



*Empowered lives.
Resilient nations.*

TERMS OF REFERENCE

UNDP-Midterm Review (MTR) of the Women in Leadership in Samoa (WILS) Project

A. Introduction:

The project started in April 2018 and is in its second year of implementation. In line with the UNDP-Guidance on MTRs, this MTR process was initiated before the submission of the second Project Implementation Report (PIR). This ToR sets out the expectations for this MTR. The MTR process must follow the guidance outlined in the document Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, Financed Projects.

B. Project Description or Context and Background:

The UNDP and UN Women, grounded in the vision of equality enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations, works for the elimination of discrimination against women and girls; the empowerment of women; and the achievement of equality between women and men as partners and beneficiaries of development, human rights, humanitarian action and peace and security.

Through the Governance and Poverty Reduction Unit (GPRU) of the UNDP and the Women's Political Empowerment and Leadership Programme (WPEL) of the UNWomen, the WILS project works with regional partners to address country specific barriers to women's full political participation. It works with government, non-governmental organizations, state owned corporations, civil society organizations and communities to help create an institutional and social environment that welcomes and supports women's participation in leadership and decision making, political participation, increasing the number of women candidates and enhancing their support networks.

The WILS Project seeks to build and reinforce progress already made on gender equality and women's leadership in Samoa. It is Phase II of the Increasing Political Participation of Women in Samoa (IPPWS) Project and builds on the work completed since the project began in 2015.

WILS targets the 'leadership' development of women as individuals and as a group, to work together to address women's leadership and gender equality issues, and to enhance their exercise of leadership. The Women in Leadership in Samoa (WILS) Project is a three-year project implemented by the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), UN Women with funding from the Australian Government in partnership with the Government of Samoa under the overall leadership of the WILS Steering Committee. The Steering Committee comprises of representatives of the Samoa government's (Ministry of Women, Community & Social Development), Ministry of Finance, Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade (MFAT), community (SUNDO)m DFAT and UN agencies (UNDP and UN Women).



*Empowered lives.
Resilient nations.*

Recent achievements included the 2013 Constitutional 10 per cent quota for women parliamentary seats, establishment of the Family Court Act (2014), Family Safety Act (2013) and the National Policy for Gender Equality (2016-2020), the 2017 Ombudsman Inquiry into Domestic Violence, the Samoa Law Reform Commission's 2016 Report into CEDAW Compliance, as well as the 2017 Samoa Family Safety Study.

However, despite significant advances made in promoting and addressing gender equality in Samoa, there remain, enduring systemic, institutional, cultural, attitudinal and financial barriers that continue to prevent women from engaging effectively in decision making roles at the community, village and national parliament levels, and including boards of public enterprises (see Table 1 of project document). Women's leadership contribution at all levels of society need encouragement, support and acknowledgement. Working with men and youth across different levels to address these barriers is also needed to address gender equality issues.

Within its limited scope, resourcing and timeframe, this Project will not address all those barriers, most of which are deeply rooted in societal belief systems and practices. Social change takes time and requires sustained leadership, partners' cooperative commitment and stakeholders' support. A key lesson from the IPPWS is that the work to increase the number of women representation needs sustained and long-term investment and support. Within a targeted focus on 'Women in Leadership', this Project is one stepping stone to building and encouraging such a long term process of looking at addressing some of the key women representation's issues in Samoa. Effective implementation of initiatives under this Project relies on genuine collaboration amongst key partners and stakeholders. It seeks to give more emphasis and recognition to women leadership in all forms, not just formal political leadership, but also women's leadership (current, potential and emerging) in families, villages, communities, businesses, and the government, as well as the private sector.

The Project Theory of Change and a set of indicative activities and partnerships were validated by partners and stakeholders in August 2017. The Project has four major outputs and a long-term outcome: strengthened women's leadership and gender equality in Samoa.

Three concepts: women in leadership, theory of change, and Samoanisation guide the conceptual underpinning of this Project. These are defined below.

The Project targets the 'leadership' development of women as individuals and mostly importantly as a group - to try and work together to address women's leadership and gender equality issues and to enhance their exercise of leadership for the common good of their villages, constituencies and the country. This Project adopts the following definition in its 'Women in Leadership' focus:

A political process of women mobilising people and resources in pursuit of shared and negotiated goals within government, private sector, and civil society (Kenway, Bradley & Lokot, 2013, p. iii)



*Empowered lives.
Resilient nations.*

Samoa's system of governance is a blend of neo-traditional and contemporary systems of governance. The Project has adopted a Samoanisation concept where learning from international best practices is valued, but local involvement and partnerships facilitate a participative process for the Project to have value added. Samoanisation is about localization – making interventions relevant to local context and seeking locally driven strategies. Specialist and technical expertise are provided when needed, complemented with involvement of partners and local counterparts to provide local insights and contextual knowledge. This Samoanisation hopes to contribute to the sustainability and continuity of initiatives and activities beyond the Project's timeframe.

The project is implemented over the course of 3.5 years and started in 2018. WILS is a joint programme between UNDP and UN Women, with funding from the Australian Government in partnership with the Government of Samoa.

Project monitoring and evaluation is conducted in accordance with established UNDP and UNWomen procedures and is provided by the project team and the UNDP Multi-Country Office (UNDP-MCO) in Apia with support from the UNDP Regional Bureau for Asia-Pacific (RBAP) region in Bangkok.

The total funds for this project is AUD \$ 3 million.

C. Objectives of the MTR:

The objective of this consultancy is to undertake the mid-term review of the WILS Project.

The MTR will assess progress towards the achievement of the project objectives and outcomes as specified in the Project Document, and assess early signs of project success or failure with the goal of identifying the necessary realistic practical changes to be made in order to set the project on-track to achieve its intended results within the remaining lifespan of the project. The MTR will also review the project's strategy, its risks to sustainability.

D. Approach and Methodology

The MTR must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The MTR consultant will review all relevant sources of information including documents prepared during the preparation phase (i.e. PIF, UNDP Initiation Plan, UNDP Environmental & Social Safeguard Policy, the Project Document, project reports including Annual Project Review/PIRs, project budget revisions,



*Empowered lives.
Resilient nations.*

lesson learned reports, national strategic and legal documents, and any other materials that the team considers useful for this evidence-based review).

The MTR consultant is expected to follow a collaborative and participatory approach¹ ensuring close engagement with the Project Team, government counterparts, the UNDP Country Office(s), UNDP Technical Adviser, UN Women and other key stakeholders.

Engagement of stakeholders is vital to a successful MTR. Stakeholder involvement should include interviews with stakeholders who have project responsibilities, including but not limited to the WILS stakeholders and agencies including Government, NGOs, Private Sector and Community Representatives, Project Management Unit, executing agencies, senior officials and task team/ component leaders, key experts and consultants in the subject area, Project Board, project stakeholders, academia, local government and CSOs, etc. Additionally, the MTR consultant is expected to conduct field missions in Samoa including the selection of the project sites on Samoa.

The final MTR report should describe the full MTR approach taken and the rationale for the approach making explicit the underlying assumptions, challenges, strengths and weaknesses about the methods and approach of the review. A list of documents that the project team will provide to the evaluator for review is included in Annex A of this Terms of Reference.

¹ For ideas on innovative and participatory Monitoring and Evaluation strategies and techniques, see [UNDP Discussion Paper: Innovations in Monitoring & Evaluating Results](#), 05 Nov 2013.



Empowered lives.
Resilient nations.

E. Detail Scope of the MTR:

The MTR consultant will assess the following four categories of project progress. See the *Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported*, for extended descriptions.

i. Project Strategy

Project design:

- Review the problem addressed by the project and the underlying assumptions. Review the effect of any incorrect assumptions or changes to the context to achieving the project results as outlined in the Project Document.
- Review the relevance of the project strategy and assess whether it provides the most effective route towards expected/intended results. Were lessons from other relevant projects properly incorporated into the project design?
- Review how the project addresses country priorities. Review country ownership. Was the project concept in line with the national sector development priorities and plans of the country (or of participating countries in the case of multi-country projects)?
- Review decision-making processes: were perspectives of those who would be affected by project decisions especially women and girls, those who could affect the outcomes, and those who could contribute information or other resources to the process, taken into account during project design processes?
- Review the extent to which relevant gender issues were raised in the project design. See Annex 9 of *Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, Financed Projects* for further guidelines.
- If there are major areas of concern, recommend practical areas for improvement for the remaining lifespan of the project.

Performance Monitoring Framework:

- Undertake a critical analysis of the project's Performance Monitoring framework indicators and targets, assess how "SMART" the midterm and end-of-project targets are (Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Relevant, Time-bound), and suggest specific amendments/revisions to the targets and indicators as necessary.
- Are the project's objectives and outcomes or components clear, practical, and feasible within its time frame?
- Examine if progress so far has led to, or could in the future catalyse beneficial development effects (i.e. income generation, gender equality and women's empowerment, improved governance etc...) that should be included in the project results framework and monitored on an annual basis.



Empowered lives.
Resilient nations.

- Ensure broader development and gender aspects of the project are being monitored effectively. Develop and recommend SMART 'development' indicators, including sex-disaggregated indicators and indicators that capture development benefits.

ii. Progress Towards Results

Progress Towards Outcomes Analysis:

- Review the Performance Monitoring Framework (revised by the WILS PMU and approved by the WILS Steering Committee) indicators against progress made towards the end-of-project targets using the Progress Towards Results Matrix and following the *Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects*; colour code progress in a "traffic light system" based on the level of progress achieved; assign a rating on progress for each outcome; make recommendations from the areas marked as "Not on target to be achieved" (red).

Table. Progress Towards Results Matrix (Achievement of outcomes against End-of-project Targets)

| Project Strategy | Indicator ² | Baseline Level ³ | Level in 1 st PIR (self-reported) | Midterm Target ⁴ | End-of-project Target | Midterm Level & Assessment ⁵ | Achievement Rating ⁶ | Justification for Rating |
|-------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------------|--|-----------------------------|-----------------------|---|---------------------------------|--------------------------|
| Objective: | Indicator (if applicable): | | | | | | | |
| Outcome 1: | Indicator 1: | | | | | | | |
| | Indicator 2: | | | | | | | |
| Outcome 2: | Indicator 3: | | | | | | | |
| | Indicator 4: | | | | | | | |
| | Etc. | | | | | | | |
| Etc. | | | | | | | | |

Indicator Assessment Key

| | | |
|-----------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Green= Achieved | Yellow= On target to be achieved | Red= Not on target to be achieved |
|-----------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|

² Populate with data from the Logframe and scorecards

³ Populate with data from the Project Document

⁴ If available

⁵ Colour code this column only

⁶ Use the 6 point Progress Towards Results Rating Scale: HS, S, MS, MU, U, HU



*Empowered lives.
Resilient nations.*

In addition to the progress towards outcomes analysis:

- Identify remaining barriers to achieving the project objective in the remainder of the project.
- By reviewing the aspects of the project that have already been successful, identify ways in which the project can further expand these benefits.

iii. Project Implementation and Adaptive Management

Management Arrangements:

- Review overall effectiveness of project management as outlined in the Project Document. Have changes been made and are they effective? Are responsibilities and reporting lines clear? Is decision-making transparent and undertaken in a timely manner? Recommend areas for improvement.
- Review the quality of execution of the Executing Agency/Implementing Partner(s) and recommend areas for improvement.
- Review the quality of support provided by the Partner Agency (UNDP) and recommend areas for improvement.

Work Planning:

- Review any delays in project start-up and implementation, identify the causes and examine if they have been resolved.
- Are work-planning processes results-based? If not, suggest ways to re-orientate work planning to focus on results?
- Examine the use of the project's results framework/ logframe as a management tool and review any changes made to it since project start.

Finance and co-finance:

- Consider the financial management of the project, with specific reference to the cost-effectiveness of interventions.
- Review the changes to fund allocations as a result of budget revisions and assess the appropriateness and relevance of such revisions.
- Does the project have the appropriate financial controls, including reporting and planning, that allow management to make informed decisions regarding the budget and allow for timely flow of funds?
- Informed by the co-financing monitoring table to be filled out, provide commentary on co-financing: is co-financing being used strategically to help the objectives of the project? Is the Project Team meeting with all co-financing partners regularly in order to align financing priorities and annual work plans?

Project-level Monitoring and Evaluation Systems:



*Empowered lives.
Resilient nations.*

- Review the monitoring tools currently being used: Do they provide the necessary information? Do they involve key partners? Are they aligned or mainstreamed with national systems? Do they use existing information? Are they efficient? Are they cost-effective? Are additional tools required? How could they be made more participatory and inclusive?
- Examine the financial management of the project monitoring and evaluation budget. Are sufficient resources being allocated to monitoring and evaluation? Are these resources being allocated effectively?

Stakeholder Engagement:

- Project management: Has the project developed and leveraged the necessary and appropriate partnerships with direct and tangential stakeholders?
- Participation and country-driven processes: Do local and national government stakeholders support the objectives of the project? Do they continue to have an active role in project decision-making that supports efficient and effective project implementation?
- Participation and public awareness: To what extent has stakeholder involvement and public awareness contributed to the progress towards achievement of project objectives?
- Are there risks (social, political, economic, etc) or structural barriers that have jeopardized the full participation of women and girls in the project? How has the project addressed these? Suggests ways to minimize/remove these risks and barriers.

Reporting:

- Assess how adaptive management changes have been reported by the project management and shared with the Project Board.
- Assess how well the Project Team and partners undertake and fulfil UNDP funded reporting requirements (i.e. how have they addressed poorly-rated PIRs, if applicable?)
- Assess how lessons derived from the adaptive management process have been documented, shared with key partners and internalized by partners.

Communications:

- Review internal project communication with stakeholders: Is communication regular and effective? Are there key stakeholders left out of communication? Are there feedback mechanisms when communication is received? Does this communication with stakeholders contribute to their awareness of project outcomes and activities and investment in the sustainability of project results?
- Review external project communication: Are proper means of communication established or being established to express the project progress and intended impact to the public (is there a web presence, for example? Or did the project implement appropriate outreach and public awareness campaigns?)
- For reporting purposes, write one half-page paragraph that summarizes the project's progress towards results in terms of contribution to sustainable development benefits, as well as global environmental benefits.



*Empowered lives.
Resilient nations.*

iv. Sustainability

- Validate whether the risks identified in the Project Document, Annual Project Review/PIRs and the ATLAS Risk Management Module are the most important and whether the risk ratings applied are appropriate and up to date. If not, explain why.
- In addition, assess the following risks to sustainability:

Financial risks to sustainability:

- What is the likelihood of financial and economic resources not being available once the assistance ends (consider potential resources can be from multiple sources, such as the public and private sectors, income generating activities, and other funding that will be adequate financial resources for sustaining project's outcomes)?

Socio-economic risks to sustainability:

- Are there any social or political risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project outcomes? What is the risk that the level of stakeholder ownership (including ownership by governments and other key stakeholders) will be insufficient to allow for the project outcomes/benefits to be sustained? Do the various key stakeholders see that it is in their interest that the project benefits continue to flow? Is there sufficient public / stakeholder awareness in support of the long-term objectives of the project? Are lessons learned being documented by the Project Team on a continual basis and shared/transferred to appropriate parties who could learn from the project and potentially replicate and/or scale it in the future?

Institutional Framework and Governance risks to sustainability:

- Do the legal frameworks, policies, governance structures and processes pose risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project benefits? While assessing this parameter, also consider if the required systems/mechanisms for accountability, transparency, and technical knowledge transfer are in place.

Environmental risks to sustainability:

- Are there any environmental risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project outcomes?

Conclusions & Recommendations



*Empowered lives.
Resilient nations.*

The MTR consultant will include a section of the report setting out the MTR’s evidence-based conclusions, in light of the findings.⁷

Recommendations should be succinct suggestions for critical intervention that are specific, measurable, achievable, and relevant. A recommendation table should be put in the report’s executive summary. See the *Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, Financed Projects* for guidance on a recommendation table.

The MTR consultant should make no more than 15 recommendations total.

Ratings

The MTR consultant will include its ratings of the project’s results and brief descriptions of the associated achievements in a *MTR Ratings & Achievement Summary Table* in the Executive Summary of the MTR report. See Annex E for ratings scales. No rating on Project Strategy and no overall project rating is required.

Table. MTR Ratings & Achievement Summary Table for WILS Project

| Measure | MTR Rating | Achievement Description |
|---------------------------------|--|-------------------------|
| Project Strategy | N/A | |
| Progress Towards Results | Objective Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale) | |
| | Outcome 1 Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale) | |
| | Outcome 2 Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale) | |
| | Outcome 3 Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale) | |
| | Etc. | |

⁷ Alternatively, MTR conclusions may be integrated into the body of the report.



*Empowered lives.
Resilient nations.*

| | | |
|---|--------------------|--|
| Project Implementation & Adaptive Management | (rate 6 pt. scale) | |
| Sustainability | (rate 4 pt. scale) | |

F. Duration of assignment:

The total duration of the MTR will be approximately 45 days over a time period of 24 weeks starting **14 Sept 2020**, and shall not exceed six months from when the consultant(s) are hired. The tentative MTR timeframe is as follows:

| TIMEFRAME | ACTIVITY |
|-----------------------------|--|
| 28 Aug 2020 | Application closes |
| 11 Sept 2020 | Select MTR Consultant |
| 14 Sept 2020: 1 day | Prep the MTR Consultant (handover of Project Documents) |
| 14 – 25 Sept 2020 : 10 days | Document review and preparing MTR Inception Report |
| 28-30 Sept 2020 :3 days | Finalization and Validation of MTR Inception Report- latest start of MTR mission |

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| 1 – 16 Oct 2020: 12 days | MTR mission: stakeholder meetings, interviews, field visits |
| 19-20 Oct 2020: 2 days | Mission wrap-up meeting & presentation of initial findings- earliest end of MTR mission |
| 21 -30 Oct 2020: 10 days | Preparing draft report |
| 1-2 Nov 2020: 2 days | Incorporating audit trail from feedback on draft report/Finalization of MTR report |
| 5-6 Nov 2020 | Preparation & Issue of Management Response |
| 12 Nov 2020: 4 days | Expected date of full MTR completion |

G. Expected Deliverables:

| # | Deliverable | Description | Timing | Responsibilities |
|---|-----------------------------|--|--|---|
| 1 | MTR Inception Report | MTR consultant clarifies objectives and methods of Midterm Review | No later than 2 weeks before the MTR mission 30 Sept 2020 | MTR consultant submits to the Commissioning Unit and project management |
| 2 | Presentation | Initial Findings | End of MTR mission: 20 Oct 2020 | MTR consultant presents to project management and the Commissioning Unit |
| 3 | Draft Final Report | Full report (using guidelines on content outlined in Annex B) with annexes | Within 3 weeks of the MTR mission: 30 Oct 2020 | Sent to the Commissioning Unit, reviewed by RTA, Project Coordinating Unit, |
| 4 | Final Report* | Revised report with audit trail detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final MTR report | Within 2 weeks of receiving UNDP comments on draft: 12 Nov 2020 | Sent to the Commissioning Unit |

*The final MTR report must be in English. If applicable, the Commissioning Unit may choose to arrange for a translation of the report into a language more widely shared by national stakeholders.

H. MTR arrangement:

The principal responsibility for managing this MTR resides with the Commissioning Unit. The Commissioning Unit for this project's MTR is the UNDP Samoa Multi-country office for Cook Islands, Niue, Samoa and Tokelau based in Samoa.



*Empowered lives.
Resilient nations.*

The commissioning unit will contract the consultant and ensure the timely provision of per diems and travel arrangements within the country for the MTR consultant. The Project Team will be responsible for liaising with the MTR consultant to provide all relevant documents, set up stakeholder interviews, and arrange field visits.

I. Team Composition:

An independent national consultant/ usually from the country of the project will conduct the MTR. The consultant cannot have participated in the project preparation, formulation, and/or implementation (including the writing of the Project Document) and should not have a conflict of interest with project's related activities.

The selection of consultant will be aimed at qualities in the following areas:

- At least a Post-graduate degree in political science, development studies, law, legislative studies, public administration or related field; 20%
- Minimum of 5 years' experience in project evaluations, results-based monitoring, and/or evaluation methodologies; 25%
- Sound understanding of the UNDP Project Cycle Management, with demonstrated experience in designing and facilitating processes to enhance project implementation and its adaptive management through the application of M&E tools, including results-based management logical frameworks; 20%
- Experience working in engaging with parliamentary development, gender equality, community development and women in leadership and in the Pacific region; 25%
- Fluency in English (oral and written) is a requirement, with excellent written and presentation skills; 10%

J. Term of Payments and Specifications:

10% of payment upon approval of the final MTR Inception Report
 30% upon submission of the draft MTR report
 60% upon finalization of the MTR report



*Empowered lives.
Resilient nations.*

K. Application Process:

Recommended Presentation of Proposal:

- a) **Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability** using the [template](#)⁸ provided by UNDP;
- b) **CV** and a **Personal History Form (P11 form)**⁹;
- c) **Brief description of approach to work/technical proposal** of why the individual considers him/herself as the most suitable for the assignment, and a proposed methodology on how they will approach and complete the assignment; (max 1 page)
- d) **Financial Proposal** that indicates the all-inclusive fixed total contract price and all other travel related costs (such as flight ticket, per diem, etc), supported by a breakdown of costs, as per template attached to the Letter of Confirmation of Interest template. If an applicant is employed by an organization/company/institution, and he/she expects his/her employer to charge a management fee in the process of releasing him/her to UNDP under Reimbursable Loan Agreement (RLA), the applicant must indicate at this point, and ensure that all such costs are duly incorporated in the financial proposal submitted to UNDP.

Criteria for Evaluation of Proposal: Only those applications which are responsive and compliant will be evaluated. Offers will be evaluated according to the Combined Scoring method – where the educational background and experience on similar assignments will be weighted at 70% and the price proposal will weigh as 30% of the total scoring. The applicant receiving the Highest Combined Score that has also accepted UNDP's General Terms and Conditions will be awarded the contract.

ANNEXES:

ANNEX I – Annex A-E for TOR

ANNEX II - [INDIVIDUAL CONSULTANT GENERAL TERMS AND CONDITIONS](#)

ANNEX III- [Offeror's letter to UNDP Confirming Interest and Availability](#)

ANNEX IV - P11 form

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

⁸

<https://intranet.undp.org/unit/bom/pso/Support%20documents%20on%20IC%20Guidelines/Template%20for%20Confirmation%20of%20Interest%20and%20Submission%20of%20Financial%20Proposal.docx>

⁹ http://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/corporate/Careers/P11_Personal_history_form.doc



*Empowered lives.
Resilient nations.*

This TOR is approved by: Deputy Resident Representative

Signature: _____

Name and Designation: Verena Linneweber – DRR

Date of Signing: _____