



**UNITED NATIONS DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME**  
**UNDP Somalia**

**Terms of Reference (TOR)**

**Consultancy - Final evaluation of the Programme for Sustainable Charcoal Reduction and Alternative Livelihoods**

| PROJECT/OUTCOME INFORMATION                   |  |               |
|---|--|---------------|
| Project/outcome title                         | Programme for Sustainable Charcoal Reduction and Alternative Livelihoods   |               |
| Atlas ID                                      | 00084974   |               |
| Corporate outcome and output                  | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I. Economic governance institutions are strengthened, and an enabling environment is established for inclusive, sustainable, and broad-based economic growth driven by the emerging small and medium enterprise (SME) sector</li> <li>II. Enhanced access to clean, affordable, and sustainable energy and livelihoods for economic growth</li> <li>III. Promote energy security and more resilient livelihoods by gradually reducing unsustainable charcoal production, trade, and use.</li> <li>IV. Engage with the federal government of Somalia, federal member states, local communities, UN agencies, the private sector, and other key stakeholders to account for both the demand and supply side of the charcoal value chain.</li> </ol> |               |
| Country                                       | Somalia  |               |
| Region  | Federal and Federal member states  |               |
| Date project document signed                  | March 2016   |               |
| Project dates                                 | Start  | Planned end   |
|   | March 2016   | December 2022 |
| Project budget                                | USD 10,502,196.18  |               |
| Project expenditure at the time of evaluation | TBC (% delivery)   |               |
| Funding source                                | MPTF (Sweden USD 4,438,927.50; Italy USD 1,084,842.00: EUD USD 3,715,499.00, Norway USD 576,000.00)<br>UNDP (USD 686,927.68)   |               |

## 1. Programme Background and context

Somalia is one of the poorest nations in Africa and the world with 69 percent of its 16 million people living below the poverty line. Due to its arid landmass, degraded habitats, and protracted conflict, Somalia scores the highest in climate vulnerability among fragile states worldwide. Protracted conflict and displacement have stunted growth in Somalia and eroded the resilience of households. Accessing energy requires daily labour in rural areas (mostly for women) and represents an important and recurring expenditure for urban households.

Biomass (firewood and charcoal) accounts for 80 to 90 percent of energy needs. Liquefied Petroleum Gas (LPG) and kerosene are also used as substitutes by wealthier households. Electricity (from diesel power plants) only accounts for a marginal portion of total energy use. Somalia's important biomass resources, sufficient to meet the population's needs, are at the same time under-exploited (e.g., marginal use of waste for biogas, practically no energy plantations); and under threat because of uncontrolled exploitation, largely to produce charcoal for the export market.

Charcoal making and its export from Somalia have been in practice since pre-colonial times to meet local and regional energy requirements and provide livelihood opportunities for poor and vulnerable households. However, unscrupulous plunder of forest and range resources for charcoal production has been witnessed during the last two decades. The breakdown of state institutions, protracted conflict, weakening of traditional systems of decision-making on access to resources, absence of alternative sources of energy and limited livelihoods options have led to unsustainable production and trade of charcoal, fueled by the constant demand for charcoal on the international market (neighbouring countries and Gulf nations). Women are over-represented in the lowest paying and most precarious positions of the charcoal value chain, earning an estimated average of 50 cents/day for the collection/selling of charcoal. On the other end of the chain, charcoal exports (banned but never effectively halted) fuel the war economy, generating revenue of over USD 15 million per annum from illegal exports for the benefit of militia groups and brokers/intermediaries who act as gatekeepers for exports. As such, a multitude of complex issues surrounds charcoal production in Somalia leading to triple threats - in the forms of irreversible environmental degradation, perpetual conflict, and dependence on fast-depleting livelihoods option. The realization of these multifaceted issues resulted in the imposition of a ban on the import of Charcoal from Somalia by the UN Security Council in February 2012. The Federal Government has also on many occasions reiterated the ban on charcoal export which was first enacted in October 1969, through press releases from the president's office and the cabinet.

In response to UN Security Council Resolution 2036 (2012) that seeks international cooperation to ban illegal exports of charcoal from Somalia and at the request of the Somali Government, the Joint Program on Charcoal Reduction and Alternative Livelihoods (PROSCAL) was framed. The Programme envisages a comprehensive response to support the Security Council Resolution and create an enabling environment to support energy security in Somalia. The specific objectives of the programme are: 1) Support the government in Somalia as well as countries in the region to produce pertinent legal instruments and strengthen enforcement mechanisms at national, regional and local levels; 2) Promote alternative sources of energy to reduce local charcoal consumption; 3) provide alternative

---

<sup>1</sup> This is the entity that has overall responsibility for implementation of the project (award), effective use of resources and delivery of outputs in the signed project document and workplan.

livelihood options to households and communities dependent on charcoal production and trade; and, 4) reforestation and afforestation throughout the country for the rehabilitation of degraded lands.

The Program is funded by the EU, Sweden, Italy and Norway through UN MPTF. PROSCAL is jointly implemented by UNDP, FAO, and UNEP, it falls under the economic development portfolio of the MPTF, providing a flexible arrangement for joint work plans and single reporting. The program implementation was launched in March 2016 and will run until March 2022. The programme engages with the Federal Government of Somalia (FGS) and the federal member states (FMS), authorities in neighbouring countries, local communities, other UN entities, the private sector, and other key stakeholders to address both the demand and supply side of the charcoal value chain.

The program has three major components:

- Component 1. Capacity building and Regional Cooperation
- Component 2. Alternative Energy
- Component 3. Alternative Livelihood

The following are the Programme outputs:

- I. Output 1.1. Regional Charcoal Policy Framework and Legally Binding Instrument, within the concept of international policy on charcoal National Promulgation and Rules of Business for Reducing Charcoal Production.
- II. Output 1.2 Monitoring Systems of Charcoal Production, Reporting and Movement in Somalia (FAO)
- III. Output 1.3. Support the development of enabling policies on Energy, Forestry and Natural Resources Management
- IV. Output 1.4. Establishment of regional Partnerships with Gulf States to Strengthen cooperation and address the Demand side of the Charcoal Trade. Promoting regional cooperation - UN is well placed to support FGS with this.
- V. Output 1.5. Improved awareness about environmental degradation and loss of livelihoods in Somalia due to charcoal trade
- VI. Output 1.6. Capacity building of federal (DOECC), state-level Env. Ministries and Communities to coordinate actions for Reducing Charcoal Production, Trade and Use
- VII. Output 2.1. Accelerated diffusion of efficient cook-stoves for reducing charcoal consumption
- VIII. Output 2.2. Sustainable and efficient production of charcoal for local consumption
- IX. Output 2.4. Development of the LPG market and its accelerated diffusion to reduce local charcoal consumption
- X. Output 2.5. Development of the solar energy market and accelerated diffusion of solar energy equipment to reduce local charcoal consumption
- XI. Output 3.2: Diversification of income and asset building for vulnerable households to facilitate the transition to more resilient and sustainable livelihoods
- XII. Output 3.3. Reforestation and rehabilitation of degraded ecosystems for environmental conservation and sustainable production of food, fuel, and fodder

The programme successfully engaged with the government in Somalia, governments of countries in the region, local communities, UN agencies, the private sector, and other key stakeholders to account for both the demand and supply side of the charcoal value chain. Further, PROSCAL has mobilized key stakeholders and technically empowered & mandated government institutions across Somalia for effective monitoring and enforcement of the charcoal trade ban, the development of an enabling policy environment for energy security, and natural resources management. Domestic awareness-

raising, regional coordination, and high-level engagement have highlighted the importance of banning charcoal export and disincentivizing business groups engaged in the charcoal trade. The programme has undertaken evidence-based monitoring through satellite and GIS mapping on the dynamics of charcoal production, stockpile, and export to inform action at national and international levels, including in partnership with UNODC and the UN security council. In addition, the programme has tackled critical points of the charcoal value chain by supporting innovative energy solutions for charcoal use by providing access to environment-friendly sustainable sources of energy, comprising of fuel-efficient stoves, alternatives to charcoal, and solar solutions. PROSCAL supported an initiative that provided livestock, agricultural inputs, and equipment to low-income families in Somalia to boost their economic growth and help mitigate Somalia's recurring shocks while becoming less dependent on the use of charcoal as the main source of livelihood. As part of the efforts to rehabilitate degraded rangelands by establishing tree nurseries and by enhancing the availability of seedlings, distribution, and community engagement.

## **2. Evaluation purpose, scope, and objectives**

The overall objective of the end of project evaluation is to generate knowledge from the 'Programme for Sustainable Charcoal Reduction and Alternative Livelihoods (PROSCAL)' which was implemented by UNDP, FAO and UNEP in partnership with federal and state-level environmental institutions. It will focus on the entire implementation period of the project (March 2016-Dec 2022). In addition, the overall progress, efficiency of management, implementation, institutional results and their sustainability will be addressed. The evaluation will provide recommendations based on the current working environment to ensure continued relevance and sustainability. The key stakeholders of this evaluation are the Federal Government of Somalia, particularly the Directorate of Environment and Climate Change (DOECC) under the Office of the Prime Minister (OPM), donors and the environment ministries of the Federal Member States (Puntland, Galmudug, Hirshabelle, Southwest and Jubaland) and Somaliland.

The overall purpose of the Evaluation is to assess the processes, achievements made, and bottlenecks faced to draw lessons that will inform the development of the next-generation program document. The evaluation is intended to be forward-looking which will capture effectively lessons learnt and provide information on the nature, extent and where possible, the effect of PROSCAL in addressing charcoal issues. The emphasis on learning lessons speaks to the issue of understanding what has and what has not worked as a guide for future planning.

### **Scope**

The evaluation will particularly focus on performance indicators with guidance from the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) with an emphasis on **relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, and sustainability**.

The total duration of the assignment will be 35 working days spread over 3 months from the date of the Contract signature. Details are illustrated in section 5 of these TORs.

A team of two consultants, one international and one national, will carry out the evaluation. The consultants will jointly hold interviews with selected key informants and field work for data collection. The national consultant will conduct fieldwork where the international consultant may not be able due to security-related restrictions. In some situations, the national consultant will involve translations and interpretations during and after interviews.

Key informants will be relevant staff from the Federal Government of Somalia engaged in the implementation of the program, representatives from the federal member state ministries of environment, the UN, donors and beneficiaries. The locations to be visited by the consultants (depending on the conditions and the need) include the FGS in Mogadishu as well as the rest of the Federal Member States' capitals and Somaliland. The areas to be visited may include:

| Area                          | Capital    |
|-------------------------------|------------|
| Federal Government of Somalia | Mogadishu  |
| Somaliland                    | Hargeisa   |
| Puntland                      | Garowe     |
| Galmudug                      | Dhusamareb |
| Hirshabelle                   | Jowhar     |
| South West                    | Baidoa     |
| Jubaland                      | Kismayo    |

The evaluation will look at the following areas as directed by the project document and results framework: project management, project outputs, and their contribution to the overall results defined in the project document. It will consider the contribution of coordination, and national leadership, to the strengthening of partnerships amongst the Federal Government of Somalia; the Federal Member States and development partners; as well as aspects related to capacity building and the approach adopted.

### 3. Evaluation criteria and key guiding questions

#### a) The Evaluation Questions

The following key questions will guide the end of the project evaluation:

##### i) Relevance/ Coherence:

- To what extent did the project achieve its overall objectives?
- Did the project provide the necessary support to the target government institutions as outlined in the project document?
- To what extent did the project contribute to gender equality, the empowerment of women and the human rights-based approach? Specifically, the evaluation will measure if the gender marker of the project was in line with the achieved results.
- What and how much progress has been made towards achieving the overall outputs and outcomes of the project, including contributing factors and constraints?
- Were the inputs and strategies identified appropriate and adequate to achieve the results? Were they realistic?
- What are the casual linkages between interventions?
- Was the project relevant in terms of addressing identified needs?
- To what extent do the implementing partners participating in the joint programme have an added value to solve the development challenges stated in the programme document?
- At what level did COVID-19 limit the project to achieve its objectives to the optimal level?
- If the programme Document was revised, Did it reflect the changes that were needed?

##### ii) Effectiveness

- To what extent did the project contribute to the Country Programme Document outputs and outcomes, UN Strategic Framework, the SDGs, and the national development priorities?
- Describe the management processes and their appropriateness in supporting delivery
- Was the project effective in delivering synergistic and coherent desired/planned results?
- How effective were the strategies and tools used in the implementation of the project?
- How effective has the project been in responding to the needs of the beneficiaries, and what synergistic and coherent results were achieved?
- How did the project funding level and resource mobilisation affect project implementation?
- What are the lessons learned for future intervention strategies and issues?
- At what level was gender mainstreaming adopted in the project implementation?

### **iii) Efficiency**

- Was the process of achieving results efficiently? Specifically, did the actual or expected results (outputs and outcomes) justify the costs incurred?
- What type of (administrative, financial and managerial) obstacles did the joint programme face and to what extent has this affected its efficiency at the terminal phase?
- Were the available resources utilised effectively?
- Did project activities overlap and duplicate other similar interventions (funded nationally and/or by other donors)?
- To what extent did the project's M&E mechanism contribute to meeting project results?
- How effectively was updated data used to manage the project?
- Are there more efficient ways and means of delivering more and better results (outputs and outcomes) with the available inputs?
- Did the project remain aligned with the theory of change, if there was a deviation, how did it affect less efficiency and effectiveness Could a different approach have produced better results?
- How was the project's collaboration with the UNDP, FAO, UNEP, the FGS, FMS, national institutions, development partners, and the MPTF?
- How efficient were the management and accountability structures of the project?
- What are the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats of the project's implementation process?

### **iv. Sustainability**

- To what extent are the benefits of the project likely to be sustained after the completion of this project?
- What is the likelihood of continuation and sustainability of project outcomes and benefits after completion of the project?
- How effective were the exit strategies, and approaches to phase out assistance provided by the project including contributing factors and constraints?
- What knowledge transfer took place during the project implementation that will guarantee government institutions will play their role when the project is closed?
- Describe key factors that will require attention to improve prospects of sustainability of project outcomes and the potential for replication of the approach
- How were capacities strengthened at the individual and organizational level (including contributing factors and constraints)?

- Describe the main lessons that have emerged
- What are the key lessons derived from the knowledge and experiences provided by the project that can be used by the evaluation users (UNDP, donor and gov) to enhance decision-making and programming?
- What are the recommendations for similar support in the future? (NB. The recommendations should provide comprehensive proposals for future interventions based on the current evaluation findings)
- Are there some risks that may adversely limit the sustainability of the project deliverables?

### Disability

- Were persons with disabilities consulted and meaningfully involved in programme planning and implementation?
- What proportion of the beneficiaries of a programme were persons with disabilities?
- What barriers did persons with disabilities face?
- Was a twin-track approach adopted?

Guiding evaluation questions will be further refined by the evaluator and agreed upon with UNDP evaluation stakeholders in the inception report.

-

## 4. Methodology

The “ Joint Program on Charcoal Reduction and Alternative Livelihoods (PROSCAL)” steering committee shall guide and oversee the overall direction of the consultancy. The evaluator is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach. The evaluation must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable, and useful. The evaluation will provide quantitative and qualitative data through the following methods:

- Desk study and review of all relevant project documentation including project documents, annual work plans, midterm evaluation reports, project progress reports, project monitoring reports (from third-party monitors) annual project reports, minutes of project board meetings, reports of consultancies and events.
- In-depth interviews to gather primary data from key stakeholders using a structured methodology. All interviews with men and women should be undertaken in full confidence and anonymity. The final evaluation report should not assign specific comments to individuals
- Focus Group discussions with project beneficiaries (men and women) and other stakeholders will be conducted
- Interviews with relevant key informants (see attached list of relevant institutions)
- Observations and verifications (field visits -when/if possible- using checklist) to be conducted by a local consultant with all Covid-19 and security protocols issued by the Government being observed.
- **Data review and analysis** of monitoring and other data sources and methods. To ensure maximum validity, and reliability of data (quality) and promote use, the evaluation team will ensure triangulation of the various data sources, to enhance the validity and utility of the findings.

- Innovation in data collection needs to be employed.<sup>2</sup>
- Data disaggregated (by gender/vulnerable group/geographical setting) to support the outreach of the diverse stakeholders' groups, **Gender and human rights lens**. All evaluation products need to address gender, disability, and human rights issues.

The final methodological approach including interview scheduling, field visits and data to be used in the evaluation should be clearly outlined in the inception report and fully discussed and agreed upon between UNDP, key stakeholders, and the evaluators.

- The findings of the evaluation should lead to the elaboration of specific, practical, achievable recommendations that should be directed to the intended users.

## 5. Evaluation of products (key deliverables)

The following deliverables are expected:

| Deliverable                         | Content  | Timing  | Responsibilities   |
|-------------------------------------|--|---------|--|
| <b>Inception Report</b>             | An inception report, outlining the key scope of the work and intended work plan of the analysis, and evaluation questions, shall be submitted (10- 15 pages)   | 5 days  | International consultant in collaboration with the local consultant<br><br>Reviewed by the Evaluation Steering Committee |
| <b>Data Collection and analysis</b> | All interviews, recordings and analyses will be delivered to UNDP and remain the property of UNDP  | 13 days | International consultant in collaboration with the local consultant  |
| <b>Draft Final Report</b>           | A draft comprehensive report that will inform all key stakeholders including representatives of the FGS and FMS, UN RCO, UNDP, in-country representatives from multilateral and bilateral development partner agencies, and civil society (A length of 40 to 60 pages including executive summary) | 7 days  | International consultant in collaboration with the local consultant<br><br>Reviewed by the Evaluation Steering Committee |

<sup>2</sup> UNDP encourage evaluators to follow innovative evaluation approaches. Examples on Innovation In Evaluation Approaches can be found in the following links: ([Case Studies of Best Practice Evaluations by UN Agencies in Asia and the Pacific](#)) and ([2022 Evaluation Excellence Award](#))



|                     |  |         |   |
|---------------------|--|---------|---|
| <b>Final Report</b> | <p>The content and structure of the final analytical report will outline findings, recommendations and lessons learnt covering the scope of the evaluation, and will meet the requirements of the UNDP Evaluation Guidelines, 2019 and should include the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Title and opening pages should provide the following basic information:<br/>Name of the evaluation intervention.<br/>The time frame of the evaluation and date of the report.<br/>Countries of the evaluation intervention. Names and organizations of evaluators.<br/>Name of the organization commissioning the evaluation.<br/>Acknowledgements.<br/>- Project and evaluation information details</li> <li>2. Table of contents, including boxes, figures, tables and annexes with page references.</li> <li>3. List of acronyms and abbreviations.</li> <li>4. Executive summary (4 pages maximum))</li> <li>5. Introduction (2-3 pages)</li> <li>6. Findings (4-5 pages)</li> <li>7. Conclusions (1-2)</li> <li>8. Recommendations (1-3) pages)</li> <li>9. Lessons learned (1-2 pages)</li> <li>10. Report annexes.: charts, terms of reference,</li> </ol> | 10 days | <p>International consultant in collaboration with the local consultant</p> <p>Reviewed by the Evaluation Steering Committee.</p> <p>Approved by the evaluation commissioner</p> |
|---------------------|--|---------|---|

Standard templates for the inception report and the evaluation report that need to be followed are provided in the Annexes section. It is expected that the evaluator will follow the UNDP evaluation guidelines and ensure that all the required quality assessment criteria outlined in section 6 are addressed in the evaluation report.

## 6. Evaluation of team composition and required competencies

The evaluation will be carried out by two experts – one international and one local consultant. The international expert will be the lead evaluator responsible and accountable for all the deliverables as well as supervising the local expert. The two experts will be expected to work together harmoniously with the local expert getting direction from the international consultant on the data collection, and verification processes as well as the submission of all relevant deliverables required for the achievement of the evaluation. In addition, the local consultant is required to advise the context and as well to lead the data collection fieldwork. Further, the locals may also be required to involve in some translation and interpretation during the data collection especially the Key informants and The Focus Group discussion sessions.

### **The International Evaluator shall have the following expertise and qualifications:**

- A Master's degree in economics, environmental management, strategic planning and natural resource management or related fields
- A Minimum of 10 years of relevant professional experience in conducting or managing evaluations, assessments, audits, research or review of Sustainable development projects and programmes in fragile context
- Experience in evaluating environmental programs in fragile contexts or conflict countries, particularly in Somalia and other IGAD Member Countries
- Good understanding of UNDP mandate, policy, procedures, and programme management
- Experience in gender analysis and mainstreaming in evaluation or research activities
- Experience in evaluating UN Joint Programmes in a fragile setting
- Sound knowledge of result-based management
- Excellent English writing and communication skills.
- Working knowledge in Somalia is an added advantage
- Full computer literacy

### **The National Evaluator shall have the following expertise and qualifications:**

- A Master's degree in Natural Resources Management, Economics, Social Sciences, Geography, Forestry, biological sciences, environmental science or other closely related fields
- A Minimum of 5 years of practical experience in a similar professional role, i.e., implementation, consultancy support and/or evaluation of sustainable development projects and programmes in fragile contexts
- Competence in adaptive management, as applied to Biodiversity; Climate Change Mitigation; Sustainable Forestry Management/REDD-Plus and Land Degradation focal areas
- Demonstrated experience/skill-set in data collection, data processing, field interviews, data presentation and facilitating focus group discussions
- Demonstrated working experience in areas of Livelihood, energy and policy formulation
- Knowledge of GIS mapping and remote sensing of rangelands at (sub)national level
- Excellent analytical and document drafting/reporting report writing skills
- Experience with the UN particularly in evaluating Joint Programmes is an asset
- Working knowledge of the Somali language is required and
- Excellent written and verbal communication skills in English.

## 7. Evaluation ethics

This evaluation will be conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation'. The consultants must safeguard the rights and confidentiality of information providers, interviewees, and stakeholders through measures to ensure compliance with

legal and other relevant codes governing the collection of data and reporting on data. The consultants must also ensure the security of collected information before and after the evaluation and protocols to ensure anonymity and confidentiality of sources of information where that is expected. The information knowledge and data gathered in the evaluation process must also be solely used for the evaluation and not for other uses with the express authorization of UNDP and partners.” The evaluators must be free and clear of perceived conflict of interest and interested consultants will not be considered if they were directly or substantively an employee or consultant in the formulation of UNDP strategies and programmes. In this regard, each consultant is mandatory to sign a code of conduct and an agreement before they start working with UNDP.

## **8. Implementation arrangements**

The key stakeholders of this evaluation are the Federal Government of Somalia, particularly the Directorate of Environment and Climate Change (DOECC) under the Office of the Prime Minister (OPM), UN implementing Agencies (UNDP, FAO, & UNEP), donors and the environment ministries of the Federal Member States (Puntland, Galmudug, Hirshabelle, Southwest and Jubaland) and Somaliland. The evaluator is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach. Also, the “ Joint Program on Charcoal Reduction and Alternative Livelihoods (PROSCAL)” steering committee shall guide and oversee the overall direction of the consultancy. The Programme Steering Committee is chaired by the Minister of Environment and Climate Change, the federal government of Somalia and co-chaired by the DSRSG/RC/HC.

The principal responsibility for managing the TE resides in UNDP Somalia. UNDP will contract the evaluators and ensure the timely provision of per diems and travel arrangements within the country for the TE team. The Project Team will be responsible for liaising with the TE team to provide all relevant documents, set up stakeholder interviews, and arrange field visits. UNDP and Project Team will facilitate and provide all the support that is required to implement remote/ virtual TE in the event of travel restrictions to the country. For any visits to the project site, the UNDP CO will arrange travel and bear the cost as per UNDP rules and policies. If the travel to project sites is restricted, the logistic support in the implementation of remote/virtual meetings shall be carried out by the project team in coordination with the UNDP Somalia CO.

### **A. Reporting**

#### **a) Reporting lines**

- i. The IC shall work under the direct supervision of the UNDP Somalia Monitoring & Evaluation (M&E) Specialist in close collaboration with project M&E focal points, Director General of the Directorate of Environment and Climate Change, Office of Prime Minister-Federal Government of Somalia, ministries of Environment at federal member states (Puntland, Galmudug, Hirshabelle, Southwest and Jubaland) and Somaliland who will support the evaluation and give comments and direction at key stages in the evaluation process.
- ii. The M&E Specialist shall be responsible for oversight of the whole evaluation process including the provision of technical guidance, quality control, ensuring the independence of the evaluation process and, that policy is followed.
- iii. The UNDP shall be responsible for all contractual arrangements and the individual Contractor (IC) shall be directly accountable to UNDP for the performance of the Contract.

- iv. The UNDP Project team will be responsible for liaising with the Evaluators team to set up stakeholder interviews, arrange field visits, and coordinate with government counterparts

**b) Progress Reporting**

- v. The terminal evaluation will be conducted by two consultants who albeit having specific deliverables, will work as a team to harmonize deliverables, tools, and methodologies and on the final report and recommendations. The team leader will be responsible for the overall design, writing, and presentation of the final report.
- vi. Progress reporting shall include both virtual presentation and submission of written reports with a brief description of progress towards achieving the expected deliverables.
  - a. Evaluation inception report. The two consultants will work collaboratively to prepare an integrated inception report.
  - b. Draft evaluation report. The UNDP and key national stakeholders involved in the evaluation shall review the draft report and provide an amalgamated set of comments to the IC within one week of submission of the report.
  - c. Evaluation report audit trail. Comments and changes by the IC in response to the draft report shall be retained by the IC to show how she or she has addressed the comments.
  - d. Evaluation debriefings. Immediately after the evaluation, the IC will debrief stakeholders, focusing on the key results and recommendations of the evaluation
  - e. Presentations: The IC shall make presentations to UNDP, donors, and other key stakeholders as required.
- vii. Outputs will be jointly reviewed and endorsed by the UNDP M&E project focal points and key national counterparts and certified by the UNDP M&E Specialist, Country Office Management, and the UNDP IEO.
- viii. All data collected during the evaluation including all interviews, recordings, and analyses will be submitted to UNDP and shall remain the property of UNDP.
- ix. The UNDP will provide existing literature or documents to the selected Consultant to facilitate a better understanding of the project.
- x. The final report will be quality assessed by the UNDP Independent Evaluation Office (IEO).

**B. Logistical/Administrative Support**

- a) The Consultant will work under UNDP's duty of care and will comply with all UNDP security regulations. SSAFE pre-deployment certification is required for Somalia travel and if not already in possession of it, will be facilitated and paid for by UNDP. The number of days spent in SSAFE training (if any) will not be considered as working days.
- b) In-country travel to project evaluation sites in Somalia and Somaliland will be arranged and borne by UNDP based on UNDP travel policy for individual contractors and prevailing UN/UNDP security guidelines.
- c) The selected Applicant will be required to provide proof of medical insurance coverage for the contract period before the commencement of the assignment.

- d) The individual contractor will be required to have a personal laptop computer. The UN will provide office space and facilities such as internet connectivity and access to office printers in UN offices as deemed necessary and based on availability.

## 9. Time frame for the evaluation process

The evaluation is expected to start in October 2022 for an estimated duration of 35 working days. This will include desk reviews, fieldwork - interviews, and report writing.

## 10. Submission process and basis for selection

Interested and qualified consultants who wish to apply are required to submit the following documents:

- a) Letter of confirmation of interest and availability
- b) Personal CV or P11, indicating all past experiences from similar projects, as well as the contact details (email and telephone number) of the Candidate and at least three (3) professional references.
- c) Brief description of why the individual considers him/herself as the most suitable for the assignment.
- d) Financial Proposal that indicates all-inclusive professional fees.

## 11. Payment Tranches

| Assignment       | Percentage to be paid |
|------------------|-----------------------|
| Inception report | 20%                   |
| Draft report     | 30%                   |
| Final report     | 50%                   |

## 12. TOR annexes. These provide links to supporting background documents and more detailed guidelines on evaluation in UNDP:

- A. Intervention results framework and theory of Change.
- B. Key stakeholders and partners.
- C. Documents to be reviewed and consulted.
- D. Evaluation matrix template.
- E. Outline of the evaluation report format.
- F. Code of conduct forms.
- G. Inception report standard template
- H. Dispute and wrongdoing resolution process and contact details (annex 3)
- I. Pledge of ethical conduct in evaluation.

All relevant documentation and literature will be given to the consultants in soft copy once the evaluation begins, including:

### Project Documents:

- Project Document for the Joint Program on Charcoal Reduction and Alternative Livelihoods (PROSCAL)
- MPTF Progress reports - annual and semi-annual reports
- Mid-Term evaluation report
- Charcoal production mapping/monitoring reports
- Other reports of workshops, meetings, and consultations

- UNDP Evaluation Guidelines
- Report of HACT (Harmonized Approach to Cash Transfer) Financial Audit carried out to the national environmental institutions

#### **List of stakeholders**

- FGS: DOECC OPM, some line ministries, possibly MOLFR
- FMS and Somaliland
- UN: UNDP, FAO, UNEP, RCO/MPTF secretariat.
- Private sector: LPG companies, companies and CBOs producing efficient stoves
- Donors: Sweden, Italy, EU, Norway, possibly some more

#### **Documents produced by donors and counterparts:**

- MPTF reports
- Third Party Monitoring reports

#### **Federal Government of Somalia**

- Somali National Development Plan (2017 – 2019)
- Somalia National Development Plan (2020 – 2024)
- Recovery and Resilience framework (RFF)
- Drought Impact Needs Assessment (DINA)

#### **UN System:**

- UNDP Country Programme Document 2018-2020
- UNDP Country Programme Document (2021-2025)
- United Nations Strategic Framework (UNSF) 2017-2020
- UN Sustainable Development Cooperation Framework (UNSDCF) (2021-2025)

#### **International**

- Rome and Paris Declarations, Accra Agenda for Action (AAA),
- Busan Partnership Document for Effective Development Cooperation
- New Deal for Engagement of International Cooperation in Fragile States and Situations
- Addis Ababa Agenda for Action Agenda on Financing for Development