## Fostering Sustainability and Resilience for Food Security in the Savanna Zones of Northern Nigeria

## (PIMS 5578)

## Terms of Reference

* **INTRODUCTION**

This is the Terms of Reference (ToR) for the UNDP-GEF Midterm Review (MTR) of the full- sized project titled **Fostering Sustainability and Resilience for Food Security in the Savanna Zones of Northern Nigeria (PIMS 5578**) implemented through the Federal Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development (FMA&RD)/State Agricultural Development Programmes, also known as ADPs, to be undertaken in August 2020. The project started on the **01 February 2018** and is in its second year of implementation. 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*.

# PROJECT BACKGROUND INFORMATION

The overall objective of this project is: To enhance productivity and promote sustainability and resilience of Nigeria’s agricultural production systems for improved national food security. To achieve this objective, the project will address the aforementioned barriers through three closely inter-related impact pathways: (i) Strengthening institutional and policy coherence; (ii) Scaling up sustainable land and water management practices; and (iii) Addressing gender disparities in agricultural production and food value chains. Impact will be monitored and assessed for sustainability and resilience.

This project is implemented in Northern Nigeria, which accounts for approximately 75% of the country’s land area and includes the north-central, north-east and north-west geopolitical zones of the country. This is an area targeted by the government to support national food security. A largely savannah landscape (Guinea-Sudan-Sahel), the major crops grown are grain legumes, cereal, root crops and tubers. It is also the major livestock production area in Nigeria. To meet the rapidly increasing demand for food by an ever- expanding human population (estimated to grow by 2.5% annually), it is expected that crop production must expand at a 4% annual rate, while livestock production must expand by more than 3% annually between now and 2025. This substantial growth requirement means both an emphasis on intensification and potentially more extensive production, pushing into marginal areas and inducing greater vulnerability to climate change and variability. Time frame for the project based on the project document is 2011-2017, which would be given an extension. The total budget for the project is US$4,610,000.00 while planned co- financing is at US$10,650,000.00,

For the project, UNDP has been the GEF Implementing Agency (IA). The project is working at the Federal level, across seven norther states and a women-based NGO targeting the women and youth for the gender component of the project. At the moment, Federal Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development (FMA&RD) is the lead government agency under the project with the Agricultural Development Programme (ADPs) of Adamawa, Benue, Jigawa, Kano, Katsina, Gombe and Nasarrawa as state counterparts. The FMA&RD is the primary authority responsible for agricultural development in Nigeria. In its capacity of lead agency, the FMA&RD is responsible for the supervision of the project, providing joint approval of quarterly work plans and budgets at the national level. To achieve project objectives and produce required outputs, the FMA&RD is partnering with the States ADPs, WOFAN and other stakeholders such as other government ministries and departments, local communities and NGOs. The State ADPs all play important role as members of the Steering Committee.

# OBJECTIVES OF THE MTR

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, its risks to sustainability.

# MTR APPROACH & METHODOLOGY

The MTR 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 Environmental & Social Safeguard Policy, the Project Document, project reports including Annual Project Review/PIRs, project budget revisions, lesson learned reports, 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 Tracking Tool submitted to the GEF at CEO endorsement, and the midterm GEF focal area Tracking Tool 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), UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Advisers, 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 Federal Ministry Of Environment (for the climate change component), National Planning Commission, State Ministries Of Agriculture and Rural Development, key experts and consultants in the subject area, Project Board, project stakeholders, academia, local government and CSOs, etc. Additionally, the MTR team is not expected to conduct project field missions to the participating states, however, contacts should be made using remote access to discuss with all the stakeholders due the prevailing covid pandemic situation across the globe.

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.

# 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.

## 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 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.

## Progress Towards Results

Progress Towards Outcomes Analysis:

* Review the log-frame 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** | **Indicator3** | **Baseline Level4** | **Level in 1st PIR (self- reported)** | **Midterm Target5** | **End-of- project Target** | **Midterm Level & Assessment6** | **Achievement Rating7** | **Justification for Rating** |
| **Objective:** | Indicator (if applicable): |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Outcome 1:** | Indicator 1: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Indicator 2: |  |  |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Outcome 2:** | Indicator 3: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Indicator 4: |  |  |  |  |  |
| Etc. |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Etc.** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

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

**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:

* Compare and analyse the GEF Tracking Tool at the Baseline with the one completed right before the Midterm Review.
* 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.

## 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 GEF 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:

* 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 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:

* 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.

## 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 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 of the report setting out the MTR’s evidence-based conclusions, in light of the findings.8

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 an *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 Fostering Sustainability and Resilience for Food Security in the Savanna Zones of Northern Nigeria. (PIMS 5578)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **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) |  |

# TIMEFRAME

The total duration of the MTR will be approximately **40 Days** over a time period of 8 weeks starting August 01, 2020*,* and shall not exceed 2 months from when the consultant(s) are hired. The tentative MTR timeframe is as follows:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **TIMEFRAME** | **ACTIVITY** |
| 20 September, 2020 | Application closes |
| 28 September, 2020 | Select MTR Team |
| 30 September, 2020 | Prep the MTR Team (handover of Project Documents) |
| 1 – 3 October, 2020 | Document review and preparing MTR Inception Report |
| 5– 10 October, 2020 (5 days) | Finalization and Validation of MTR Inception Report- latest start of MTR mission |
| 12 - 30 October 2020 (15 days) | MTR mission: stakeholder meetings, remote interviews, discussions with relevant stakeholders, State ADPs |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 1 November, 2020 (1 day) | Mission wrap-up meeting & presentation of initial findings- earliest end of MTR mission |
| 2 - 7 November, 2020 (6 days) | Preparing and submission of draft report |
| 7 - 12 November, 2020 (6 days) | Incorporating audit trail from feedback on draft report/Finalization of MTR report) |
| 13 – 19 November, 2020 (7 days) | Preparation & Issue of Management Response |
| 20 November 2020 | Expected date of full MTR completion |

# MIDTERM REVIEW DELIVERABLES

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **#** | **Deliverable** | **Description** | **Timing** | |  |  | **Responsibilities** |
| **1** | **MTR Inception Report** | MTR team clarifies objectives and methods of Midterm Review | No later than 2 weeks before the MTR mission: **3**  **October, 2020** | | | MTR team submits to the Commissioning Unit and project management | |
| **2** | **Presentation** | Initial Findings | End of MTR mission: **1**  **November, 2020** | | | MTR Team 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 4 weeks of the MTR mission: **14 November,**  **2020** |  | Sent to the Commissioning Unit, reviewed by RTA, | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |  | Project Coordinating Unit, GEF OFP |
| **4** | **Final Report\*** | Revised report with audit trail detailing how all | Within 1 week of receiving UNDP | Sent to the Commissioning Unit | |
|  |  | received comments have | comments on draft: |  | |
|  |  | (and have not) been | **12 October, 2020** |  | |
|  |  | addressed in the final |  |  | |
|  |  | MTR report |  |  | |

\*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.

# MTR ARRANGEMENTS

The principal responsibility for managing this MTR resides with the Commissioning Unit. The

Commissioning Unit for this project’s MTR is the UNDP Nigeria 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 MTR team. 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.

# 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) and one team expert, usually from the country of the project. 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:

* Recent experience with result-based management evaluation methodologies; (5 marks)
* Experience applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios; (5 marks)
* Competence in adaptive management, as applied to; (15 marks)
* Experience working with the GEF or GEF-evaluations; (15 marks)
* Experience working in developing countries especially Sub – Saharan Africa; (10 marks)
* Work experience in relevant technical areas (ecosystem management, sustainable land management, food security) for at least 10 years; (10 marks)
* Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender and biodiversity mainstreaming, experience in gender sensitive evaluation and analysis; (10 marks)
* Excellent communication skills; (5 marks)
* Demonstrable analytical skills; (5 marks)
* Project evaluation/review experiences within United Nations system will be considered an asset; (10 marks)
* A Master’s degree or higher in biology, ecology, forestry, zoology, integrated landscape management, natural resources management or other closely related field. (10 marks)

# PAYMENT MODALITIES 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

Or, as otherwise agreed between the Commissioning Unit and the MTR team.

# APPLICATION PROCESS9

## Recommended Presentation of Proposal:

* + - **Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability** using the template10 provided by UNDP;
    - **CV** and a **Personal History Form** (P11 form11);
    - **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)
    - **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 done online at the UNDP jobsite ONLY: by *midnight of 30th October 2016.*

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.

## ToR ANNEX A: List of Documents to be reviewed by the MTR Team

1. PIF
2. UNDP Initiation Plan
3. UNDP Project Document
4. UNDP Environmental and Social Screening results
5. Project Inception Report
6. All Project Implementation Reports (PIR’s)
7. Quarterly progress reports and work plans of the various implementation task teams
8. Audit reports
9. Finalized GEF Land Degradation Tracking Tools at CEO endorsement and midterm
10. Oversight mission reports
11. All monitoring reports prepared by the project
12. 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 Board Meetings and other meetings (i.e. Project Appraisal Committee meetings)

9 Engagement of the consultants should be done in line with guidelines for hiring consultants in the POPP: https://info.undp.org/global/popp/Pages/default.aspx

10

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

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