

Terms of Reference

UNDP-GEF Adapting to Climate Change Induced Coastal Risk Management Project, Mid Term Review



General Information

Services Required	Mid Term Review
Project/Program Title	"Adapting to climate change induced coastal risk management in Sierra Leone"
Post Title	International and National Mid Term Review Experts.
Type of Contract	Individual Consultants (Local and International)
Duty Station	The consultancy will be homebased with support from a National consultant in Freetown in order to partake in briefing and debriefings with government and non-government partners in Sierra Leone.
Region/Country	Sierra Leone, West Africa
Expected Places of Travel	Home-based.
Duration	Working period 4 th January 2021 to 19 th February 2021)
Expected Start Date	Immediately after Concluding Contract Agreement (4 th January 2021)

BASIC CONTRACT INFORMATION

Location: Freetown, Sierra Leone

Application Deadline: 9 December 2020

Category: Climate Change and Environment

Type of Contract: Individual Contract

Assignment Type: International Consultant

Language Required: English

1. INTRODUCTION

This is the Terms of Reference (ToR) for the UNDP-GEF Midterm Review (MTR) of the *full* sized project titled: ***Adapting to Climate Change Induced Coastal Risk Management Project (PIMS# 5178)*** implemented through UNDP *Sierra Leone Country office*, which is to be undertaken in November 2020. The project officially started in April 2018 and is in its *third* year of implementation. In line with the UNDP-GEF Guidance on MTRs, this MTR process was initiated before the submission of the Third 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, GEF-Financed Projects* ([Link](#)).

Terms of Reference

UNDP-GEF Adapting to Climate Change Induced Coastal Risk Management Project, Mid Term Review



General Information

Services Required	Mid Term Review
Project/Program Title	“Adapting to climate change induced coastal risk management in Sierra Leone”
Post Title	International and National Mid Term Review Experts.
Type of Contract	Individual Consultants (Local and International)
Duty Station	The consultancy will be homebased with support from a National consultant in Freetown in order to partake in briefing and debriefings with government and non-government partners in Sierra Leone.
Region/Country	Sierra Leone, West Africa
Expected Places of Travel	Home-based.
Duration	Working period 4 th January 2021 to 19 th February 2021)
Expected Start Date	Immediately after Concluding Contract Agreement (4 th January 2021)

BASIC CONTRACT INFORMATION

Location: Freetown, Sierra Leone

Application Deadline: 9 December 2020

Category: Climate Change and Environment

Type of Contract: Individual Contract

Assignment Type: International Consultant

Language Required: English

1. INTRODUCTION

This is the Terms of Reference (ToR) for the UNDP-GEF Midterm Review (MTR) of the *full* sized project titled: ***Adapting to Climate Change Induced Coastal Risk Management Project (PIMS# 5178)*** implemented through UNDP *Sierra Leone Country office*, which is to be undertaken in November 2020. The project officially started in April 2018 and is in its *third* year of implementation. In line with the UNDP-GEF Guidance on MTRs, this MTR process was initiated before the submission of the Third 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, GEF-Financed Projects* ([Link](#)).

2. PROJECT BACKGROUND INFORMATION

This project was designed to support Coastal communities' resilience to climate change induced risk on physical assets and economic livelihoods. The coastal zone of Sierra Leone is highly vulnerable to the increased frequency and severity of coastal erosion, flooding and storm surges which severely impact social wellbeing (health), livelihood security (and water resources) and major economic sectors such as fishing, tourism, water resources and agriculture. Coastal communities are already experiencing considerable repercussions of these impacts, notably on their livelihoods with reduced fishing productivity, ecosystem degradation and low farming outputs. The limited accessibility of climate-related data limits the ability of decision-makers to make informed planning and policy decisions for the coast (in particular marine and sea parameters databases such as wave height, wave period, wind speed and direction), and to take any clear strategic actions to remedy these negative effects. This inadequate knowledge is contributing towards undermining social and economic development, particularly under a changing climate.

This project is funded from the Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF) to implement a Full-Size Project (FSP) along the coastal zone, in six different pilot sites (Conakry Dee, Lakka, Hamilton, Tombo, Shenge and Turtle Island). The objective of this project, implemented by UNDP in collaboration with the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA SL), the Ministry of Fisheries and Marine Resources (MFMR) and the Institute of Marine Biology and Oceanography (IMBO) and the National Tourist Board (NTB) is designed to *"Strengthen the ability of coastal communities to systematically manage climate change risks and impacts on physical infrastructure and economic livelihoods"*. The project focuses on five of the national priorities presented in Sierra Leone's National Adaptation Programme of Action (NAPA) submitted to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), namely priorities interventions n° 2, 4, 14, 16 and 17.

Barriers need to be overcome in order to achieve the project objective. These include: (i) the limited accessibility and use of data and information relevant to understanding coastal related climate risks, (ii) inadequate institutional and policy capacities for Integrated Coastal Zone Management (ICZM), (iii) limited awareness programmes on coastal related climate risk and human activities along the coast; (iv) Inadequate resources and financial constraints and (v) the need to introduce climate resilient livelihood options and approaches to address the climate risk facing coastal communities. The project's approach to be adopted will deliver three complimentary outcomes to address these barriers in a coherent and holistic manner. It shall also contribute to the improvement of Sierra Leone's ability to systematically manage coastal risks in the face of a changing climate.

The activities under Outcome 1 focus on enhancing the availability of high-quality climate risk information that is critical for development decision-making in the coastal zone. Under Outcome 2, a series of appropriate protection measures shall be designed along with supporting policy/legal tools and integrated coordination mechanisms to improve or support the implementation of policy to help deal with current and long-term coastal challenges; Finally, Outcome 3 will promote public awareness and promote climate resilient alternatives to sand mining for better adhesion of policy makers and communities on adaptation. This is a five-year project for which implementation started in April 2018 and is planned to end in April 2023.

The total budget of the project is **10,165,000 USD** with Government co-financing commitment amounting to **31,610,000 USD**.

Sierra Leone is not different from the rest of the world when it comes to Covid 19 pandemic. The country recorded its first Covid 19 positive case on 30 March 2020. Prior to this date, the impact of Covid 19 was already felt across the globe including Sierra Leone and the Government had already started putting in place both preventive and preparedness measures. These protocols and restrictions changed the way we do things and forced citizens to adopt the new normal of less interactions with one another, reduced human movement and the increase use of digital communication platforms for formal and informal information sharing. The imposition of travel restrictions and other Covid 19 protocols accelerated serious economic loss to the country thereby causing more economic hardship to the already vulnerable population. Since 30 March 2020, and as at 20 October 2020, the country has recorded 2,336 Covid 19 confirmed cases with 73 Covid related death and 5 active cases remaining.

Covid 19 preventive measures impacted project implementation dramatically. Social distancing measure, lockdowns and inter-district travel restriction did not permit the project to implement initial 2020 AWP in communities as originally planned. This is so because, 60% of project locations are situated outside the capital city where the CO is housed. As such, the initial budget was repurposed, and the unutilized fund was reversed.

3. MTR PURPOSE

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 changes to be made in order to set the project on-track to achieve its intended results. The MTR will also review the project's strategy and its risks to sustainability. The project management team will use the MTR results to identify weaknesses, make adjustments to project implementation where necessary and build on progress made so far. The MTR is to be conducted within this time frame to reflect the mid-point of project implementation and to assess whether project implementation is on track and to identify lessons learned for ongoing project quality improvement.

In recognition of the mid point date of this project implementation, the MTR was already planned during UNDP SL Country programme document (2020-2023) preparation. Accordingly, this was inputted in the UNDP Corporate Evaluation planning system (ERC platform) and was scheduled as one of the Evaluations to be undertaking in last Quarter of 2020.

The MTR consultants should endeavor to cover all aspects of the project activities implemented so far and should focus on reviewing results attained so far for the period under review

4. MTR APPROACH & METHODOLOGY

The MTR report must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful.

The MTR team will review all relevant sources of information including documents prepared during the preparation phase (i.e. PIF, UNDP Initiation Plan, UNDP Social and Environmental Screening Procedure/SESP), the Project Document, project reports including annual PIRs, project budget revisions, national strategic and legal documents, and any other materials that the team considers useful for this evidence-based review. The MTR team will review the baseline GEF focal area Core Indicators/Tracking Tools submitted to the GEF at CEO endorsement, and the midterm GEF focal area Core Indicators/Tracking Tools that must be completed before the MTR field mission begins.

The MTR team is expected to follow a collaborative and participatory approach¹ ensuring close engagement with the Project Team, government counterparts (the GEF Operational Focal Point), the UNDP Country Office(s), the Nature, Climate and Energy (NCE) Regional Technical Advisor, direct beneficiaries, and other key stakeholders.

Engagement of stakeholders is vital to a successful MTR.² Stakeholder involvement should include interviews with stakeholders who have project responsibilities, including but not limited to *National Government Department*), NGO's; 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 team is expected to conduct field missions including the following project sites (*Lakea, Hamilton, Tombo, Konakri Dee, Shenge and Turtle Island*). Zoom platform may be utilized for meetings with and discussing with the consultants.

The specific design and methodology for the MTR should emerge from consultations between the MTR team and the above-mentioned parties regarding what is appropriate and feasible for meeting the MTR purpose and objectives and answering the evaluation questions, given limitations of budget, time and data. The MTR team must, however, use gender-responsive methodologies and tools and ensure that gender equality and women's empowerment, as well as other cross-cutting issues and SDGs are incorporated into the MTR report.

The final methodological approach including interview schedule, field visits and data to be used in the MTR must be clearly outlined in the Inception Report and be fully discussed and agreed between UNDP, stakeholders and the MTR team.

The final MTR report must 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.

5. DETAILED SCOPE OF THE MTR

The MTR team 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?

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.

² For more stakeholder engagement in the M&E process, see the [UNDP Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results](#), Chapter 3, pg. 93.

- 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 governance 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. 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 ³	Baseline Level ⁴	Level in 1 st PIR (self-reported)	Midterm Target ⁵	End-of-project Target	Midterm Level & Assessment ⁶	Achievement Rating ⁷	Justification for Rating
------------------	------------------------	-----------------------------	--	-----------------------------	-----------------------	---	---------------------------------	--------------------------

³ Populate with data from the Logframe and scorecards

⁴ Populate with data from the Project Document

⁵ If available

⁶ Colour code this column only

⁷ Use the 6 point Progress Towards Results Rating Scale: HS, S, MS, MU, U, HU

[illegible]

Indicator Assessment Key

In addition to the progress towards outcomes analysis:

iii. Project Implementation and Adaptive Management

- 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 GEF Partner Agency (UNDP) and recommend areas for improvement.

⁸ Populate with data from the Logframe and scorecards

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?

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financer	Type of Co-financing	Co-financing amount confirmed at CEO Endorsement (US\$)	Actual Amount Contributed at stage of Midterm Review (US\$)	Actual % of Expected Amount
		TOTAL			

- Include the separate GEF Co-Financing template (filled out by the Commissioning Unit and project team) which categorizes each co-financing amount as 'investment mobilized' or 'recurrent expenditures'. (This template will be annexed as a separate file.)

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?
- Review the extent to which relevant gender issues were incorporated in monitoring systems. See Annex 9 of *Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects* for further guidelines.

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?
- How does the project engage women and girls? Is the project likely to have the same positive and/or negative effects on women and men, girls and boys? Identify, if possible, legal, cultural, or religious constraints on women's participation in the project. What can the project do to enhance its gender benefits?

Social and Environmental Standards (Safeguards)

- Validate the risks identified in the project's most current SESP, and those risks' ratings; are any revisions needed?
- Summarize and assess the revisions made since CEO Endorsement/Approval (if any) to:
 - The project's overall safeguards risk categorization.
 - The identified types of risks¹³ (in the SESP).
 - The individual risk ratings (in the SESP).
- Describe and assess progress made in the implementation of the project's social and environmental management measures as outlined in the SESP submitted at CEO Endorsement/Approval (and prepared during implementation, if any), including any revisions to those measures. Such management measures might include Environmental and Social Management Plans (ESMPs) or other management plans, though can also include aspects of a project's design; refer to Question 6 in the SESP template for a summary of the identified management measures.

A given project should be assessed against the version of UNDP's safeguards policy that was in effect at the time of the project's approval.

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 GEF 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 & Knowledge Management:

- 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.

¹³ Risks are to be labeled with both the UNDP SES Principles and Standards, and the GEF's "types of risks and potential impacts": Climate Change and Disaster; Disadvantaged or Vulnerable Individuals or Groups; Disability Inclusion; Adverse Gender-Related impact, including Gender-based Violence and Sexual Exploitation; Biodiversity Conservation and the Sustainable Management of Living Natural Resources; Restrictions on Land Use and Involuntary Resettlement; Indigenous Peoples; Cultural Heritage; Resource Efficiency and Pollution Prevention; Labor and Working Conditions; Community Health, Safety and Security.

- List knowledge activities/products developed (based on knowledge management approach approved at CEO Endorsement/Approval).

iv. Sustainability

- Validate whether the risks identified in the Project Document, Annual Project Review/PIRs and the ATLAS Risk Register 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 GEF 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

The MTR team will include a section in the MTR report for evidence-based conclusions, in light of the findings.

Additionally, the MTR consultant/team is expected to make recommendations to the Project Team. 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 MTR team should make no more than 15 recommendations total.

Ratings

The MTR team 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 (*Adapting to Climate Change Induced Coastal Risk Management 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.	
Project Implementation & Adaptive Management	(rate 6 pt. scale)	
Sustainability	(rate 4 pt. scale)	

6. TIMEFRAME

The total duration of the MTR will be approximately *30 days* over a time period of *5 weeks* starting *1 December 2020*, and shall not exceed five months from when the consultant(s) are hired. The tentative MTR timeframe is as follows:

ACTIVITY	NUMBER OF WORKING DAYS	COMPLETION DATE
Document review and preparing MTR Inception Report (MTR Inception Report due no later than 2 weeks before the MTR mission)	<i>4 days</i>	<i>(7 January 2021)</i>
MTR mission: stakeholder meetings, interviews, field visits (National Consultant)	<i>15 days</i>	<i>(28 January 2021)</i>
Presentation of initial findings- last day of the MTR mission	<i>1 day</i>	<i>(29 January 2021)</i>
Preparing draft report (due within 3 weeks of the MTR mission)	<i>5 days</i>	<i>(5 February 2021)</i>
Finalization of MTR report/ Incorporating audit trail from feedback on draft report (due within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on the draft)	<i>10 days</i>	<i>(19 February 2021)</i>

Options for site visits should be provided in the Inception Report.

7. MIDTERM REVIEW DELIVERABLES

#	Deliverable	Description	Timing	Responsibilities
---	-------------	-------------	--------	------------------

1	MTR Inception Report	MTR team clarifies objectives and methods of Midterm Review	7 January 2021	MTR team submits to the Commissioning Unit and project management
2	Presentation	Initial Findings	28 January 2021	MTR Team presents to project management and the Commissioning Unit
3	Draft MTR Report	Full draft report (using guidelines on content outlined in Annex B) with annexes	5 February 2021	Sent to the Commissioning Unit, reviewed by RTA, Project Coordinating Unit, GEF OFF
4	Final Report*	Revised report with audit trail detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final MTR report	19 February 2021	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.

8. MTR ARRANGEMENTS

The principal responsibility for managing this MTR resides with the Commissioning Unit. The Commissioning Unit for this project's MTR is UNDP Country Office in Sierra Leone. The Consultants are expected to work hand in hand with the Responsible Parties in executing their responsibilities. The Consultant is expected to:

- Report primarily to the UNDP Regional Technical Advisor in Addis Ababa, the UNDP Sierra Leone Office. e
- Co-ordinate with other team members, government counterparts and UNDP officials as required on all the technical requirements.
- UNDP CO will be responsible for facilitating data collection, meetings, and provision of other supporting functions and the Quality Assurance of the final documents produced.

The Commissioning Unit will contract the consultants and ensure the timely provision of per diems and travel arrangements within Sierra Leone for the MTR team and will provide an updated stakeholder list with contact details (phone and email). The Project Team will be responsible for liaising with the MTR team to provide all relevant documents, set up stakeholder interviews, and arrange field visits.

9. TEAM COMPOSITION

A team of two independent consultants will conduct the MTR - one team leader (with experience and exposure to projects and evaluations in other regions globally who normally is an International consultant and one team expert, usually from the country of the project-National consultant. The team leader (International consultant) will be responsible for the overall design and writing of the TE report and account for the overall completion of the MTR report. The National expert will assess emerging trends with respect to regulatory frameworks, budget allocations, capacity building, work with the Project Team in developing the TE itinerary and should take the lead in field data collection exercises and analysis etc.)

The consultants 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 consultants will be aimed at maximizing the overall “team” qualities in the following areas:

Education

- A Master’s degree in Social or Environmental Sciences, or other closely related field (15 points)

Experience

- Relevant experience with result-based management evaluation methodologies; (10 points)
- Experience applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios; (10 points)
- Experience in evaluating Climate change adaptation projects; (10 points)
- Experience working in *Africa*; (5 points)
- Experience in relevant technical areas for at least 10 years; (10 points)
- Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender and Climate change Adaptations; experience in gender sensitive evaluation and analysis. (10 points)
- Excellent communication skills and fluency in written and spoken English; (5 points)
- Demonstrable analytical skills; (5 points)
- Project evaluation/review experiences within United Nations system will be considered an asset; (10 points)
- Experience with implementing evaluations remotely will be considered an asset. (10 points)

The consultancy will be homebased, supported by a National Consultant

10. ETHICS

The MTR team will be held to the highest ethical standards and is required to sign a code of conduct upon acceptance of the assignment. This MTR will be conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG ‘Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation’. The MTR team must safeguard the rights and confidentiality of information providers, interviewees and stakeholders through measures to ensure compliance with legal and other relevant codes governing collection of data and reporting on data. The MTR team must also ensure security of collected information before and after the MTR and protocols to ensure anonymity and confidentiality of sources of information where that is expected. The information, knowledge and data gathered in the MTR process must also be solely used for the MTR and not for other uses without the express authorization of UNDP and partners.

11. PAYMENT SCHEDULE

- 20% payment upon satisfactory delivery of the final MTR Inception Report and approval by the Commissioning Unit
- 40% payment upon satisfactory delivery of the draft MTR report to the Commissioning Unit
- 40% payment upon satisfactory delivery of the final MTR report and approval by the Commissioning Unit and RTA (via signatures on the TE Report Clearance Form) and delivery of completed TE Audit Trail

Criteria for issuing the final payment of 40%¹⁴:

- The final MTR report includes all requirements outlined in the MTR TOR and is in accordance with the MTR guidance.
- The final MTR report is clearly written, logically organized, and is specific for this project (i.e. text has not been cut & pasted from other MTR reports).
- The Audit Trail includes responses to and justification for each comment listed.

In line with the UNDP's financial regulations, when determined by the Commissioning Unit and/or the consultant that a deliverable or service cannot be satisfactorily completed due to the impact of COVID-19 and limitations to the MTR, that deliverable or service will not be paid.

Due to the current COVID-19 situation and its implications, a partial payment may be considered if the consultant invested time towards the deliverable but was unable to complete due to circumstances beyond his/her control.

12. APPLICATION PROCESS¹⁵

Recommended Presentation of Proposal:

- a) **Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability** using the [template](#)¹⁶ provided by UNDP;
- b) **CV and a Personal History Form** ([P11 form](#))¹⁷;
- 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.

All application materials should be submitted to the UNDP Country office, Fourah Bay Close, Off Main Motor Road, Wilberforce, Freetown, Sierra Leone in a sealed envelope indicating the following reference "Consultant for Adapting to Climate Change Induced Coastal Risk Management project Midterm Review" or by email at the following address ONLY: by **11:59pm 9 December 2020**. Incomplete applications will be excluded from further consideration.

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.

¹⁴ The Commissioning Unit is obligated to issue payments to the MTR team as soon as the terms under the ToR are fulfilled. If there is an ongoing discussion regarding the quality and completeness of the final deliverables that cannot be resolved between the Commissioning Unit and the MTR team, the Regional M&E Advisor and Vertical Fund Directorate will be consulted. If needed, the Commissioning Unit's senior management, Procurement Services Unit and Legal Support Office will be notified as well so that a decision can be made about whether or not to withhold payment of any amounts that may be due to the evaluator(s), suspend or terminate the contract and/or remove the individual contractor from any applicable rosters.

Prepared by:

Sign: 

Date: 16/11/2020

Moi Swaray- M & E Officer, SLED

Reviewed by:

Sign:  Date: 16/11/2020

Tanzila Sankoh- Team Leader, SLED

Approved by:

Sign: 

Date: 16/11/2020

Rokya Ye Dieng- Deputy Resident Representative, UNDP