**INDIVIDUAL CONSULTANT PROCUREMENT NOTICE** 

Date: 15 July 2019

**Country: Suriname**

**Description of the assignment: International Consultant – Terminal Evaluation (TE) of** **Global Climate Change Alliance Suriname adaptation project (proj ID 00083024**)

**Project name: Global Climate Change Alliance Suriname adaptation project**

**Period of assignment/services (if applicable):**  30 working days - in the period 01 Oct – 15 Dec 2019 (non-consecutive), with at least 12 working days during the month of October in Suriname.

The applicant is requested to submit an offer, including financial proposal (quotation) accompanied by a resume (CV) and P11 history form to the following email address procurement.sr@undp.org no later than **24 July 2019**.

Any request for clarification must be sent in writing, or by standard electronic communication to the address or e-mail indicated above. The Procurement unit will respond in writing or by standard electronic mail and will send written copies of the response, including an explanation of the query without identifying the source of inquiry, to all consultants.

Terminal Evaluation Terms of Reference

INTRODUCTION

In accordance with the agreement between the UNDP and EU, the EU financed GCCA+ Suriname Adaptation Project is required to undergo a terminal evaluation upon completion of implementation. These terms of reference (TOR) sets out the expectations for a Terminal Evaluation (TE) of the *Global climate Change Alliance Suriname Adaptation Project (Proj ID 00083024)*

The essentials of the project to be evaluated are as follows:

Project Summary Table

|  |
| --- |
| Project Title: |
| Project ID: | | *00083024* |  | *(Million US$)* |
|  | |  | EU financing: | 3,000,000 |
| Country: | | Suriname | IA/EA own: | 405,000 |
| Region: | | LAC | Government: |  |
|  | |  | Other: |  |
|  | |  | Total co-financing: | 405,000 |
| Executing Agency: | | UNDP | Total Project Cost: | 3,405,000 |
| Other Partners involved: | | Ministry of Finance, Environment, Office of the President NIMOS, ROGB/NCD; MDS; WLA, Coordination, SBB; ADEk UvS | ProDoc Signature (date project began): | March 2016 |
| (Operational) Closing Date: | 31 Augustus 2019 |

Objective and Scope

The project was designed to: *Contribute to the reduction of Suriname’s vulnerability to the negative effect of climate change by enhancing local capacity to cope with these negative effects and to develop adequate solutions. In the present context, local capacity refers both to skills (culturally defined) as well as to facilitating equipment, tools and instruments.*

The TE will be conducted according to the guidance, rules and procedures established by UNDP and EU as reflected in the UNDP Evaluation Guidance.

The objectives of the evaluation are to assess the achievement of project results, and to draw lessons that can both improve the sustainability of benefits from this project, and aid in the overall enhancement of UNDP programming.

Evaluation approach and method

An overall approach and method[[1]](#footnote-1) for conducting project terminal evaluations of UNDP supported projects developed over time. 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. A set of questions covering each of these criteria have been drafted and are included with this TOR ([*Annex C*](#_TOR_Annex_C:)) The evaluator is expected to amend, complete and submit this matrix as part of an evaluation inception report, and shall include it as an annex to the final report.

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, ministry of Finance, UNDP Country Office, project management team, Coordination Environment of the Office of President, the Programme Manager of the responsible EU Delegation and key stakeholders. The evaluator is expected to assess if the project was able and to which extent, realize the stated objectives.

The goal and objectives of the project are; to reduce Suriname’s vulnerability to negative effects of climate change; to support Suriname in improving its current climate change adaptation capacity and mitigation.

The action will support such capacity enhancing activities in two thematic areas (that also included grant pilot projects) which are reflected in the Expected Result Areas (ERAs).

The first ERA focuses on the generation of additional climate data and change analysis, on improving the understanding of climate change effects and on the development of adaptation measures or strategies in the water management and agricultural sectors.

The second ERA addresses specific capacity needs that are related to mangrove conservation proposing interventions which aim to assist Suriname in developing a number of effective tools to support the mandated ministries and interest groups in their commitment to protect mangroves.

The evaluator will conduct country mission to Paramaribo, Suriname. Interviews are to be conducted in and around Paramaribo including visits to project field sites. The list of stakeholders interviewed should include at minimum the following:

* ADEK; Anton de Kom University of Suriname
* Department of Climate Change and Water (Chair in the Faculty of Technology of ADEK)
* CM Coordination Environment, Office of the President
* IICA; Inter-American institute for Collaboration on Agriculture
* Min Fin; Ministry of Finance, Department for Planning and Development Finance
* MDS; (Meteorological Services)
* NCD; Nature Conservation Division within the Ministry of RGB
* NIMOS; National Institute for Environment and Development in Suriname
* ROGB; Ministry of Physical Planning, Land and Forest Management
* SBB; Foundation for Forest Management and Production Control
* WLA; Hydrological Department Suriname
* The Ministry of Natural Resources
* Stichting Water forum Suriname
* ACT: Amazone Conservation Team;
* Villa Zapakara
* Tropenbos Suriname

The evaluator will review all relevant sources of information, such as the project document, Results Oriented Monitoring report of the EU, project reports – including Annual project reports, project budget revisions, substantial and technical reports, , project files, national strategic and legal documents, and any other materials that the evaluator considers useful for this evidence-based assessment. A list of documents that the project team will provide to the evaluator for review is included in [Annex B](#_TOR_Annex_B:) of this Terms of Reference.

Evaluation Criteria & Ratings

An assessment of project performance will be carried out, based against expectations set out in the Project Logical Framework/Results Framework ([Annex A](#_TOR_Annex_A:)), which provides performance and impact indicators for project implementation along with their corresponding means of verification. The evaluation will at a minimum cover the criteria of: **relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact.**

Mainstreaming

UNDP environmental projects projects are key components in UNDP country programming, as well as regional and global programmes. 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.

Impact

The evaluators 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 whether the project has demonstrated: a) contributed to enhancing local capacity to cope with negative effects of climate change and climate variability, b) contributed to enhance systems to collect data on Climate Change and the environment and c) progress towards adequate management systems and solutions in response the effects from Climate Change and Climate variability.

Conclusions, recommendations & lessons

The evaluation report must include a chapter providing a set of **conclusions**, **recommendations** and **lessons**.

Implementation arrangements

The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation resides with the UNDP CO in *Suriname.* 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 Project Team will be responsible for liaising with the Evaluators team to set up stakeholder interviews, arrange field visits, coordinate with the Government etc.

Evaluation timeframe

The total duration of the evaluation will be *30* days according to the following plan:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Activity** | Timing | Completion Date |
| **Preparation** | 5 days | *20 August* |
| **Evaluation Mission** | *12* days | *22 October* |
| **Draft Evaluation Report** | 10 days | *12 November* |
| **Final Report** | 3 days | *20 November* |

Evaluation deliverables

The evaluation team is expected to deliver the following:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Deliverable | Content | Timing | Responsibilities |
| **Inception Report** | Evaluator provides clarifications on timing and method | No later than 1 week before the evaluation mission. | Evaluator submits to UNDP CO |
| **Presentation** | Initial Findings | End of evaluation mission | To Implementing Partner, project management, UNDP CO |
| **Draft Final Report** | Full report, (per annexed template) with annexes | Within 3 weeks of the evaluation mission | Sent to Implementing Partner, CO, reviewed by RTA, OFPs |
| **Final Report\*** | Revised report | Within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft | Sent to CO for uploading to UNDP ERC. |

\*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.

Team Composition

The evaluation team will be composed of *(1 international evaluator).* The consultant shall have prior experience in evaluating similar projects. Experience with UNDP managed 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 Evaluator must present the following qualifications:

* Master’s degree or higher in Natural Resource Management, environmental management, socio-economics field or other related field
* Minimum *7* years of relevant professional experience
* Substantial knowledge in Climate Change Adaptation programme areas and projects
* At least 5 years of recent experience with results‐based monitoring and evaluation methodologies
* At least 5 years’ experience applying participatory monitoring approaches
* Previous experience with monitoring and evaluation of Capacity strengthening in general and specifically knowledge and information management systems is an advantage
* Recent knowledge of UNDP’s results‐based evaluation policies and procedures
* Previous knowledge with UNDP Monitoring and Evaluation Policy
* Excellent command of the English language (oral and written)
* Knowledgeable of the Suriname context and national circumstances is an advantage
* Good command of the Dutch language is an advantage

Evaluator Ethics

Evaluation consultants will be held to the highest ethical standards and are required to sign a Code of Conduct (Annex E) 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)

Payment modalities and specifications

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| % | Milestone |
| *20%* | Upon submission and acceptance of inception report including work plan |
| *40%* | Following submission and approval of the 1st draft terminal evaluation report |
| *40%* | Following submission and approval (UNDP-CO) of the final terminal evaluation report |

Application process

Individual consultants are requested to email to procurement.sr@undp.org) by 24th July 2019. Individual consultants are invited to submit applications together with their CV for these positions. The application should contain an offer letter, confirmation of immediate availability for assignment current and complete C.V. in English with indication of the e‐mail and phone contact. Costs of local field visits should not be included in the offer.

UNDP applies a fair and transparent selection process that will take into account the competencies/skills of the applicants as well as their financial proposals. Qualified women and members of social minorities are encouraged to apply.

Annex A: Project Logical Framework

# Annex A. Logical Framework

Objective: To reduce Suriname’s vulnerability to negative effects of climate change.

Duration: 42 months

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| COMPONENT 1: Collecting climate data and developing capacity for sustainable water resource management | | | |
| ***Output 1.1 Capacity at the Meteorological Service of Suriname (MDS), Hydraulic Research Division (WLA) and other related institutions strengthened*** | | | |
| ***Narrative***  *This output contributes towards supporting the Hydro-Met departments of the Ministry of Public Works through rehabilitation of existing hydrological and meteorological monitoring stations, procurement and installation of additional automatic hydrological and meteorological stations, office equipment, and specialised software, as well as through capacity building of human resources.* | | | |
| **Output Indicator** | **Baseline** | **End Target** | **Progress to date** |
| * + 1. number of operating meteorological equipment in expansion of the MDS meteorological network     2. Number of operating hydrometric stations in the coastal areas in expansion of WLA hydro network | * + 1. Total 70 rain gauge stations to collect rainfall data, spread in the country. There are currently 6 AWS, 4 synoptic stations and 5 climate stations. Coverage can be estimated at 80% for the coastal regions and 20% for the interior.     2. WLA has a hydrometric basic network consisting of only 18 operating stations in the coastal area. Coverage for the coastal area can be estimated at 50% and no coverage for the interior regions. | 1.1.1) Coverage MDS increased with 4 AWS and 4 raingauges  1.1.2) WLA coverage increased with 5 stations in the interior | Result: Achieved  Increase of Meteorology Department Suriname (MDS) coverage with new equipment 4 raingauges and 2 AWS (automatic weather stations)  Result: Achieved  Interior: 4 achieved  placement of 5 Automatic Water Level Stations (AWLS) in 4 mayor rivers and 1 in the coast. |
| 1.1.2) number of staff trained in operation and maintenance using new guidelines & manuals*, under the project* | 1.1.2) zero staff trained in operation and maintenance of new hydro-meteorological equipment | 1.1.2) At least 2 persons with gender balanced composition trained on operation and maintenance of hydro-met equipment | Result: 3 persons trained in operation and maintenance of newly acquired equipment. |
| ***Output 1.2: Water resources modelling and planning for integrated and sustainable water management undertaken.*** | | | |
| *Narrative*  *This output contributes towards data rescue and the use of historical climatological data in water resource modeling, as input for establishing and updating early warning systems and to reduce disaster risks in Suriname. This output contributes furthermore towards establishing sustainable water resource management* | | | |
| Output Indicator | Baseline | End Target | Progress to date |
| 1.2.1) Number of water management institutions benefitting from access to a new national hydrological / water resources model due to the project intervention. | 1.2.1) Zero water management institutions with access to the new national hydrological / water resources model | 1.2.1) By end year three, at least 2 water management institutions aware of availability and access to improved modelled output information. | Result: No result |
| 1.2.2) Number of automatic data transmission for new hydrological and meteorological network stations | 1.2.2) Zero automatic data transmission locally. | 1.2.2) Automatic daily data transmission for at least 10 hydrological and 6 meteorological network stations by mid-year three. | Result: No result |
| 1.2.3) Status of development of GoS Development  Strategy and land-use  Plans at National/District level | 1.2.3) GoS Development Strategy and land-use  Plans at National/District do not integrate climate information in their formulation and implementation | 1.2.3) At least 2 GoS Development Strategy and land-use Plans at National/District integrate climate information in their formulation and implementation | Result: Achieved  Various aspects of Climate Change integrated in the development strategy 2017-2021 of the GOS: 2 District plans on Disaster Risk Management developed |
| ***Output 1.3: New technologies to reduce the vulnerability of the agricultural sector to climate variability researched and results published.*** | | | |
| ***Narrative***  *This output contributes towards reducing the vulnerability of the agricultural sector to climate variability, by developing new agricultural technologies focused on of climate change adaptation.* | | | |
| **Output Indicator** | **Baseline** | **End Target** | **Progress to date** |
| 1.3.1) Number of research opportunities awarded funding under EU CfP grants, to reduce vulnerability of the agricultural sector to climate variability | 1.3.1) Zero research opportunities awarded funding under EU CfP grants. | 1.3.1) At least three new research opportunities awarded by mid-year one and 6 by end of year three. | Result: 5 awards to date  The 1st research project was on waste and pet-bottles in partnership with Sustainable Recycling Suriname (SURESUR) was completed in the first year. 4 other research collaborations are currently in execution of which one (1) on climate smart agriculture technologies in collaboration with IICA; a second (2nd)one on: multi-disciplinary landscape assessment (MLA) related to agriculture by Tropenbos International Suriname (TBIS) and the Centre of Agricultural Research in Suriname (CELOS); the third (3rd): research on the use of mangrove ecosystem services in coastal communities of 4 districts by Development Art Foundation (DAF) and the fourth (4th) on potential changes of the biodiversity in the Bigi Pan Lagoon, conducted by the Anton de Kom University of Suriname (ADeK UvS). |
| 1.3.2) Number of appropriate technologies developed from the CfP “grant facility” research initiatives in the agricultural sectors. | 1.3.2) Zero innovative projects take place within the agricultural sector | 1.3.2) At least three new agricultural focused technologies developed by end of year two that link to the relevant outputs of the JCCCP (JCCCP Outputs 2.2-2.5). | Result: Three technologies developed to date  In collaboration with IICA design and implementation of rainwater harvesting and reservoir in combination with (2) protective structures (greenhouses) and two (2) irrigation systems (drip-irrigation and micro-sprinkler) have been designed. |
| 1.3.3) Number of knowledge sharing events on the opportunities and technologies developed for CC practitioners, researchers and policy-makers. | No compilation of number of knowledge sharing events available. | 1.3.3) At least two national/regional knowledge sharing events per year (6 in total) with at least one associated with horticulture partnering initiatives. | Result: 3 events in year two  In March 2018 a delegation of 8 persons from water related institutions and Ministries and the GCCA+ PMU participated at the 8th World Water Forum in Brasilia.  In December 2017 a Climate Change Learning event was organized where amongst others the IICA presented preliminary results under the GCCA+ Suriname Adaptation Project on challenges and climate change adaptation measures in agriculture. A total of 154 student from the districts of Marowijne and Para and 245 persons from institutions nationwide participated in this event.  In partnership with the Embassy of the United States of America a Regional Mangrove Experts Session was organized for Mangrove research in the Guyana Shield. |
| COMPONENT 2:Essential tools and structures for sustainable management, focused on conservation of mangrove ecosystems in place. | | | |
| **Output 2. 1 - National Mangrove Strategy endorsed** | | | |
| *Narrative*  *The Mangrove Strategy is the first step in developing and implementing a governance system aimed at the sustainable use of mangrove ecosystems in Suriname.* | | | |
| **Output Indicator** | **Baseline** | **End target** | **Progress to date** |
| 2.1.1) Status of a national mangrove strategy policy document for Suriname. | 2.1.1) There is currently no statutory policy or plan for the 1,100 km2 of mangroves in Suriname. Activities for conserving mangroves are ad hoc and un-coordinated with on-going plans and programmes. | 2.1.1) Final proposal Mangrove Strategy Policy Document is prepared and presented to Ministry of RGB and ready for formal endorsement by midyear three | Result: Target Not yet achieved,  The Project Manager for implementation of activities on the development of the National Mangrove Strategy has signed contract and has started working. |
| 2.1.2 ) a) Status of development of codes of practice, tailored to mangrove management  Status of development of Cross Sectoral guidelines | 2.1.2) There are no coastal regulatory building codes that provide advice/recommendations on developments close to mangroves.  There is also no coastal protection guidance manual (or environmental policy guidelines) to help developers to design climate resilient coastal developments or structures. | 2.1.2) Draft Code of Practice for mangrove conservation and sustainable management /use of Mangrove ecosystems produced by end of year three.  One (1) cross-sectoral guideline for climate-resilient coastal planning is produced and disseminated | Result: Not achieved  Code of practice and the guidelines not developed yet, these will be developed with the Mangrove Strategy  Draft Coastal Protection Act developed which is expected to be approved by Parliament. During the development of the National Mangrove Strategy, recommendations for codes of practice and draft regulations will be produced. |
| 2.1.3 Number of overlapping/supporting actions with previous or current projects implemented | 2.1.3. ZERO overlapping/supporting actions with the GEF Environmental Conventions Mainstreaming project, Japan Caribbean Climate Change Partnership (JCCCP) nor previous projects such as the Integrated Coastal Zone Management (ICZM) project report, Suriname Coastal Protected Area Management Project (SCPAM). | 2.1.3) At least 3 complementary activities are taking place with the GEF Environmental Mainstreaming project by the end of year two.  At least 3 activities are implemented by end of year two. | |  | | --- | | Result: 2 complementary activities in year two  GCCA+ project and the JCCCP have collaborated in various areas covering the development of the National climate risk and vulnerability report, the Increase of capacity amongst the District commissioner’s offices, the installation of innovative greenhouse constructions in schools, using pet-pottles. Joint awareness activities reported under the other outputs include: Knowledge Sharing event on climate Change and climate change adaptation and the media training executed under output 2.6 | |
| **Output 2. 2 - Economic (monetary) valuation study of the mangrove ecosystems conducted** | | | |
| ***Narrative*** *An economic valuation study shall be initiated to help identify the selection of specific mangrove-related products to be included for more detailed financial strategic assessment* | | | |
| **Output Indicator** | **Baseline** | **End target** | **Progress to date** |
| 2.2.1) Number of economic valuation report of Mangrove area.  Number of small entrepreneurs in coastal areas trained in sustainable income alternatives due to the project intervention. | 2.2.1 Economic valuation assessment of Mangrove Ecosystem in Bigi Pan; on fisheries and tourism  Zero of small entrepreneurs in coastal areas trained in sustainable income alternatives due to the project intervention. | 2.2.1) At least 1 Economic Valuation report of Mangrove Area  At least 50 potential local small entrepreneurs trained in sustainable alternatives including women and youth by end of year three. | Result: Partially achieved  Zero Economic Valuation report of Mangrove Area  Training of 12 tour guides in Mangrove area of Coronie and  Training of 55 community members trained in film making for awareness purposes |
| 2.2.2) Number of economic strategies identified that support the “value added” products identified in Activity 2.2a. | 2.2.2) No economic strategies are set out to encourage mangrove conservation in Suriname. At present, most local communities and populations lack the capacity to produce and market potential new products from mangrove areas. | 2.2.2) At least 1 new market initiative facilitated by private sector for improved access to micro-credit and capacity-building programs | Target Not yet achieved  Existing micro-credit facilitating organizations and existing capacity building programs have been identified. |
| ***Output 2.3 - Existing management plans of 4 coastal MUMAs updated and implemented*** | | | |
| ***Narrative***  *Management plans for 4 coastal Multiple Use Management Areas (MUMAs) were created during the Suriname Coastal Protected Area Management (SCPAM). These plans are being reviewed based on recommendations from the SCPAM and PA- Management evaluation of NCD in Collaboration with Conservation International Suriname.* | | | |
| **Output Indicator** | **Baseline** | **End Target** | **Progress to date** |
| 2.3.1 MUMA Management Plans are updated and implemented with updated land use guidelines and tailored towards improving mangrove conservation. | 2.3.1) Existing management plans exist for coastal MUMAs, though the only recently accepted plan is for Bigi Pan MUMA. | 2.3.1) Four (4) updated MUMA management plans by the end of year two. | Result: Target not yet achieved  Under leadership of the NCD, 3 Multi-use management Area (MUMA) management plans in process in revision and update. |
| 2.3.2 % of the key actors have signed on to the updated management plan documents, declaring adherence to proposed zoning regulations | 2.3.2) Linked to this, most management plans do not involve local communities in the implementation of mangrove conservation measures and hence do not integrate agricultural and water use livelihood challenges | 2.3.2) Three (3) district council plans, including investment plans, incorporate MUMA zoning regulations and integrate future recurrent and capital expenditure needs by end of year three. | Result: No result to date  No progress to report, this activity can commence after completion of 2.3.1 |
| 2.3.2) Monitoring of mangrove land cover is in place as stated within the management plans. | 2.3.2) There is no formalized monitoring of mangrove extent and health (or use). Uncoordinated mangrove monitoring takes place and there are no clear indicators to demonstrate biodiversity improvements. | 2.3.2) M&E programs for mangrove land cover and health developed and implemented | Result: Target Achieved  Mangrove monitoring is incorporated in the National Forest Inventory (NFI) System of forest cover monitoring. Permanent sample plots projected for data collection |
| ***Output 2.4: Establish and adequately equip management structures at the 4 coastal MUMAs*** | | | |
| ***Narrative:*** *Institutional procedures and capacities aligned to new regulatory framework for mangrove management and coordinated with sectoral policies (Project Management and Monitoring developed and implemented), and capacity increased.* | | | |
| 2.4.1) Number of staff trained to implement new regulations under the National Strategy | 2.4.1) Zero trained staff in key aspects of MUMA management related to National Mangrove Strategy. | 2.4.1) At least 7 core staff trained and assigned for each MUMA | No result to date  Meetings and discussion held with the Deputy Permanent Secretary of the Ministry of RGB for identification and assignment of cores staff for MUMA’s |
| 2.4.2) Extent to which procedures and capacities are aligned to new guidelines for mangrove management | 2.4.2) Zero alignment of MUMA management needs with necessary knowledge and capacities. | 2.4.2) By the end of the project MUMA management needs in staff knowledge and capacities aligned with each other | No result to date  Connected with the assessment to update MUMA management plans, the capacity gap and required alignment determined. Based on the updated MUMA Management Plans, a capacity building plan will be developed and executed |
| ***Output 2. 5 – Patrolling, monitoring and enforcement activities improved*** | | | |
| ***Narrative***  *The Nature Conservation division of the Ministry of Physical Planning, Land and Forestry is responsible for patrolling and enforcement aimed at conserving protected Areas and wildlife in Suriname. This output serves to increase the capabilities and the effectiveness of this unit.* | | | |
| 2.5.1) Status of briefs, facts sheets on patrolling, monitoring and enforcement that are aligned with updated MUMAs plans. | 2.5.1) No information of Patrolling, monitoring and enforcement activities | 2.5.1) By the end of each year, (1) annual briefing notes, and fact sheets on patrolling, monitoring and enforcement activities are produced and disseminated. | Result: Partially achieved  One briefing note reflecting the enforcement activities;  Fact sheet being compiled with relevant patrolling and monitoring information |
| 2.5.2) Number of persons trained to implement the new National Mangrove Strategy and supporting guidelines/codes of practice. | 2.5.2) Capacity at the national level relevant to the integrated planning and management of mangrove is limited to a core group of experts within GoS and research institutions. Baseline within line Ministry is zero. | 2.5.2) By mid-Year three 30 successful trainees from a national training seminar for relevant national ministries and organizations on climate-resilient coastal planning conducted. | Result: No result  No progress to report; this activity is planned after development of National Mangrove Strategy |
| 2.5.3) Number of national sectoral planners with improved understanding of climate change risks and adaptation measures. | 2.5.3) Zero integrated framework and human and institutional capacity for assessing, planning for, and addressing climate change-induced risks in coastal areas | 2.5.3) By the end of year three, At least 8 disaster management teams of 17 district commissioner’s offices and national sectoral planners have improved understanding of Climate change risks and adaptation measures and an up-to date district disaster risk management plan | Result: 4 District Commissioner offices trained  Of the total of 17 District commissioner’s offices, 4 have been trained in Disaster Risk Management. Staff has increased knowledge of Climate Change as related disaster risks |
| ***Output 2.6 - Public and community awareness campaigns designed and implemented*** | | | |
| ***Narrative***  *The output is important for creating awareness and ownership in all layers of the community, especially the vulnerable groups. Ownership will increase the efficiency and durability of the program and will help society adapt to the effects of climate change.* | | | |
| 2.6.1) a) Number of community members with increased awareness of sustainable mangrove management and resource use, including women and youth due to the project intervention.  b) percentage of coastal population is exposed to mangrove conservation messages via mass media | 2.6.1) Zero of community members with increased awareness of sustainable mangrove management and resource use, including women and youth | 2.6.1) At least One hundred (100) community members involved in awareness activities regarding sustainable mangrove management and resource use, including women and youth.  - 30% of all coastal populations have been exposed to mangrove protection knowledge projects by end of year three. | Result: 1839 community members trained  Dissemination of information on Mangrove Ecosystems was as follows:  -854 community members spread across Paramaribo, Commewijne, Coronie and Nickerie reached through Stichting DAF.  -12 community members in Coronie trained through Stichting SORTS.  -973 community members in Nickerie reached through AdeK SMNR.  The coastal population is exposed to mangrove conservation knowledge through the radio program “Wist je dat” and 3175 followers of UNDP facebook page |
| 2.6.2) Number of members of Association of Journalists in Suriname (AJS) trained and/or sensitized on mangrove ecosystem related issues.  ii)Number of male and female communication officers from participating institutes trained. | 2.6.2) Zero training of media/ journalists only have a basic understanding of mangroves in relation to the coastal area. | 2.6.2) At least 15 of reporters/media in Suriname trained/sensitized on mangrove related issues by end of year three.  At least 10 of trained officers are female. | Result: 21 media workers trained; 19F, 3M  21 media workers (of which 85% female) representing 60% of registered members of the Association of Journalists in Suriname were trained/sensitized on climate change reporting, mangrove conservation and related issues. |

Annex B: List of Documents to be reviewed by the evaluators

*Non- limitative*

*1 UNDAF 2012 – 2016, UNMSDF 2017-2021;*

*2 UNDP CPD 2012 – 2016, UNDP CPD 2017 - 2021;*

*3 Project Document;*

*4 Annual work plans;*

*5 Annual Project reports;*

*6 Project Progress Reports;*

*7 Minutes from Project Steering Board meetings;*

*8 ToRs for Consultancies;*

*9 Workshop reports;*

*10 Multi Annual Development Plan (OP 2012 – 2016), (OP 2017 – 2021);*

*11 Risk Logs;*

*12 UNDP’s Handbook on Monitoring and Evaluation for Results;*

*13 Technical Report Environment Atlas;*

*14 Technical Report National Mangrove strategy;*

*15 Grant progress reports*

*16 Results Oriented Monitoring report (ROM)*

*17 Suriname Nationally Determined Contribution (NDC)*

*18 Draft National Adaptation Plan (NAP)*

Annex C: Evaluation Questions

*This is a generic list, to be further detailed with more specific questions by CO and EU Delegation based on the particulars of the project.*

| **Evaluative Criteria Questions** | | **Indicators** | **Sources** | **Methodology** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Relevance: How does the project relate to the main objectives of the GEF focal area, and to the environment and development priorities at the local, regional and national levels? | | | | |
|  | * How realistic were the project’s intended outcomes? | * Degree to which the project supports national environmental Objectives | * Project documents and evaluations | * Document analysis |
|  | * Were the project’s objectives and components relevant, according to the social and political context? | * Degree of coherence between the project and national priorities, policies and strategies | * Min of Finance; Environment Coordination (Office of the president), Project team, UNDP | * Interviews |
|  | * Were counterpart resources (funding, staff, and facilities), enabling legislation, and adequate project management arrangements in place at project entry? | * Appreciation from national stakeholders with respect to adequacy of project design and implementation to national realities and existing capacities | * Project partners and relevant stakeholders | * Interviews |
|  | * Are the stated assumptions and risks logical and robust? And did they help to determine activities and planned outputs? | * Coherence between needs expressed by national stakeholders and UNDP CPDpriorities | * Extent to which the project is actually implemented in line with incremental cost argument | * Document analysis |
| Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved? | | | | | |
|  | * To what extent were project results achieved? | * See indicators in the project document   results framework and log frame | * Project documents and evaluations | * Document   analysis | |
|  | * In what ways are long-term emerging effects to the project foreseen? | * Level of coherence between project expected results and project design internal logic | * Environment Coordination (Office of the president), MDS;Project team, UNDP | * Interviews | |
|  | * Were the relevant representatives from government and civil society involved in project implementation, including as part of the project steering committee? | * Level of coherence between project design and project implementation approach | * Project partners and relevant stakeholders | * Document analysis | |
|  | * Was an intergovernmental committee given responsibility to liaise with the project team, recognizing that more than one ministry should be involved? | * Level of coherence between project design and project implementation approach | * Project documents and evaluations | * Document analysis | |
| Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards? | | | | | |
|  | * Was adaptive management used and if so, how did these modifications to the project contribute to obtaining the objectives? | * Quality of existing information systems   in place to identify emerging risks and other issues | * Project documents and evaluations | * Document analysis | |
|  | * How did institutional arrangements influence the project’s achievement of results? | * Quality of risk mitigations strategies   developed and followed | * ROGB, MDS; WLA; Environment Coordination (Office of the president) ; Project team, UNDP | * Interviews | |
|  | * Were the indicators provided in the Project Document effectively used for measuring progress and performance? | * Occurrence of change in project design/ implementation approach (i.e. restructuring) when needed to improve   project efficiency | * Project documents and evaluations * Environment Coordination (Office of the president); NIMOS, Min of Finance Project team, UNDP | * Interviews | |
|  | * Were baseline conditions, methodology and roles and responsibilities well-articulated at project start-up? | * Occurrence of change in project design/ implementation approach (i.e. restructuring) when needed to improve   project efficiency | * Project documents and ROM report | * Interviews; Document analysis | |
| Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, social-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results? | | | | | |
|  | * In what way may the benefits from the project be maintained or increased in the future? | * See indicators in project document   results framework and log frame | * Project documents and reports | * Document analysis | |
|  | * Is there sufficient public/stakeholder awareness in support of the project’s long-term objectives? | * Evidence that particular partnerships/linkages will be sustained | * NIMOS, Project team, UNDP; Grantees | * Interviews | |
|  | * Which of the project’s aspects deserve to be replicated in future initiatives? | * Evidence that particular practices will be sustained | * NIMOS, Project team, UNDP; Environment Coordination (Office of the president); | * Interviews | |
|  | * Do the legal frameworks, policies, and governance structures and processes within which the project operates pose risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project benefits? | * Evidence that Mainstreaming has taken place and SLM concepts are integrated in multiple sectors’ policies. | * Project documents and reports | * Document analysis | |
| **Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward, reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status?** | | | | | |
|  | * Are there verifiable reductions in stress on ecological systems? | * See indicators in project document results framework and log frame | * Project documents and evaluations | * Document analysis | |
|  | * Is there demonstrated progress towards these impact achievements? | * NFIS; Mangrove Monitoring Geo Portal | * SBB * Project team * Project partners and relevant stakeholders | * Interviews | |

Annex D: Evaluation Consultant Code of Conduct and Agreement Form

**Evaluators:**

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 imitations, findings and recommendations.
7. Should reflect sound accounting procedures and be prudent in using the resources of the evaluation.

**Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form[[2]](#footnote-2)**

**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: Evaluation Report Outline[[3]](#footnote-3)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **i.** | Opening page:   * Title of UNDP supported EU financed project * UNDP and EU project ID#s. * Evaluation time frame and date of evaluation report * Region and countries included in the project * UNDP Operational Program/Strategic Program * Implementing Partner and other project partners * Evaluation team members * Acknowledgements |
| **ii.** | Executive Summary   * Project Summary Table * Project Description (brief) * Evaluation Rating Table * Summary of conclusions, recommendations and lessons |
| **iii.** | Acronyms and Abbreviations  (See: UNDP Editorial Manual[[4]](#footnote-4)) |
| **1.** | Introduction   * Purpose of the evaluation * Scope & Methodology * Structure of the evaluation report |
| **2.** | Project description and development context   * Project start and duration * Problems that the project sought to address * Immediate and development objectives of the project * Baseline Indicators established * Main stakeholders * Expected Results |
| **3.** | Findings |
| **3.1** | Project Design / Formulation   * Analysis of LFA/Results Framework (Project logic /strategy; Indicators) * Assumptions and Risks * Lessons from other relevant projects (e.g., same focal area) incorporated into project design * Planned stakeholder participation * Replication approach * UNDP comparative advantage * Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector * Management arrangements |
| **3.2** | Project Implementation   * Adaptive management (changes to the project design and project outputs during implementation) * Partnership arrangements (with relevant stakeholders involved in the country/region) * Feedback from M&E activities used for adaptive management * Project Finance: * Monitoring and evaluation: design at entry and implementation (\*) * UNDP and Implementing Partner implementation / execution (\*) coordination, and operational issues |
| **3.3** | Project Results   * Overall results (attainment of objectives) * Relevance * Effectiveness & Efficiency * Country ownership * Mainstreaming * Sustainability * Impact |
| **4.** | Conclusions, Recommendations & Lessons   * 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 * Best and worst practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance and success |
| **5.** | Annexes   * ToR * Itinerary * List of persons interviewed * Summary of field visits * List of documents reviewed * Evaluation Question Matrix * Questionnaire used and summary of results * Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form |

Annex F: Evaluation Report Clearance Form

Evaluation Report Reviewed and Cleared by

UNDP Suriname Office

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

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

**OFFEROR’S LETTER TO UNDP**

**CONFIRMING INTEREST AND AVAILABILITY**

**FOR THE INDIVIDUAL CONTRACTOR (IC) ASSIGNMENT**

Date

*(Name of Resident Representative/Bureau Director)*

United Nations Development Programme

*(Specify complete office address)*

Dear Sir/Madam:

I hereby declare that:

1. I have read, understood and hereby accept the Terms of Reference describing the duties and responsibilities of [*indicate title of assignment*] under the [*state project title*];
2. I have also read, understood and hereby accept UNDP’s General Conditions of Contract for the Services of the Individual Contractors;
3. I hereby propose my services and I confirm my interest in performing the assignment through the submission of my CV which I have duly signed and attached hereto as Annex 1;
4. In compliance with the requirements of the Terms of Reference, I hereby confirm that I am available for the entire duration of the assignment, and I shall perform the services in the manner described in my proposed approach/methodology which I have attached hereto as Annex 3 [delete this item if the TOR does not require submission of this document];
5. I hereby propose to complete the services based on the following payment rate: *[please check the box corresponding to the preferred option]:*

* An all-inclusive daily fee of [*state amount in words and in numbers indicating currency]*
* A total lump sum of [*state amount in words and in numbers, indicating exact currency]*, payable in the manner described in the Terms of Reference.

1. For your evaluation, the breakdown of the abovementioned all-inclusive amount is attached hereto as Annex 2;
2. I recognize that the payment of the abovementioned amounts due to me shall be based on my delivery of outputs within the timeframe specified in the TOR, which shall be subject to UNDP's review, acceptance and payment certification procedures;
3. This offer shall remain valid for a total period of \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ days [*minimum of 90 days*] after the submission deadline;
4. I confirm that I have no first degree relative (mother, father, son, daughter, spouse/partner, brother or sister) currently employed with any UN agency or office *[disclose the name of the relative, the UN office employing the relative, and the relationship if, any such relationship exists];*
5. If I am selected for this assignment, I shall *[please check the appropriate box]:*

* Sign an Individual Contract with UNDP;
* Request my employer *[state name of company/organization/institution]* to sign with UNDP a Reimbursable Loan Agreement (RLA), for and on my behalf. The contact person and details of my employer for this purpose are as follows:

1. I hereby confirm that *[check all that applies]*:

* At the time of this submission, I have no active Individual Contract or any form of engagement with any Business Unit of UNDP;
* I am currently engaged with UNDP and/or other entities for the following work:

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Assignment** | **Contract Type** | **UNDP Business Unit / Name of Institution/Company** | **Contract Duration** | **Contract Amount** |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

* I am also anticipating conclusion of the following work from UNDP and/or other entities for which I have submitted a proposal:

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Assignment** | **Contract Type** | **Name of Institution/ Company** | **Contract Duration** | **Contract Amount** |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

1. I fully understand and recognize that UNDP is not bound to accept this proposal, and I also understand and accept that I shall bear all costs associated with its preparation and submission and that UNDP will in no case be responsible or liable for those costs, regardless of the conduct or outcome of the selection process.
2. ***If you are a former staff member of the United Nations recently separated, please add this section to your letter:*** I hereby confirm that I have complied with the minimum break in service required before I can be eligible for an Individual Contract.
3. I also fully understand that, if I am engaged as an Individual Contractor, I have no expectations nor entitlements whatsoever to be re-instated or re-employed as a staff member.
4. Are any of your relatives employed by UNDP, any other UN organization or any other public international organization?

C:\Users\jennifer.pareja\Desktop\bpi.PNGYES  NO If the answer is "yes", give the following information:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Relationship** | **Name of International Organization** |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

1. Do you have any objections to our making enquiries of your present employer?

YES  NO 

1. Are you now, or have you ever been a permanent civil servant in your government’s employ?

YES  NO  If answer is "yes", WHEN?

1. REFERENCES: List three persons, not related to you, who are familiar with your character and qualifications.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Full Name** | **Full Address** | **Business or Occupation** |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

1. Have you been arrested, indicted, or summoned into court as a defendant in a criminal proceeding, or convicted, fined or imprisoned for the violation of any law (excluding minor traffic violations)?

YES  NO  If "yes", give full particulars of each case in an attached statement.

I certify that the statements made by me in answer to the foregoing questions are true, complete and correct to the best of my knowledge and belief. I understand that any misrepresentation or material omission made on a Personal History form or other document requested by the Organization may result in the termination of the service contract or special services agreement without notice.

DATE: SIGNATURE:

NB. You will be requested to supply documentary evidence which support the statements you have made above. Do not, however, send any documentary evidence until you have been asked to do so and, in any event, do not submit the original texts of references or testimonials unless they have been obtained for the sole use of UNDP.

**Annexes** *[please check all that applies]***:**

* CV shall include Education/Qualification, Processional Certification, Employment Records /Experience
* Breakdown of Costs Supporting the Final All-Inclusive Price as per Template
* Brief Description of Approach to Work (if required by the TOR)

**BREAKDOWN OF COSTS**

**SUPPORTING THE ALL-INCLUSIVE FINANCIAL PROPOSAL**

1. **Breakdown of Cost by Components:**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Cost Components** | **Unit Cost** | **Quantity** | **Total Rate for the Contract Duration** |
| 1. **Personnel Costs** |  |  |  |
| Professional Fees |  |  |  |
| Life Insurance |  |  |  |
| Medical Insurance |  |  |  |
| Communications |  |  |  |
| Land Transportation |  |  |  |
| Others (pls. specify) |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| 1. **Travel Expenses to Join duty station** |  |  |  |
| Round Trip Airfares to and from duty station |  |  |  |
| Living Allowance |  |  |  |
| Travel Insurance |  |  |  |
| Terminal Expenses |  |  |  |
| Others (pls. specify) |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| 1. **Duty Travel** |  |  |  |
| Round Trip Airfares |  |  |  |
| Living Allowance |  |  |  |
| Travel Insurance |  |  |  |
| Terminal Expenses |  |  |  |
| Others (pls. specify) |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Total |  |  |  |

1. **Breakdown of Cost by Deliverables\***

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Deliverables**  *[list them as referred to in the TOR]* | **Percentage of Total Price (Weight for payment)** | **Amount** |
| Inception  Report |  |  |
| Presentation |  |  |
| Draft Final  Report |  |  |
| Final Report |  |  |
| Total |  |  |

*\*Basis for payment tranches*

1. For additional information on methods, see the [Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results](http://www.undp.org/evaluation/handbook), Chapter 7, pg. 163 [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. The Report length should not exceed *40* pages in total (not including annexes). [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. UNDP Style Manual, Office of Communications, Partnerships Bureau, updated November 2008 [↑](#footnote-ref-4)