## Terms of Reference

**Interim Evaluation (IE) of the UNDP supported GCF financed M-CLIMES project**

|  |
| --- |
|  |
| **Location :** | Lilongwe with travel to project districts |
| **Application Deadline :** |  |
| **Time left :** |  |
| **Type of Contract :** | Individual Contract  |
| **Post Level :** | International Consultant  |
| **Languages Required :** | English  |
| **Duration of Initial Contract :** | 30 days  |

### A. Project Title: Saving Lives and Protecting Agriculture-based Livelihoods in Malawi: Scaling Up the Use of Modernized Climate Information and Early Warning systems (M-CLIMES)

##### **B. Project Description:**

The Government of Malawi, with the support from UNDP, has secured funding from the [Green Climate Fund](http://www.greenclimate.fund/home) to scale up the use of modernized early warning systems (EWS) and climate information in the country. The project will work with communities in disaster prone and food-insecure districts to co-develop tailored weather- and climate-based agricultural advisories to be disseminated through ICT/mobile, print and radio channels. The project will also scale up best practices in community readiness to respond to disasters and mitigate key risks. Community-based EWS will be scaled up in flood-prone areas and capacities to use and respond to warnings will be strengthened at the national, district and community levels.

The project is being implemented in 21 districts by the Department of Disaster Management Affairs (DODMA), in collaboration with the Department of Climate Change and Meteorological Services (DCCMS), Department of Water Resources (DWR), Department of Agricultural Extension Services (DAES), Department of Fisheries (DoF), and the National Smallholder Farmers Association of Malawi (NASFAM).

The project has three expected outputs;

1. Expansion of observation networks that generate climate-related data to save lives and safeguard livelihoods from extreme climate events
2. Development and dissemination of products and platforms for climate-related information/services for vulnerable communities and livelihoods
3. Strengthening communities’ capacities for use of EWS/CI in preparedness for response to climate related disaster

The M-CLIMES project was approved by the GCF Board in November 2015. The Accreditation Master Agreement (AMA) was signed between GCF and UNDP on 5th August 2016, and the Funded Activity Agreement (FAA) for the project was signed on 10th May 2017. The FAA entered into effectiveness on 28th June 2017, which is considered as the project start date. UNDP and the Department of Disaster Management (DoDMA), as Implementing Partner for this project, have worked together to finalize a subsidiary agreement (in the form of the UNDP Project Document), which was signed on 4th August 2017. An interim project evaluation is scheduled in the third year of the project implementation, while the final project evaluation will be carried out in 2023. In the above context, UNDP is seeking an international consultant to carry out the interim evaluation (IE) of the project.

##### **C. Objectives**

The consultant will assess implementation of the project and its alignment with FAA obligations and progress towards the achievement of the project objectives and outcomes as specified in the Project Document. The evaluation will assess early signs of project success or failure with the goal **of identifying the necessary changes** to be made in order to set the project on-track to achieve its intended results. The IE will also assess the following;

* Overall performance of the project in relation to project goals, outcomes, outputs, targets and indicators;
* Performance of the project in relation to GCF investment criteria, paradigm shift potential, contribution to the creation of an enabling environment, potential for knowledge and learning, sustainable development potential and meeting needs of the recipients and country ownership;
* Compliance of the project in relation to environmental and social safeguards and gender action plan;
* Relevance, effectiveness and efficiency of the project;
* Project sustainability; and
* Unexpected results, both positive and negative.

**D. IE approach and methodology**

The consultant must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The consultant will review all relevant sources of information including documents prepared during the preparation phase (i.e. baseline Funding proposal submitted to the GCF, the Project Document, project reports including Annual Performance Reports, Quarterly Progress Reports, UNDP Environmental & Social Safeguard Policy, project budget revisions, national strategic and legal documents, and any other materials that the team considers useful for this evidence-based review). The consultant will review the baseline Funding Proposal submitted to the GCF.

The consultant is expected to follow a collaborative and participatory approach[[1]](#footnote-1) ensuring close engagement with the Project Team, Implementing Partner, NDA focal point, government counterparts, the UNDP Country Office, UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Advisers, and other key stakeholders.

Engagement of stakeholders is vital to a successful Interim Evaluation. Stakeholder involvement should include interviews with stakeholders who have project responsibilities, including but not limited to executing agencies, senior officials and task team/component leaders, key experts and consultants in the subject area, Project Steering Committee, project stakeholders, local government, CSOs, project beneficiaries, etc. Additionally, the IE team is expected to conduct field missions to project sites.

The final Interim Evaluation report should describe the full evaluation 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.

**E. Scope of the IE**

The consultant will assess the following four categories of project progress. See the *Guidance for Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects* 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, 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, GEF-Financed Projects* for further guidelines.
* If there are major areas of concern, recommend areas for improvement.

Results Framework/Logframe:

* Undertake a critical analysis of the project’s logframe 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 resilience etc...) that should be included in the project results framework and monitored on an annual basis.
* 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. Relevance, Effectiveness and Efficiency**

* Were the context, problem, needs and priorities well analysed and reviewed during project initiation?
* Are the planned project objectives and outcomes relevant and realistic to the situation on the ground?
* Is the project Theory of Change (ToC) and intervention logic coherent and realistic? Does the ToC and intervention logic hold or does it need to be adjusted?
* Do outputs link to intended outcomes which link to broader paradigm shift objectives of the project?
* Are the planned inputs and strategies identified realistic, appropriate and adequate to achieve the results? Were they sequenced sufficiently to efficiently deliver the expected results?
* Are the outputs being achieved in a timely manner? Is this achievement supportive of the ToC and pathways identified?
* What and how much progress has been made towards achieving the overall outputs and outcomes of the project (including contributing factors and constraints)?
* To what extent is the project able to demonstrate changes against the baseline (assessment in approved Funding Proposal) for the GCF investment criteria (including contributing factors and constraints)?
* How realistic are the risks and assumptions of the project?
* How did the project deal with issues and risks in implementation?
* To what extent did the project’s M&E data and mechanism(s) contribute to achieving project results?
* Have project resources been utilized in the most economical, effective and equitable ways possible (considering value for money; absorption rate; commitments versus disbursements and projected commitments; co-financing; etc.)?
* Are the project’s governance mechanisms functioning efficiently?
* To what extent did the design of the project help or hinder achieving its own goals?
* Were there clear objectives, ToC and strategy? How were these used in performance management and progress reporting?
* Were there clear baselines indicators and/or benchmark for performance measurements? How were these used in project management? To what extent and how the project apply adaptive management?
* What, if any, alternative strategies would have been more effective in achieving the project objectives?

**iii. Progress Towards Results**

Progress Towards Outcomes Analysis:

* Review the logframe 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]](#footnote-2)** | **Baseline Level[[3]](#footnote-3)** | **Level in 1st APR (self- reported)** | **Level in 2nd APR (self- reported)** | **Midterm Target[[4]](#footnote-4)** | **End-of-project Target** | **Midterm Level & Assessment[[5]](#footnote-5)** | **Achievement Rating[[6]](#footnote-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 |

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.
* Progress assessment for outcome with full on track > 75%; partly on track 50-70%; partly on track 25-50%; not on track <25%

**iv. 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? Are agencies sufficiently staffed? 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 GCF 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/ log frame 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.
* Review project cost norms to assess their appropriateness to current situation in different localities.
* 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?

Coherence in climate finance delivery with other multilateral entities

* Who are the partners of the project and how strategic are they in terms of capacities and commitment?
* Is there coherence and complementarity by the project with other actors for local other climate change interventions?
* To what extent has the project complimented other on-going local level initiatives (by stakeholders, donors, governments) on climate change adaptation or mitigation efforts?
* How has the project contributed to achieving stronger and more coherent integration of shift to low emission sustainable development pathways and/or increased climate resilient sustainable development (GCF RMF/PMF Paradigm Shift objectives)? Please provide concrete examples and make specific suggestions on how to enhance these roles going forward.

Project-level Monitoring and Evaluation Systems:

* 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?

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 GCF reporting requirements (i.e. how have they addressed poorly rated APRs, 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.

**v. Sustainability**

* Validate whether the risks identified in the Project Document, Annual Performance Reports 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 GCF 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 jeopardise sustenance of project outcomes?

**vi. Performance of the project in relation to GCF criteria.**

* To what extent the project meeting the GCF investment criteria ?
* The progress of the project towards paradigm shift potential.
* How is the project contributing to creation of an enabling environment including potential for knowledge and learning ?
* The progress of the project in meeting sustainable development potential including economic, social and environmental benefits.

**vii. Needs of the recipient and country Ownership**

* To what extent the project is aligned to the needs of beneficiary groups as well as the financial, economic, social and institutional needs ?
* To what extent is the project aligned with national development plans, national plans of action on climate change, or sub-national policy as well as projects and priorities of the national partners?
* How well is country ownership reflected in the project governance, coordination and consultation mechanisms or other consultations?
* To what extent are country level systems for project management or M&E utilized in the project?
* Were the modes of deliveries of the outputs appropriate to build essential/necessary capacities, promote national ownership and ensure sustainability of the result achieved?

**viii. Environment and social safeguards and gender action plan**

* To what extent the project is compliant to environmental and social safeguards as outlined in the project document?
* Does the project only rely on sex-disaggregated data per population statistics?
* Are financial resources/project activities explicitly allocated to enable women to benefit from project interventions?
* Does the project account in activities and planning for local gender dynamics and how project interventions affect women as beneficiaries?
* Do women as beneficiaries know their rights and/or benefits from project activities/interventions?
* How do the results for women compare to those for men?
* Is the decision-making process transparent and inclusive of both women and men?
* To what extent are female stakeholders or beneficiaries satisfied with the project gender equality results?
* Did the project sufficiently address cross cutting issues including gender?

**viii. Unexpected results, both positive and negative**

* What has been the project’s ability to adapt and evolve based on continuous lessons learned and the changing development landscape? Please account for factors both within the AE/EE and external.
* Can any unintended or unexpected positive or negative effects be observed as a consequence of the project's interventions?
* What factors have contributed to the unintended outcomes, outputs, activities, results?

**ix. Replication and Scalability**

* What are project lessons learned, failures/lost opportunities to date? What might have been done better or differently?
* How effective were the exit strategies and approaches to phase out assistance provided by the project including contributing factors and constraints
* What factors of the project achievements are contingent on specific local context or enabling environment factors?
* Are the actions and results from project interventions likely to be sustained, ideally through ownership by the local partners and stakeholders?
* What are the key factors that will require attention in order to improve prospects of sustainability, scalability or replication of project outcomes/outputs/results?

**Conclusions & Recommendations**

The consultant will include a section of the report setting out the evaluation’s evidence-based conclusions, in light of the findings.[[7]](#footnote-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, GEF-Financed Projects* for guidance on a recommendation table.

The consultant should make no more than 15 recommendations total.

**Ratings**

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

Table. Interim Evaluation Ratings & Achievement Summary Table

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Measure** | **IE Rating** | **Achievement Description** |
| **Project Strategy** | N/A |  |
| **Progress Towards Results** | Objective Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale) |  |
| Output 1 Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale) |  |
| Output 2 Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale) |  |
| Output 3 Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale) |  |
| Etc.  |  |
| **Project Implementation & Adaptive Management** | (rate 6 pt. scale) |  |
| **Sustainability** | (rate 4 pt. scale) |  |

**F. Timeframe**

The total duration of consultancy will be approximately 30working days. The tentative evaluation timeframe is as follows:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No.** | **Activity** | **Number of working days**  | **Expected completion date** |
| 1 | Document review and preparing IE Inception Report (IE Inception Report due no later than 2 weeks before the IE mission) | *3 days*  | 15th June 2020 |
| 2 | IE mission: stakeholder meetings, interviews, field visits | *13 days*  | 15th July 2020 |
| 3 | Meeting with PMU, internal presentation on preliminary findings, preparation presentation | *1 day* | 18th July 2020 |
| 4 | Workshop presentation – debriefing/handout key findings presented to stakeholders | *1 day* | 20th July 2020 |
| 5 | Preparing draft report (due no later than 3 weeks of the IE mission) | *6 days*  | 26th July 2020  |
| 6 | Finalization of IE report/ Incorporating audit trail from feedback on draft report (due within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on the draft) *(note: 2 weeks’ time delay accommodated for circulation and review of the draft report)* | *4 days*  | 5st August 2010 |

**G. IE deliverables**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Deliverable** | **Description** | **Responsibilities**  |
| Inception report | Consultant clarifies objectives and methods of Midterm Review | Consultant submits to the Commissioning Unit and project management |
| Presentation | Initial findings  | Consultant presents to project management. Project stakeholders and the Commissioning Unit |
| Draft report | Draft final report  | Sent to the Commissioning Unit, reviewed by RTA, Project Coordinating Unit, NDA focal point |
| Final report  | Revised report with audit trail detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final report | Sent to the Commissioning Unit |

\*The final IE 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. IE arrangements**

The principal responsibility for managing this IE resides with the Commissioning Unit. The Commissioning Unit for this project’s IE is the UNDP Malawi Country Office.

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

**I. Qualifications**

**Education:**

* At least Master’s Degree in environment, engineering, technology, climate change, environmental science, economics, sustainable development or related fields.

**Experience:**

* Minimum 8 years at the national or international level, related to environmental and/or energy planning, climate change, transport and waste management, low carbon development, and carbon footprint development.
* Minimum of 5 years of project evaluation and/or implementation experience in the result-based management framework, adaptive management and UNDP or GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy. Some experience working with GEF or GEF-evaluation is an advantage.
* Very good report writing and communication skills in English.
* Familiarity with the issues concerning the evaluated project in Thailand or in Asia Region is an advantage.
* Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender, youth, and interlinkages with the Sustainable Development Goals.
* Good in data analytic and visualization techniques

**Competencies:**

**Corporate Competencies:**

* Demonstrates integrity by modelling the UN’s values and ethical standards;
* Promotes the vision, mission, and strategic goals of UNDP;
* Displays cultural, gender, religion, race, nationality and age sensitivity and adaptability;
* Treats all people fairly without favouritism.

 **Technical Competencies:**

* Analytic capacity and demonstrated ability to process, analyse and synthesise complex, technical information;
* Proven ability to support the development of high quality knowledge and training materials, and to train technical teams;
* Proven experience in the developing country context and working in different cultural settings.

 **Communication:**

* Communicate effectively in writing to a varied and broad audience in a simple and concise manner.

 **Professionalism:**

* Capable of working in a high pressure environment with sharp and frequent deadlines, managing many tasks simultaneously;
* Excellent analytical and organizational skills.

**Language Requirements:**

* Fluency in written and spoken English is essential. Ability to write reports, make presentations

**J. Scope of Price Proposal and Schedule of Payments**

A *Lump Sum Amount* payable modality is envisaged upon submission of deliverables and acceptance/approval by UNDP CO for each identified task reflected in the agreed and signed specific TOR. The lump sum amount is inclusive of all the costs related to the assignment. Payments are based upon output, i.e. upon delivery of the services specified in the TOR. All planned costs related to this consultancy must be specified in the proposal by contractor for this assignment. The contract will be paid in USD.

**K. Recommended Presentation of Offer**

Interested and qualified consultant are invited to apply. The consultants must submit the following documents/information to demonstrate their qualifications:

1. **Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability** using the [template](https://intranet.undp.org/unit/bom/pso/Support%20documents%20on%20IC%20Guidelines/Template%20for%20Confirmation%20of%20Interest%20and%20Submission%20of%20Financial%20Proposal.docx)[[8]](#footnote-8) provided by UNDP;
2. **CV** and a **Personal History Form** ([P11 form](http://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/corporate/Careers/P11_Personal_history_form.doc)[[9]](#footnote-9));
3. **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)
4. **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](http://procurement-notices.undp.org/view_file.cfm?doc_id=29916). 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.

All application materials should be submitted to the address (fill address) in a sealed envelope indicating the following reference “Consultant for (*project title*) Interim Evaluation” or by email at the following address ONLY: (fill email) This email address is being protected from spam bots, you need Javascript enabled to view it by ***(time and date).*** Incomplete applications will be excluded from further consideration.

**K. Criteria for Selection of the Best Offer**

The award of the contract shall be made to the consultant who has received the highest score out of pre-determined technical and financial criteria specific to the solicitation.

Technical criteria weight – 70 %

Financial criteria weight – 30 %

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  Criteria  | Weight | Max. Point  |
| Technical (based on Technical proposal) | 70% | 70 |
| Minimum educational background and work experience  | 20% | 20 |
| Understanding of the assignment from the ToRs  | 20% | 20 |
| Methodology and experience with similar assignments  | 30 % | 30 |
| Financial (based on financial proposal) | 30% | 30 |

**L. Annexes to the TOR**

1. Funding Proposal
2. UNDP Project Document
3. UNDP Environmental and Social Screening results
4. Project Inception Report
5. All Annual Performance Reports (APRs)
6. Quarterly progress reports and work plans of the various implementation task teams
7. Audit reports
8. Mission reports
9. All monitoring reports prepared by the project
10. Financial and Administration guidelines used by Project Team

The following documents will also be available:

1. Project operational guidelines, manuals and systems
2. UNDP country/countries programme document(s)
3. Minutes of the Project Steering Committee Meetings and other meetings (i.e. Project Appraisal Committee meetings)
4. Project site location maps
5. Project site location maps

**M. Approval**

**This TOR is approved by**: Sothini Nyirenda, Program Analyst, Resilience and Sustainable Growth

Signature

Name and Designation

Date of Signing

**ANNEX B: Guidelines on Contents for the Interim Evaluation Report**[[10]](#footnote-10)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **i.** | Basic Report Information *(for opening page or title page)** Title of UNDP supported GCF financed project
* UNDP PIMS# and GCF project ID#
* Evaluation time frame and date of report
* Region and countries included in the project
* Executing Agency/Implementing Partner and other project partners
* Acknowledgements
 |
| **ii.**  | Table of Contents |
| **iii.** | Acronyms and Abbreviations |
| **1.** | Executive Summary *(3-5 pages)* * Project Information Table
* Project Description (brief)
* Project Progress Summary (between 200-500 words)
* Evaluation Ratings & Achievement Summary Table
* Concise summary of conclusions
* Recommendation Summary Table
 |
| **2.** | Introduction *(2-3 pages)** Purpose of the Interim Evaluation and objectives
* Scope & Methodology: principles of design and execution of the IE, IE approach and data collection methods, limitations to the Interim Evaluation
* Structure of the report
 |
| **3.** | Project Description and Background Context *(3-5 pages)** Development context: environmental, socio-economic, institutional, and policy factors relevant to the project objective and scope
* Problems that the project sought to address: threats and barriers targeted
* Project Description and Strategy: objective, outcomes and expected results, description of field sites (if any)
* Project Implementation Arrangements: short description of the Project Steering Committee, key implementing partner arrangements, etc.
* Project timing and milestones
* Main stakeholders: summary list
 |
| **4.** | Findings *(12-14 pages)* |
| **4.1** | Project Strategy* Project Design
* Results Framework/Log-frame
 |
| **4.2** | Relevance |
| **4.3** | Effectiveness and Efficiency |
| **4.4** | Progress Towards Results * Progress towards outcomes analysis
* Remaining barriers to achieving the project objective
 |
| **4.5** | Project Implementation and Adaptive Management* Management Arrangements
* Work planning
* Finance and co-finance
* Coherence in climate finance delivery with other multilateral entities
* Project-level monitoring and evaluation systems
* Stakeholder engagement
* Reporting
* Communications
 |
| **4.6** | Project progress against GCF criteria |
| **4.7** | Sustainability* Financial risks to sustainability
* Socio-economic to sustainability
* Institutional framework and governance risks to sustainability
* Environmental risks to sustainability
 |
| **4.7** | Needs of the recipient and country Ownership |
| **4.8** | Environmental and social safeguards and progress in relation to gender action plan |
| **4.9** | Unexpected results, both positive and negative |
| **4.10** | Replication and Scalability |
| **5.** | Conclusions and Recommendations *(4-6 pages)* |
|  |  **5.1**   | Conclusions * Comprehensive and balanced statements (that are evidence-based and connected to the evaluation’s findings) which highlight the strengths, weaknesses and results of the project
 |
|  **5.2** | Recommendations * 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
 |
| **6.**  | Annexes* Interim Evaluation ToR (excluding ToR annexes)
* Interim Evaluation evaluative matrix (evaluation criteria with key questions, indicators, sources of data, and methodology)
* Example Questionnaire or Interview Guide used for data collection
* Ratings Scales
* mission itinerary
* List of persons interviewed
* List of documents reviewed
* Co-financing table (if not previously included in the body of the report)
* Signed UNEG Code of Conduct form
* Signed Interim Evaluation final report clearance form
* *Annexed in a separate file:* Audit trail from received comments on draft IE report.
 |

**ToR ANNEX C: Interim Evaluation Evaluative Matrix Template**

*(Questions to be filled out by the Commissioning Unit)*

This Interim Evaluation Evaluative Matrix must be fully completed/amended by the consultant and included in the evaluation inception report and as an Annex to the report.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Evaluative Questions** | **Indicators** | **Sources** | **Methodology** |
| **Project Strategy: To what extent is the project strategy relevant to country priorities, country ownership, and the best route towards expected results?**  |
| (include evaluative question(s)) | (i.e. relationships established, level of coherence between project design and implementation approach, specific activities conducted, quality of risk mitigation strategies, etc.) | (i.e. project documents, national policies or strategies, websites, project staff, project partners, data collected throughout the IE mission, etc.) | (i.e. document analysis, data analysis, interviews with project staff, interviews with stakeholders, etc.) |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| **Progress Towards Results: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved thus far?** |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| **Project Implementation and Adaptive Management: Has the project been implemented efficiently, cost-effectively, and been able to adapt to any changing conditions thus far? To what extent are project-level monitoring and evaluation systems, reporting, and project communications supporting the project’s implementation?** |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| **Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, socio-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?** |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

**ToR ANNEX D: UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluators/Interim Evaluation Consultants[[11]](#footnote-11)**

**Evaluators/Consultants:**

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

**Interim Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form**

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: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**ToR ANNEX E: Interim Evaluation Ratings**

|  |
| --- |
| **Ratings for Progress Towards Results:** (one rating for each outcome and for the objective) |
| 6 | Highly Satisfactory (HS) | The objective/outcome is expected to achieve or exceed all its end-of-project targets, without major shortcomings. The progress towards the objective/outcome can be presented as “good practice”. |
| 5 | Satisfactory (S) | The objective/outcome is expected to achieve most of its end-of-project targets, with only minor shortcomings. |
| 4 | Moderately Satisfactory (MS) | The objective/outcome is expected to achieve most of its end-of-project targets but with significant shortcomings. |
| 3 | Moderately Unsatisfactory (HU) | The objective/outcome is expected to achieve its end-of-project targets with major shortcomings. |
| 2 | Unsatisfactory (U) | The objective/outcome is expected not to achieve most of its end-of-project targets. |
| 1 | Highly Unsatisfactory (HU) | The objective/outcome has failed to achieve its midterm targets, and is not expected to achieve any of its end-of-project targets. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Ratings for Project Implementation & Adaptive Management:** (one overall rating) |
| 6 | Highly Satisfactory (HS) | Implementation of all seven components – management arrangements, work planning, finance and co-finance, project-level monitoring and evaluation systems, stakeholder engagement, reporting, and communications – is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management. The project can be presented as “good practice”. |
| 5 | Satisfactory (S) | Implementation of most of the seven components is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management except for only few that are subject to remedial action. |
| 4 | Moderately Satisfactory (MS) | Implementation of some of the seven components is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management, with some components requiring remedial action. |
| 3 | Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU) | Implementation of some of the seven components is not leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive, with most components requiring remedial action. |
| 2 | Unsatisfactory (U) | Implementation of most of the seven components is not leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management. |
| 1 | Highly Unsatisfactory (HU) | Implementation of none of the seven components is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Ratings for Sustainability:** (one overall rating) |
| 4 | Likely (L) | Negligible risks to sustainability, with key outcomes on track to be achieved by the project’s closure and expected to continue into the foreseeable future |
| 3 | Moderately Likely (ML) | Moderate risks, but expectations that at least some outcomes will be sustained due to the progress towards results on outcomes at the Midterm Review |
| 2 | Moderately Unlikely (MU) | Significant risk that key outcomes will not carry on after project closure, although some outputs and activities should carry on |
| 1 | Unlikely (U) | Severe risks that project outcomes as well as key outputs will not be sustained |

**ToR ANNEX F: Interim Evaluation Report Clearance Form**

*(to be completed by the Commissioning Unit and UNDP-GEF RTA and included in the final document)*

**Interim Evaluation Report Reviewed and Cleared By:**

**Commissioning Unit**

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

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

**UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Advisor**

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

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

**ToR ANNEX G: Audit Trail Template**

*Note:* The following is a template for the Interim Evaluation Team to show how the received comments on the draft Interim Evaluation report have (or have not) been incorporated into the final report. This audit trail should be included as an annex in the final report, but kept as a separate file

**To the comments received on (*date*) from the Interim Evaluation of (*project name*) (UNDP Project ID-*PIMS #)***

*The following comments were provided in track changes to the draft Interim Evaluation report; they are referenced by institution (“Author” column) and track change comment number (“#” column):*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Author** | **#** | **Para No./ comment location**  | **Comment/Feedback on the draft IE report** | **Interim Evaluation team****response and actions taken** |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

1. For ideas on innovative and participatory Monitoring and Evaluation strategies and techniques, see [UNDP Discussion Paper: Innovations in Monitoring & Evaluating Results](http://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/librarypage/capacity-building/discussion-paper--innovations-in-monitoring---evaluating-results/), 05 Nov 2013. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Populate with data from the Logframe and scorecards [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Populate with data from the Project Document [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. If available [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. Colour code this column only [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. Use the 6 point Progress Towards Results Rating Scale: HS, S, MS, MU, U, HU [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. Alternatively, IE conclusions may be integrated into the body of the report. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. <https://intranet.undp.org/unit/bom/pso/Support%20documents%20on%20IC%20Guidelines/Template%20for%20Confirmation%20of%20Interest%20and%20Submission%20of%20Financial%20Proposal.docx> [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. <http://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/corporate/Careers/P11_Personal_history_form.doc> [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. The Report length should not exceed *40* pages in total (not including annexes). [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
11. <http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/100> [↑](#footnote-ref-11)