

Terms of Reference

Title:	Regional Evaluator Support for Terminal Evaluation of the project “Japan-Caribbean Climate Change Partnership (J-CCCP)”
Supervisor:	J-CCCP Project Manager
Duty Station:	Home based with missions to Project Management Unit in Barbados and two beneficiary countries (Grenada and St. Lucia)
Expected Duration of Assignment:	21 Working days periodically
Period:	August - October 2019
Expected Contract Start Date:	19 August 2019

I. BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT

The United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and the Government of Japan concluded an agreement to implement a regional climate change project, titled “Japan-Caribbean Climate Change Partnership (J-CCCP)” in 2014. The project was launched officially in January 2016, with a total budget of USD 15 million equivalent. It is a regional project, participated by eight countries including Belize, the Commonwealth of Dominica, Grenada, the Republic of Guyana, Jamaica, Saint Lucia, St. Vincent and the Grenadines, and the Republic of Suriname.

The project aims to support these eight Caribbean countries in advancing the process of low-emission risk-resilient development by improving energy security and integrating medium to long-term planning for adaptation to climate change. The project has three components (Outcomes):

Outcome 1: NAMAs and NAPs to promote alternative low emission and climate resilient technologies that can support energy transformation and adaptation in economic sectors are formulated and institutionalised

- Output 1.1. Technical support towards national and sub-national institutional and coordination arrangements in Caribbean countries to support the formulation of national roadmaps on the NAP process, including elements for monitoring the progress of their implementation.
- Output 1.2. National teams are trained in the use of tools, methods and approaches to advance the NAP process and budgeting.
- Output 1.3. Business-as-usual greenhouse gas emission baselines established, and climate change mitigation options for selected sectors relevant for the Caribbean region identified.
- Output 1.4. Design and implementation of NAMAs in the Caribbean with MRV systems and NAMA registries in place to monitor their execution.

Outcome 2: Selected mitigation and adaptation technologies transferred and adopted for low emission and climate resilient development in the Caribbean

- Output 2.1 Affordable climate-resilient community-based water harvesting, storage and distribution systems designed, built and rehabilitated in selected target areas (e.g. communal reservoirs, rooftop catchment, rainwater storage tanks and conveyance systems)
- Output 2.2 Crop diversification practices tested for their ability to improve resilience of farmers to climate change impacts.
- Output 2.3 Community-based water capacity and irrigation systems improved or developed to test their ability to raise agricultural productivity.
- Output 2.4 Climate resilient agro-pastoral practices and technologies (e.g. water management and soil fertility) demonstrated in selected target areas.
- Output 2.5 Small-scale infrastructure implemented to reduce climate change and disaster induced losses
- Output 2.6 Energy pilot demonstrations applied to selected adaptation, mitigation and disaster risk management interventions to catalyse low emission climate resilient technology transfer, development and investments in the Caribbean.

Outcome 3: Knowledge Network created in Caribbean to foster South-South and North-South cooperation through sharing of experiences, and knowledge in the area of climate change

- Output 3.1 High level policy events and financial tools to support the implementation of a mitigation actions programs in selected sectors (e.g. fiscal incentives, feed in tariffs, credits and guarantees) and to look at effective practices in NAPs and Community Based Adaptation.
- Output 3.2 Communication campaign on the benefits of mitigation and adaptation, mitigation and disaster risk management interventions to catalyse low emission technologies for sustainable cities in island towns and communities
- Output 3.3 Japan-Caribbean transfer of technical and process-orientated information on experiences, good practice, lessons and examples of relevance to medium to long-term national, sector and local planning and budgeting processes

The project is funded by the Government of Japan (GOJ) and is implemented directly by United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). UNDP Barbados and OECS Sub Regional Office (SRO) serves as lead office for the project, where the Project Management Unit (PMU) therefore sits. The Barbados SRO is responsible for implementing Outcomes 1 and 3 of the project as well as Outcome 2 with respect to OECS countries (Dominica, Grenada, Saint Lucia and Saint Vincent and the Grenadines). UNDP other country offices in Belize, Guyana, Jamaica and Suriname are responsible for implementing Outcome 2 in their respective countries. Outcome 2 primarily focused on the implementation of thirty-seven (37) pilot

projects in all eight countries and related to all six (6) of its outputs. UNDP Panama Regional Hub and UNDP Barbados & the OECS are providing a technical advisory and oversight role to the PMU. Mid-term Evaluation was conducted in December 2017. The project will end in December 2019.

II. EVALUATION PURPOSE, SCOPE AND OBJECTIVES

The evaluation is being conducted as agreed in the project document and in accordance with the UNDP Evaluation Plan for the Regional Bureau for Latin America and the Caribbean's Regional Programme 2018-2021, UNDP's Strategic Plan, and UNDP's Evaluation Policy which sets out a number of guiding principles, norms and criteria for evaluation in the organization.

Amongst the norms that the Policy seeks to uphold, the most important are that the evaluation exercise should be independent, impartial and of appropriate quality, but also that it should be intentional and designed with utility in mind. The evaluation should generate relevant and useful information to support evidence-based decision making.

This evaluation has been designed with dual purposes: 1) to allow national counterparts (in each project country), the donor, Japan) and UNDP meet their accountability objectives, and 2) to capture good practices and lessons learned.

The Terminal Evaluation will focus on the delivery of the project's results as initially planned and as corrected after the Mid-Term Evaluation, and as deemed necessary management. The Terminal Evaluation should also examine impact and sustainability of results, including the contribution to capacity development and the achievement of global environmental benefits/goals and provide recommendations for follow-up activities.

It is expected that the evaluation will follow a forward-looking approach and provide useful and actionable recommendations to increase the likelihood of success relating to impact and sustainability. In line with standard evaluation practice, the scope of the exercise goes beyond assessing whether UNDP is currently "doing things right" in programme execution and management, to a broader assessment of whether on the basis of evidence available, the approach -- as implemented and in comparison with similar approaches implemented by others-- is likely to be the "right approach" to achieve the higher-level results agreed in the start of the project.

The findings, lessons learned and recommendations generated by the evaluation will be used by UNDP, its national counterparts, implementing partners, donors and civil society to improve future projects and programmes and to identify strategies that contribute in achieving the main objective of the project.

Under the direction of the J-CCCP Project Manager and working closely with the J-CCCP Monitoring and Evaluation Analyst, the Lead evaluator is expected to conduct a terminal evaluation and prepare an evaluation report which should assess the achievement of project results. The assessment should focus on criteria such as relevance, efficiency, effectiveness and impact. It should also ultimately include lessons that can improve sustainability of benefits from this project and that also relate specifically to Outcomes in the UNDP Strategic Plan.

The Lead evaluator will review all project activities (according to the criteria identified) to assess the achievements of the project against its key objectives, as set out in the project document and revised results framework. It will also identify factors that have facilitated or impeded the achievement of the objectives. The evaluation will span the entire project process from the beginning to the present, and will include focus on both design and implementation, especially major project activities and results. The evaluation will extend over all specific geographic areas covered by the project, and assess the entire results chain, but will focus more specifically on outputs and planned outcomes, and also the likelihood of achieving planned impacts. Pertinent issues such as management arrangements, procurement and financial procedures, timeliness of interventions, selection of beneficiaries, incorporation of innovative solutions and prospects for sustainability should also be included in the analysis.

More specifically, the evaluation should:

- Review outcomes and the key factors that affect the outcomes (both positive and negative);
- Review and assess the project's partnerships with stakeholders - governments, civil society, other international organisations and provide recommendations for how these partnerships can be ensure sustainability;
- Review and assess the project's interventions as it relates to the Project Document and Quality Assurance Assessment; UNDP Barbados and OECS Evaluation Plan; UNDP Strategic Plan; UNDP Gender Strategy and the UNDP Youth Strategy, and provide recommendations for sustainability.
- Assess how the project has targeted and met current beneficiary needs (as dictated by project document and updated Results Framework) and disaggregated as recommended

The Regional Evaluator will support the above processes and objectives through assistance with desk review, primary and secondary data collection and analysis of information for drafting of findings. The Regional Evaluator will be guided by the Lead evaluator through the methodology and all other aspects of the evaluation process. The J-CCCP Project Manager and M & E Analyst will also provide initial guidance for the Regional Evaluator on expectations relating to the deliverables.

III. EVALUATION CRITERIA AND KEY QUESTIONS

The evaluators will be expected to prepare a more targeted and specific set of questions and to design related survey instrument/questionnaires in line with the above evaluation purpose. The following questions are expected to be included (but not limited to) in the assessment:

1. **Relevance:** concerns the extent to which the project and its intended outputs are consistent with national and local policies and priorities and the needs of intended beneficiaries. Relevance also considers the extent to which the project is responsive to UNDP corporate plan and human development priorities of empowerment and gender equality issues.
 - a) To what extent is the initiative in line with the UNDP mandate, national priorities?
 - b) Were the project's broader and immediate objectives, including specification of targets and identification of beneficiaries and prospects for sustainability clear and realistic? How feasible was it for the project to meet its stated targets and objectives?
 - c) Was the project relevant to the needs of target beneficiaries?
 - d) Was there a clear and logical consistency between, inputs, activities, outputs and progress towards achievement of objectives (quality, quantity and time-frame)?
 - e) Was the project's criteria for the selection of beneficiaries appropriate?
 - f) How has the project contributed to the priorities of UNDP?
 - g) How relevant has the project been to the country's national policies and plans?
 - h) Were the counterparts appropriately involved?
 - i. Were they participating in the identification of their critical problem areas and in the development of technical cooperation strategies and
 - ii. Were they actively supporting the implementation of the project approach?
 - i) Is the local ownership of the project ensured? Of the Government, counterparts and at the level of beneficiaries?

2. **Effectiveness:** is a measure of the extent to which the project's intended results (outputs or outcomes) have been achieved or the extent to which progress toward outputs or outcomes has been achieved.
 - a) To what extent have the outputs and outcome targets been achieved? How has project contributed to its expected outcomes?
 - b) What factors have contributed to achieving or not achieving intended outputs and outcomes?
 - c) What has been the contribution of partners and other organizations to the outcome, and how effective have UNDP partnerships been in contributing to achieving the outcome? Instances of co-financing and its influence on project activities can also be cited (if possible)

- d) To what extent has the project improved the capacities of national implementing partners to advocate on climate change issues?
- e) To what extent has the project partnered with civil society and local communities to promote climate change awareness and actions in the country?
- f) To what extent are the current results benefitting women and men equally?
- g) To what extent have triangular and South-South cooperation and knowledge management contributed to the results attained?
- h) To what extent are project management and implementation participatory and is this participation contributing towards achievement of the project objectives?
- i) In which areas does the project have the greatest achievements? Why and what have been the supporting factors? How can the project build on or expand these achievements?
- j) In which areas does the project have the fewest achievements? What have been the constraining factors and why? How can or could they be overcome?

The evaluation will include a full and systematic assessment of outcomes and outputs produced to date (quantity and quality as compared with results framework/work plan)

3. Efficiency: measures how economically resources or inputs (such as funds, expertise and time) are converted to results. An initiative is efficient when it uses resources appropriately and economically to produce the desired outputs.

- a) Were the strategies utilized adequate? How have they contributed to the maximum intervention efficiency?
- b) Did the management arrangements (centralized management with decentralized support teams) deliver efficient outcomes?
- c) To what extent was the DIM strategy using IP agreements (as compared to NIM or other) efficient in completing activities delivering results?
- d) Did the project design reflect effective analysis of the market to define realistic cost estimates?
- e) Were the use of resources been efficient? Was there economic use of resources?
- f) To what extent was project implementation (procurement, recruitment) guided by effectiveness principles such as accountability, fairness and value for money?
- g) To what extent were quality outputs delivered on time?
- h) To what extent were partnership modalities conducive to the delivery of outputs?
- i) How was monitoring used to manage the project? Was it adequate?

4. Sustainability: measures how economically resources or inputs (such as funds, expertise and time) are converted to results. An initiative is efficient when it uses resources appropriately and economically to produce the desired outputs.

- a) Did the project have the intended impact and/or is the project likely to?
- b) What strategies and mechanisms have been incorporated to the implementation of the project to guarantee the sustainability of expected outputs after the project?
- c) To what extent has a sustainability strategy, including capacity development of key national stakeholders, been developed or implemented?
- d) To what extent were policy and regulatory frameworks in place to support the continuation of benefits?
- e) To what extent have partners committed to providing continuing support?
- f) To what extent do stakeholders support the project's long-term objectives?
- g) To what extent are lessons learned being documented by the project team on a continual basis and shared with appropriate parties who could learn from the project?
- h) How will concerns for gender equality, human rights and human development be taken forward by primary stakeholders?
- i) Assessment of the possible ex-post role of UNDP.

5. Human rights

Does the project have capacity to provide data for a HR & GE responsive evaluation?

Is there baseline data on the situation of rights holders, and in particular women, at the beginning of the intervention?

6. Gender equality

- a) To what extent has gender equality and the empowerment of women been addressed in the design, implementation and monitoring of the project?
- b) Is the gender marker data assigned to this project representative of reality?
- c) To what extent has the project promoted positive changes in gender

7. Impact: measures changes in human development and people's well-being that are brought about by development initiatives, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended.

- a) Did the project have the intended impact and/or is the project likely to?
- b) What specific contribution did the project make? What specific part of this difference can be attributed to the project?

IV. METHODOLOGY

The terminal project evaluation is to be undertaken in accordance with UN evaluation norms and policies, including UN Standards and Norms for Evaluations and UNDP Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation for Development Results and the UNDP Evaluation Guidance document.

The evaluation is expected to take a “theory of change” (TOC) approach to determine causal links between the interventions that UNDP has supported and observed progress in the achievement of expected results at national and local levels. The evaluator(s) can develop a logic model of how UNDP interventions are expected to lead to the expected changes. Evaluation methods should be selected for their rigor in producing empirically based evidence to address the evaluation criteria, to respond to the evaluation questions, and to meet the purpose of the evaluation.

The type of information and methods selected must produce evidence, and they should combine both qualitative and quantitative aspects. The evaluation findings should not rely only on perceptions, but the evidence should be validated by triangulation of different data sources /or methods. The evaluation should be carried out based on a participatory approach, and should seek the views and assessments of all relevant parties. The evaluation will engage a wide array of stakeholders and beneficiaries, including national and local government officials, donors, civil society organizations, academics and subject experts, private sector representatives and community members as needed.

The evaluation should use primary and secondary data and the findings and recommendation should be derived from the following methods:

- Desk review of project related documents such as Project Document, Annual Work Plans (AWPs), Combined Delivery Reports (CDRs), Documents presented for the Project Board and Technical Advisory Group (TAGs), Progress reports and Monitoring Tools
- Consultation with selected stakeholders and counterparts (interviews and focus groups);
- Consultation with selected beneficiaries (interviews and focus groups);
- Technical consultation with the Regional Programme Officer at UNDP Panama Regional Hub
- Field visits to meet regional partners, beneficiaries and other stakeholders, other regional and international key stakeholders. The evaluation methods and parties to be consulted should be selected so that all the participation countries will be covered in the evaluation. This may require use of electronic survey and complement to the other data collection tools.
- Consultation meetings with J-CCCP project staff, project staff and senior management as appropriate.
- Other evidence-based sources of information, survey data, questionnaires and interviews

The Regional Evaluator will support the development of the methodology with guidance from the Lead Evaluator. It is expected that the Regional Evaluator will conduct research and some primary data collection on their own based on the agreed methodology.

V. EVALUATION PRODUCTS (DELIVERABLES)

The Regional Evaluator will conduct a preliminary scoping exercise and provide a desk review report (containing an evaluation matrix, evaluation protocols for different stakeholders and a description of the methodology (using quantitative and qualitative data and means of collection), to be discussed with the Lead Evaluator and to form part of the Inception Report to be submitted. There will be a meeting with the J-CCCP Project Manager and M & E Analyst, before the evaluation commences and before the field missions. There will also be an evaluation reference group consisting of key members of the Regional Office, Project Management Unit and the national counterparts which will also review the deliverables and provide feedback.

1. *Desk review and evaluation plan – forming part of the Evaluation framework/design and implementation plan*

This information shall also be reflected in an evaluation matrix, for example:

SAMPLE EVALUATION MATRIX						
Criteria/ Sub- criteria	(Examples of) questions to be addressed by outcome-level evaluation	What to look for	Data sources	Data collection methods	Indicators/Success Standards	Methods for Analysis

2. *Report on mission interviews and preliminary findings*

The Regional Evaluator should provide a preliminary report on the results of the interviews. This should be submitted to the Lead Evaluator and copied to the J-CCCP Project Manager and M & E Analyst.

3. *Final report on evaluation*

The Regional Evaluator’s report should outline their role in the evaluation and the accompanying findings (as well as feedback comments) from the analysis conducted. This report should be submitted to the Lead Evaluator to form part of the Terminal evaluation report and should also be submitted to the J-CCCP Project Manager and M & E Analyst. Annexes such as TOR, field visits, list of stakeholders interviewed, documents reviewed should also be included.

Please note detailed deliverable schedule below (this is subject to deliverable dates for Lead Evaluator):

Regional Evaluator - J-CCCP Final Evaluation Delivery Schedule - August – October 2019 - REVISED

No.	Deliverables	Sub-tasks	Number of w/days	Tentative dates	Expected result
1	Mission plan and schedule	Meeting with Lead Evaluator; review of documents as guided and prepare mission plan based on inception report	3	19 – 21 August	Preparation for mission; data collection plan etc
2	Report on Mission interviews	Meetings and interviews with stakeholders, beneficiaries and Partners; (site visits)	10	22 August – 4 September	Data from major stakeholders collected and summary of missions shared for debriefing. Summaries will form part of full mission report
		Debriefing with PMU and lead evaluator (last day of the mission)			
3a	Report on the Evaluation Findings and feedback	Findings featuring data analysis and feedback comments conducted should be included	5	23 – 27 September	Finding based on data collection should be reported here. Some recommendations can be noted based on these findings
3b	Support with drafting of Final report	Assistance with drafting of Final report	3	14 – 16 October	Provide support to Lead evaluator with information needed for drafting of final report
Total working days (incl. travel)			21		

VI. EVALUATION REQUIRED COMPETENCIES

The Lead/International Evaluator will be designated as the team leader and will be responsible for collating all information collected and finalizing the reports and deliverables. The Regional Evaluator will provide evaluation support to this process primarily through assistance with data collection and analysis of these findings from the data collected. The Regional Evaluator selected must be independent from any organization that was involved in the project and must not have participated in the project preparation and/or implementation and must not have conflict of interest with project related activities.

The Regional Evaluator shall have prior experience in evaluating similar projects. Experience with UNDP projects is an advantage. The team members must present the following qualifications:

REGIONAL CONSULTANT/EVALUATOR

- Post-graduate in environmental science, environmental studies, development studies, social sciences and/ or other related fields
- Minimum of 5 years of supporting project evaluation and/or implementation experience in the result-based management framework, adaptive management and UNDP Evaluation Policy
- Knowledge of multilateral and bilateral cooperation project development and implementation
- Familiarity in similar countries or regional situations similar to activities conducted under the “Japan-Caribbean Climate Change Partnership” is an advantage.
- Excellent communication skills

RESPONSIBILITIES

- Documentation review and data gathering
- Supporting the collection of all primary and secondary data related to the evaluation.
- Analysing the information collection and providing preliminary findings
- Contributing to the development of the evaluation plan and methodology as guided
- Conducting those elements of the evaluation determined jointly with the Lead/International evaluator and UNDP
- Contributing to the drafting and finalization of the review report as guided by the International/Lead Evaluator/Consultant

VII. a) Selection Criteria- Regional Consultant

1. Technical Capacity and Related Qualifications		Points Obtainable (70 points max.)
1.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Post-graduate degree in environmental science, environmental studies, development studies, statistics, social sciences and/ or other related fields	15
1.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• 5-10 years of supporting project evaluation and/or implementation experience in the result-based management framework, adaptive management and UNDP Evaluation Policy	15
1.3	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Proven track record in evaluation of UN-projects	12
1.4	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Demonstrated knowledge of multilateral and bilateral cooperation project development and implementation	10
1.5	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Strong and supported familiarity in similar countries (in the Caribbean) or regional situations similar to activities conducted under the “Japan-Caribbean Climate Change Partnership” is an advantage.	10
1.6	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Excellent communication skills and report writing skills	8

VII. b) Selection Method

Lowest price and technically compliant offer:

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

- a) responsive/compliant/acceptable*, and
- b) offering the lowest price/cost

*responsive/compliant/acceptable” can be defined as fully meeting the TOR provided

Shortlisted applicants may be interviewed.

VIII. PAYMENT

Payments would be made upon submission and approval of the following deliverables as highlighted in Section VI above:

1. Desk Review report – 15%
2. Report on Mission interviews – 25%
3. Final Report on the Evaluation – 35%
4. Support with drafting of Final report – 25%

IX. ETHICS

This evaluation will be conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG “Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation” available at <http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/102>

The Evaluation Team must safeguard the rights and confidentiality of information providers, interviewees and stakeholders through measures to ensure compliance with legal and other relevant codes governing collection of data and reporting on it. The Evaluation Team must also ensure security of collected information before and after the evaluation and protocols to ensure anonymity and confidentiality of sources of information where that is expected. The information knowledge and data gathered in the evaluation process must also be solely used for the evaluation and not for other uses with the express authorization of UNDP and partners.

X. IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS

The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation resides with [UNDP Barbados and OECS] and will contract the evaluators.

The evaluation team will report directly to the J-CCCP Project Manager assisted by the M&E Analyst. The evaluation team would be required to travel to four representative project countries (Grenada, Jamaica, St. Lucia and Suriname) as well as the lead office in Barbados. The project's National Focal Points (NFPs) will assist in setting up meetings as necessary. Provision regarding office space can be made at the UNDP Barbados office (if necessary). The meeting schedule will be determined in collaboration with the Project Management Unit and the relevant UNDP country offices.

XI. OTHER

Candidates will submit their **CV, Offeror's Letter, and Financial Proposal** with a per day rate. Applications must be submitted in English, and incomplete proposals will not be considered.

Documents to be included when submitting the proposals

- **CV** - In alignment with the required qualifications and relevant experience; including past experience in similar projects;
- **Offeror's Letter** - Include at least 3 professional references (please make sure to include email and phone number of each reference); and
- **Financial Proposal/ Daily Rate** - All envisaged travel costs must be included in the offeror's Financial Proposal. This includes all duty travels, travels to join duty station and repatriation.

XII. ANNEXES

1. Project Document
2. Results Framework (revised)
3. List of partners and key stakeholders
4. Preliminary List of key documents and databases to consult
5. Evaluation matrix template
6. Outline of the evaluation report format
7. Code of conduct forms