mainstreamed with other UNDP priorities, including poverty alleviation, improved governance, the prevention and recovery from natural disasters, and gender.

The evaluation should also assess the key financial aspects of the project. Variances between planned and actual expenditures will need to be assessed and explained. Results from recent financial audits, as available, should be taken into consideration. The evaluator(s) will receive assistance from the UNDP Regional Hub for Africa (RHA) and Project Team to obtain financial data.

**Evaluation Questions and Ratings**

Monitoring and Evaluation (Ratings: 6: Highly Satisfactory (HS): no shortcomings; 5: Satisfactory (S): minor shortcomings; 4: Moderately Satisfactory (MS); 3. Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): significant shortcomings; 2. Unsatisfactory (U): major problems; 1. Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): severe problems)

* Evaluate M&E design at entry
* Evaluate M&E plan at implementation
* Evaluate overall quality of M&E

Project Execution (Ratings: 6: Highly Satisfactory (HS): no shortcomings; 5: Satisfactory (S): minor shortcomings; 4: Moderately Satisfactory (MS); 3. Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): significant shortcomings; 2. Unsatisfactory (U): major problems; 1. Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): severe problems)

* Quality of UNDP implementation
* Quality of Project execution
* Overall quality of Project implementation and execution

Relevance (Ratings: 2. Relevant (R), 1. Not-relevant (NR))

* How does the project relate to the main objectives of the GEF focal area, and to addressing main barriers identified in regards to access to climate information for development purposes in the region?

Effectiveness(Ratings: 6: Highly Satisfactory (HS): no shortcomings; 5: Satisfactory (S): minor shortcomings; 4: Moderately Satisfactory (MS); 3. Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): significant shortcomings; 2. Unsatisfactory (U): major problems; 1. Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): severe problems)

* To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved?

Efficiency(Ratings:6: Highly Satisfactory (HS): no shortcomings; 5: Satisfactory (S): minor shortcomings; 4: Moderately Satisfactory (MS); 3. Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): significant shortcomings; 2. Unsatisfactory (U): major problems; 1. Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): severe problems)

* Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards?

Sustainability(Ratings: 4. Likely (L): negligible risks to sustainability; 3. Moderately Likely (ML): moderate risks; 2. Moderately Unlikely (MU): significant risks; 1. Unlikely (U): severe risks)

* To what extent did the Project provide support in looking to address financial and institutional risks to sustaining long-term project results from partner counties?

Impact(Ratings: 3. Significant (S), 2. Minimal (M), 1. Negligible (N))

* Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward a new adaptive approach to climate information from national observation systems?

**Deliverables**

The consultant is expected to deliver the following:

* **Inception Report**: Evaluator provides clarifications on their understanding of the task, timing and method to UNDP RHA and Project Management (provided no later than 5 days from the contract start date);
* **Presentation**: Evaluator presents initial findings to Project Management and UNDP RHA (provided within estimated 15 days after the inception report and no later than 20 November);
* **Draft Final Report**: Evaluator presents full report including a chapter on conclusions, recommendations and lessons along with annexes for review to RHA. The draft will be reviewed by RTA and UNDP HQ (provided within 15 days after presentation and no later than 13 December;
* **Final Report**: Final report incorporating revisions made by UNDP. An **audit trail** detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final evaluation report will be included. The report will be sent to RHA for uploading to UNDP Evaluation Resource Centre (provided within 2 weeks of receiving UNDP comments on draft report and no later than 31 December).

**Payment Method**

Inception Report, 10%;

Presentation 15%

Draft final evaluation Report, 35%;

Final Evaluation Report, 40%;

**Information on working arrangements**

Estimated level of effort: 20 days;

The consultant will be home-based;

The Consultant will be given access to relevant information necessary for the execution of the tasks under this assignment, including list of potential interviews to be held via online platforms (Skype, email etc.);

* The consultant will engage with the Supervisor by email and Skype on an as-needed basis;

The Consultant will be responsible for providing her/his working station (i.e., laptop, internet, phone, scanner/printer, etc.) and must have access to a reliable internet connection;

* Given the regional consultations to be undertaken during this assignment, the consultant is expected to be reasonably flexible with his/her availability for such consultations taking into consideration different time zones;
* Payments will be made upon submission of the deliverables, a detailed time sheet and certification of payment form, and acceptance and confirmation by the Supervisor on days worked (with a “day” calculated as 8 hours of work) and satisfactory delivery and acceptance of outputs.

**Competencies**

Corporate

Demonstrates integrity by modeling the UN’s values and ethical standards;

Promotes the vision, mission, and strategic goals of UNDP;

Displays cultural, gender, religion, race, nationality and age sensitivity and adaptability;

Treats all people fairly without favoritism.

Technical

Good knowledge in the planning, management, monitoring and evaluation of development projects;

Adequate understanding of environmental finance concepts and programming;

High degree of familiarity with UNDP and GEF monitoring and evaluation concepts;

Proven experience and good track record of final project evaluations.

Professionalism

Capable of working in a high-pressure environment with sharp and frequent deadlines, managing many tasks simultaneously;

Excellent analytical and organizational skills;

Exercise the highest level of responsibility and be able to handle confidential and politically sensitive issues in a responsible and mature manner.

Communication

* Excellent writing and verbal communication skills;

Communicate effectively in writing to a varied and broad audience simply and concisely;

Good command of video communication software packages, such as GoToMeeting and Skype.

Teamwork

Works well in a team to advance the priorities of GEF and UNDP as a whole;

Projects a positive image and is ready to take on a wide range of tasks;

Focuses on results for governments requesting support;

Welcomes constructive feedback.

**Qualifications**

Education:

* Master’s degree in Climate Change, Environmental Sciences, Natural Resources Management, Water Resources Management, Meteorology or other closely related field (Max. 10 points).

Experience:

* Technical knowledge that can be proven by a minimum 7 years’ work experience in a field related to Climate Change Adaptation such as meteorology and hydrology, natural resource management, etc. (Max. 15 points);
* Knowledge of UNDP and GEF programming and procedures (Max. 15 points);
* Previous experience with results‐based monitoring and evaluation methodologies (Max. 10 points);
* Demonstrated evaluation experience through two writing samples of past evaluations of similarly funded projects (Max 15 points);

• Experience with evaluations of global or regional projects is a strong asset (max 5 points).

Languages:

* Fluency in English, both oral and written is required (Max. 4 points);
* Working knowledge of French is a plus (1 point).

**Evaluation Method**

* Only those applications which are responsive and compliant will be evaluated;
* Offers will be evaluated according to the Combined Scoring method – where the technical criteria will be weighted at 70%, and the financial offer will be weighted at 30%;
* The technical criteria [education, experience, languages (max 75 points) and interview (max 15 points)] will be based on a maximum 90 points;
* Only the top three candidates obtaining 52.5 points or higher from the review of qualifications (education, experience, languages) will be considered for the interview;
* Candidates obtaining 10.5 points or higher in the interview will be deemed technically compliant and considered for financial evaluation;
* Financial score (max 100 points) shall be computed as a ratio of the proposal being evaluated and the lowest priced proposal of those technically qualified;
* The financial proposal shall specify a lump-sum fee. To assist the requesting unit in the comparison of financial proposals, the financial proposal must additionally include a breakdown of this fee (including all foreseeable expenses to carry out the assignment);
* Applicant receiving the Highest Combined Score and has accepted UNDP’s General Terms and Conditions will be awarded the contract.

**Documentation to be submitted**

* Applicants must submit a CV and/or P-11 including Education/Qualification, Professional Certification, Employment Records/Experience;
* Two examples of past evaluations of similar projects;
* Applicants must reply to the mandatory questions asked by the system when applying;
* Applicants must submit a duly completed and signed Annex II Offeror´s letter to UNDP confirming interest and availability for the Individual Contractor (IC) assignment to be downloaded from the UNDP procurement site

**Kindly note you can upload only ONE document to this application (scan all documents in one single PDF file to attach).**

**UNDP Personal History form (P-11):**

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

**General Conditions of Contract for the ICs:**

<http://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/documents/procurement/documents/IC%20-%20General%20Conditions.pdf>.

**Annex II Offeror´s letter to UNDP confirming interest and availability for the Individual Contractor (IC) assignment**

<http://procurement-notices.undp.org/view_notice.cfm>