**Terms of Reference**

**Building Capacity and Mainstreaming Sustainable Land**

**Management in Maldives**

 **(Consultant)**

**Title:** Consultant for Terminal Evaluation

**Project:** Building Capacity and Mainstreaming Sustainable Land Management in Maldives

**Duration:** 20 working days to be completed by 10 November 2012

**Duty Station:** Male’ Maldives

**Background:**

The land and the natural resources of the Maldives are extremely fragile and vulnerable to a number of domestic and external threats. In the densely populated islands of Maldives, expansion of housing and intensification of land use have lead to over extraction of groundwater and contamination of aquifers by poor sewerage and improper waste disposal practices. In the inhabited and uninhabited coastal and islands areas where agriculture is intensive, land productivity is declining due to continuous cropping coupled with shorter fallow periods. In these coastal and islands communities, the risk of groundwater depletion and contamination by fertilizers and pesticides is very high. Consequently, sustainable land management (SLM) is one of the top priorities of the Government of Maldives.

The objective of the project is to build capacity in Sustainable Land Management (SLM) in appropriate government institutions and communities and mainstream SLM into government policy, planning and strategy development. The project has four outcomes, namely, (1) Strengthening human resources and institutional capacities on SLM; (2) Developing capacity in knowledge management; (3) Mainstreaming SLM into national development plans and sector policies; and (4) Completion of a National Action Programme (NAP) to combat desertification. The project was implemented by the Ministry of Housing and Urban Development (MHUD) over a period of three years beginning August 2007 under the guidance and oversight from a Steering Committee (SC). The total budget of the project is US$ 1,101,500 of which US$ 525,000 would be the GEF increment

**Objectives of the Evaluation**

The Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) policy at the project level in UNDP/GEF has four objectives: (1) to monitor and evaluate results and impacts; (2) to provide a basis for decision making on necessary amendments and improvements; (3) to promote accountability for resource use; and (4) to document, provide feedback on, and disseminate lessons learned. A mix of tools is used to ensure effective project M&E. These might be applied continuously throughout the lifetime of the project – e.g. periodic monitoring of indicators, or as specific time-bound exercises such as mid-term reviews, audit reports and independent evaluations.

In accordance with UNDP/GEF M&E policies and procedures, all regular and medium-sized projects supported by the GEF should undergo a terminal evaluation upon completion of implementation. The terminal evaluation must provide a comprehensive and systematic account of the performance of a completed project by assessing its project design, process of implementation, achievements vis-à-vis project objectives endorsed by the GEF including any agreed changes in the objectives during project implementation and any other results.

Terminal evaluations have four complementary purposes:

* To promote accountability and transparency, and to assess and disclose levels of project accomplishments;
* To synthesize lessons that may help improve the selection, design and implementation of future GEF activities;
* To provide feedback on issues that are recurrent across the portfolio and need attention, and on improvements regarding previously identified issues; and,
* To contribute to the GEF Evaluation Office databases for aggregation, analysis and reporting on effectiveness of GEF operations in achieving global environmental benefits and on the quality of monitoring and evaluation across the GEF system.

The overall objective of this terminal evaluation is to review progress towards the project’s objectives and outcomes, assess the efficiency and cost-effectiveness of how the project has moved towards its objectives and outcomes, identify strengths and weaknesses in project design and implementation, and provide recommendations on design modifications that could have increased the likelihood of success, and on specific actions that might be taken into consideration in designing future projects of a related nature.

**Scope of work / Expected Output / Timelines:**

Terminal evaluation will address the following specific issues;

1. Broad areas to be covered

The following broad areas will be covered by the Evaluation:

* **relevance** of the project concept, design and implementation arrangements in today’s context. This includes overall relevance of the Project in the broader global and national context, *i.e.* whether the Project outcomes are consistent with the GEF Land Degradation Focal Area Strategy and country priorities;
* Project **ownership** at the national and local levels;
* stakeholder **participation**, including government, community, civil society and gender balances in participation and influence;
* **Mainstreaming gender** - whether the project has taken adequate measures to ensure gender concerns are mainstreamed in the implementation of the project activities;
* Project **effectiveness**, *i.e.,* progress achieved to date against planned outputs and sub-outputs, and likelihood of achieving planned objectives in time;
* **partnership** and **complementarity** with other relevant on-going or past activities;
* likely **sustainability** of the Project achievements and impacts, including **financial, sociopolitical, institutional framework and governance, and environmental** **sustainability**, as well as an assessment of the feasibility of planned replication and exit strategies;
* any **catalytic role** played by the project;
* **financial aspect**: planning, execution and sustainability, including the timely delivery and use of co-financing;
* project **efficiency**: cost effectiveness and financial supply;
* effectiveness of the application of **adaptive management** principles through monitoring and evaluation (including effective use of log frame, UNDP risk management system, the Annual Project Implementation Reviews, and other monitoring tools and mechanisms as appropriate);
* any other unplanned achievements.

The assessment will be based on the GEF Terminal Evaluation Guidelines and will include an assessment of 1) **Project results** 2) **Assessment of Sustainability of Project Outcomes 3) Catalytic Role 4) Monitoring and Evaluation Systems 5) Processes that Affected Attainment of Project Results. The report will also present the evaluation consultant’s Lessons and Recommendations.** Ratings for different aspects of project will need to be presented by the consultant with appropriate data, analysis and explanations as outlined below. All these sections MUST be presented in the final report. The report must also contain an annex with co-finance details and appropriate tracking tools.

1. Assessment of Results

The terminal evaluation will assess achievement of outputs and outcomes and will provide ratings for targeted objectives and outcomes. The assessment of project results seeks to determine the extent to which the project objectives were achieved, and assess if the project has led to any other short term or long term and positive or negative consequences and an assessment of impacts when appropriate. While assessing a project’s results, the evaluation will seek to determine the extent of achievement and shortcomings in reaching project’s objectives as stated in the project document and also indicate if there were any changes and whether those changes were approved. If the project did not establish a baseline (initial conditions), the evaluator should seek to estimate the baseline condition so that achievements and results can be properly established.

The following three criteria should be assessed to determine the level of achievements/ impacts of project outcomes and objectives and must be rated as objective as possible and must include sufficient and convincing empirical evidence.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **For Each Output and Outcome to be rated for below** | **Rating to be scored for each** | **Key Justification for rating** |
| 1. **Relevance**: Were the project’s outcomes consistent with the focal areas/operational program strategies and country priorities?
 | **Satisfactory (S):** The project had minor shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives, in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency.**Moderately Satisfactory (MS):** The project had moderate shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives, in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency.**Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU):** The project had significant shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives, in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency.**Unsatisfactory (U)** The project had major shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives, in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency.**Highly Unsatisfactory (HU):** The project had severe shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives, in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency. |  |
| 1. **Effectiveness**: Are the actual project outcomes commensurate with the original or modified project objectives)? In case the original or modified expected results are merely outputs/inputs then the evaluators should assess if there were any real outcomes of the project and if yes then whether these are commensurate with the realistic expectations from such projects.
 | **Satisfactory (S):** The project had minor shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives, in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency.**Moderately Satisfactory (MS):** The project had moderate shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives, in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency.**Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU):** The project had significant shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives, in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency.**Unsatisfactory (U)** The project had major shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives, in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency.**Highly Unsatisfactory (HU):** The project had severe shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives, in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency. |  |
| 1. **Efficiency**: Was the project cost effective? Was the project the least cost option? Was the project implementation delayed and if it was, then did that affect cost-effectiveness? Wherever possible, the evaluator should also compare the cost-time vs. outcomes relationship of the project with that of other similar projects.
 | **Satisfactory (S):** The project had minor shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives, in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency.**Moderately Satisfactory (MS):** The project had moderate shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives, in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency.**Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU):** The project had significant shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives, in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency.**Unsatisfactory (U)** The project had major shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives, in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency.**Highly Unsatisfactory (HU):** The project had severe shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives, in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency. |  |

The consultant will use a project logical framework to determine the overall contribution of project outcomes to development and global environmental goals. The consultant is also invited to highlight contributions which are strictly beyond the project scope.

***Overall Rating:*** An overall rating for the project will be given based on the above.

*NOTE: The overall outcomes rating cannot not be higher than the lowest rating on relevance and effectiveness. Thus, to have an overall satisfactory rating for an outcome, project must have at least satisfactory ratings on both relevance and effectiveness.*

1. Assessment of Sustainability of Project Outcomes

As per the GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy, 2006, a terminal evaluation will assess at the minimum the “likelihood of sustainability of outcomes at project termination, and provide a rating for this.” The sustainability assessment will give special attention to analysis of the risks that are likely to affect the persistence of project outcomes. The sustainability assessment should also explain how other important contextual factors that are not outcomes of intervention, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended. Sustainability will be understood as the likelihood of continued benefits after the GEF project ends.

The following four dimensions or aspects of sustainability should be addressed:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Key issues** | **Rating** | **Key justification for rating** |
| 1. **Financial resources:** Are there any financial risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project outcomes? What is the likelihood of financial and economic resources not being available once the GEF assistance ends (resources can be from multiple sources, such as the public and private sectors, income generating activities, and trends that may indicate that it is likely that in future there will be adequate financial resources for sustaining project’s outcomes)
 | **Likely (L):** There are no or negligible risks that affect this dimension of sustainability. **Moderately Likely (ML):** There are moderate risks that affect this dimension ofsustainability.**Moderately Unlikely (MU):** There are significant risks that affect this dimension of sustainability**Unlikely (U):** There are severe risks that affect this dimension of sustainability. |  |
| 1. **Sociopolitical:** Are there any social or political risks that may jeopardize sustenance 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?
 | **Likely (L):** There are no or negligible risks that affect this dimension of sustainability. **Moderately Likely (ML):** There are moderate risks that affect this dimension ofsustainability.**Moderately Unlikely (MU):** There are significant risks that affect this dimension of sustainability**Unlikely (U):** There are severe risks that affect this dimension of sustainability. |  |
| 1. **Institutional framework and governance:** Do the legal frameworks, policies and governance structures and processes pose risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project benefits? While assessing this parameter, also consider if the required systems for accountability and transparency, and the required technical know-how are in place.
 | **Likely (L):** There are no or negligible risks that affect this dimension of sustainability. **Moderately Likely (ML):** There are moderate risks that affect this dimension ofsustainability.**Moderately Unlikely (MU):** There are significant risks that affect this dimension of sustainability**Unlikely (U):** There are severe risks that affect this dimension of sustainability. |  |
| 1. **Environmental:** Are there any environmental risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project outcomes? The terminal evaluation should assess whether certain activities will pose a threat to the sustainability of the project outcomes. For example, construction of dam in a protected area could inundate a sizable area and thereby neutralizing the biodiversity related gains made by the project.
 | **Likely (L):** There are no or negligible risks that affect this dimension of sustainability. **Moderately Likely (ML):** There are moderate risks that affect this dimension ofsustainability.**Moderately Unlikely (MU):** There are significant risks that affect this dimension of sustainability**Unlikely (U):** There are severe risks that affect this dimension of sustainability. |  |
| **Overall Rating:** |  |  |

**NOTE:** All the risk dimensions of sustainability are critical. Therefore, overall rating for sustainability will

not be higher than the rating of the dimension with lowest ratings. For example, if a project has an ‘Unlikely’

rating in either of the dimensions then its overall rating cannot be higher than ‘Unlikely’.

1. C. Catalytic Role

The terminal evaluation will also describe any catalytic or replication effect of the project. If no effects are identified, the evaluation will describe the catalytic or replication actions that the project carried out. No ratings are required for the catalytic role.

1. D. Assessment Monitoring and Evaluation Systems

As per the GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy, 2006, a terminal evaluation will assess whether the project met the minimum requirements for project design of M&E, the implementation of the Project M&E plan and whether long-term monitoring provisions to measure mid-term and long-term results (such as global environmental effect, replication effects, and other local effects) after project completion exist. Terminal evaluation reports will include separate assessments of the achievements and shortcomings of the project M&E plan and of implementation of the M&E plan.

**M&E during Project Implementation**

**M&E design.** Projects should have a sound M&E plan to monitor results and track progress towards achieving project objectives. An M&E plan should include a baseline (including data, methodology, etc.), SMART14 indicators and data analysis systems, and evaluation studies at specific times to assess results and adequate funding for M&E activities. The time frame for various M&E activities and standards for outputs should have been specified. The evaluation should present its assessment on these.

**M&E plan implementation.** A terminal evaluation should verify that: an M&E system was in place and facilitated timely tracking of progress towards projects objectives by collecting information on chosen indicators continually through the project implementation period; annual project reports were complete, accurate and with well justified ratings; the information provided by the M&E system was used during the project to improve project performance and to adapt to changing needs; and, projects had an M&E system in place with proper training for parties responsible for M&E activities to ensure data will continue to be collected and used after project closure.

**Budgeting and Funding for M&E Activities.** In addition to incorporating information on funding for M&E while assessing M&E design, a **se**parate mention will be made of: whether M&E was sufficiently budgeted at the project planning stage; and, whether M&E was adequately and timely funded during implementation.

Project monitoring and evaluation systems will be rated as follows on quality of M&E design and quality of M&E implementation:

1. **Highly Satisfactory (HS):** There were no shortcomings in the project M&E system.
2. **Satisfactory(S):** There were minor shortcomings in the project M&E system.
3. **Moderately Satisfactory (MS):** There were moderate shortcomings in the project M&E system.
4. **Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU):** There were significant shortcomings in the project M&E system.
5. **Unsatisfactory (U):** There were major shortcomings in the project M&E system.
6. **Highly Unsatisfactory (HU):** The Project had no M&E system.

The ratings should be justified with objective evidence.

**Overall rating:**

**NOTE:** The overall rating of M&E during project implementation will be solely based on the quality of M&E plan implementation.” The ratings on quality at entry of M&E design and sufficiency of funding both during planning and implementation stages will be used as explanatory variables.

**Monitoring of Long Term Changes**

The M&E of long term changes is often incorporated in the GEF supported projects as a separate component and it may include determination of environmental baselines, specification of indicators, provisioning of equipment and capacity building for data gathering, analysis and use. This section of the terminal evaluations will describe the actions and accomplishments of the project in the establishment of a long term monitoring system. The review will address the following questions:

1. Did this project contribute to the establishment of a long term monitoring system? If it did not, should the project have included such a component?
2. What were the accomplishments and short comings in establishment of this system?
3. Is the system sustainable, i.e. is it embedded in a proper institutional structure and has financing?
4. Is the information generated by this M&E system being used as originally intended?

**E. Assessment of Processes that Affected Attainment of Project Results**

Among other factors, when relevant, it is suggested that the evaluation team considers the following issues affecting project implementation and attainment of project results. However, evaluators are not expected to provide ratings or separate assessment on the following issues but they could be considered while assessing the performance and results sections of the report:

1. **Preparation and readiness.** Were the project’s objectives and components clear, practicable and feasible within its timeframe? Were the capacities of executing institution and counterparts properly considered when the project was designed? Were lessons from other relevant projects properly incorporated in the project design? Were the partnership arrangements properly identified and the roles and responsibilities negotiated prior to project approval? Were counterpart resources (funding, staff, and facilities), enabling legislation, and adequate project management arrangements in place at project entry?
2. **Country ownership/drivenness.** Was the project concept in line with the sectoral and development priorities and plans of the country or of participating countries in the case of multi-country projects? Are project outcomes contributing to national development priorities and plans? Were the relevant country representatives, from government and civil society, involved in the project? Did the recipient government maintain its financial commitment to the project? Has the government approved policies or regulatory frameworks been in line with the project’s objectives?
3. **Stakeholder involvement.** Did the project involve the relevant stakeholders through information-sharing, consultation and by seeking their participation in the project’s design, implementation, and monitoring and evaluation? For example, did the project implement appropriate outreach and public awareness campaigns? Did the project consult and make use of the skills, experience and knowledge of the appropriate government entities, NGOs, community groups, private sector, local governments and academic institutions in the design, implementation and evaluation of project activities? Were perspectives of those that would be affected by decisions, those that could affect the outcomes and those that could contribute information or other resources to the process taken into account while taking decisions? Were the relevant vulnerable groups and the powerful, the supporters and the opponents, of the processes properly involved?
4. **Financial planning.** Did the project have the appropriate financial controls, including reporting and planning, that allowed management to make informed decisions regarding the budget and allowed for timely flow of funds. Was there due diligence in the management of funds and financial audits? Did promised co-financing materialize? (Please fill the form in Annex 1 on co-financing).
5. **Implementing/Executing Agency’s supervision and backstopping.** Did Implementing/Executing Agency staff identify problems in a timely fashion and accurately estimate its seriousness? Did Implementing/Executing Agency staff provide quality support and advice to the project, approved modifications in time and restructured the project when needed? Did the Implementing/Executing Agencies provide the right staffing levels, continuity, skill mix, and frequency of field visits for the GEF projects?
6. **Co-financing and Project Outcomes and Sustainability.** If there was a difference in the level of expected co-financing and actual co-financing, then what were the reasons for the variance? Did the extent of materialization of co-financing affect the project’s outcomes and/or sustainability, and if it did affect outcomes and sustainability then in what ways and through what causal linkages?
7. **Delays and Project Outcomes and Sustainability.** If there were delays in project implementation and completion, then what were the reasons? Did the delay affect the project’s outcomes and/or sustainability, and if it did affect outcomes and sustainability then in what ways and through what causal linkages?
8. F. Lessons and Recommendations

The evaluators will present lessons and recommendations in the terminal evaluation report on all aspects of the project that they consider relevant. The evaluators will be expected to give special attention to analyzing lessons and proposing recommendations on aspects related to factors that contributed or hindered: attainment of project objectives, sustainability of project benefits, innovation, catalytic effect and replication, and project monitoring and evaluation. Evaluators should refrain from providing recommendations to improve the project. Instead they should seek to provide a few well formulated lessons applicable to the type of project at hand or to GEF’s overall portfolio. Terminal evaluations should not be undertaken with the motive of appraisal, preparation, or justification, for a follow-up phase. Wherever possible, the reports should include examples of good practices for other projects in a focal area, country or region.

**Methodology**

The evaluation methodology will be determined by the consultant, guided by the requirements of GEF and UNDP as articulated in various guidelines, policies and manuals on the conduct of evaluations for GEF projects as well as key project documents such as the approved GEF project brief, the final UNDP project document, the inception workshop report, mid-term evaluation report, the project log-frame and annual budgets and work plans, the annual project implementation review, Project Board, and PMT meeting minutes as available, and other technical reports and documents as relevant. The evaluation methodology should be clearly documented in the final evaluation including comprehensive details of the following:

* documents reviewed
* interviews conducted
* consultations held with all stakeholders
* project site visited
* techniques and approaches used for data gathering, verification and analysis

**Conduct of the Evaluation**

The consultant will work independently but will liaise closely with UNDP Maldives and Ministry of Housing and Urban Development. The consultant will also liaise periodically with the UNDP to ensure that UNDP-GEF and GEF requirements are being met.

The consultant will visit the project site to ensure adequate consultation with all key stakeholders. Towards the end of the field evaluation, presentation will be made to all key stakeholders in country. After the presentation the consultant will take note of verbal and/or written response to its presentation and consider these in preparing an interim draft evaluation report that will be provided to UNDP before the consultant leaves for distribution to stakeholders. UNDP will circulate the draft report to all stakeholders requesting written feedback and finalized by the evaluator within the dates reflected in the evaluation schedule.

While the consultant is free to determine the actual layout of the evaluation report, this must include the minimum content requirements mentioned earlier. The consultant will forward the final report by e-mail to UNDP Maldives for onward distribution to all stakeholders. In addition the consultant will forward a hard copy and electronic copy saved on disk to UNDP Maldives Country Office. The consultant will be responsible for the contents, quality and veracity of the report.

**Deliverables**

The terminal evaluation mission will produce the following deliverables:

1. a detailed Terminal Evaluation Report in concise English, including lessons learned and recommendations, using on the specified UNDP/GEF format (no more than 30 pages, including Executive Summary and Annexes) with sections and assessment ratings outlined earlier in the TOR; ;
2. record of key outputs from the evaluation process, including workshop outputs, and minutes of meetings with stakeholders
3. summary presentation of Terminal Evaluation Report findings to be presented at the Project Terminal Workshop .

The final report together with the annexes shall be written in English and shall be presented in electronic form in MS Word format as well as a hard copy.

The final report should include the sections specified in Annex 1 of this TOR and not exceed 30 pages, in addition to the annexes.

**Composition of the Evaluation Team**

One Consultant either International or National will be responsible for conducting and reporting on the evaluation, under the guidance of and reporting to UNDP's Environment and Energy Programme. The Consultant will be lead and will carry overall responsibility for organizing and completing the evaluation and delivering the final report including technical analysis and coordination of logistical arrangements.

**Qualification – Consultant**

* Minimum of a master’s degree or equivalent in natural resource management, environment, development or related field demonstrably relevant to the position
* Substantive experience in reviewing and evaluating similar technical assistance projects, preferably those involving UNDP/GEF or other United Nations agencies, development agencies and major donors;
* International/regional consultant with academic and/or professional background in natural resource management or related fields with experience in land management, with in-depth understanding of land issues as well as community-based natural resource management. A minimum of 10 years of working experience is required;
* Experience in leading multi-disciplinary and multi-national teams to deliver quality products in high stress and short deadline situations;
* Familiar with SLM approaches in developing countries including Asia will be an advantage either through management and/or implementation or through consultancies in evaluation of land related projects. Understanding of local actions contributing to global benefits is crucial;
* Highly knowledgeable of participatory monitoring and evaluation processes; and
* Excellent English writing and communication skills.

**Proposed Methodology and Timelines**

The consultants shall undertake the evaluation working concurrently according to a planned schedule to be completed by 10 November 2012. The consultant will have the overall responsibility of organizing and completing the terminal evaluation, submitting the final terminal evaluation report. The consultant are expected to propose a work layout, plan, budget and timelines to achieve the expected outputs with the appropriate methodology.

**Proposal Requirements**

Interested individuals should ensure the proposal contain the following information to demonstrate their qualification:

1. Personal updated CV Technical Proposal:
2. Explaining how the applicant meets the selection criteria/most suitable for the work;
3. Provide methodology on how applicant will approach and conduct the work if successful;
4. Financial Proposal

The consultant is requested to provide a proposal or quotation of the fees/cost for the services which will be rendered using the following format and should be separate from the technical proposal.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Daily consultancy rates | A daily consultancy rate inclusive of living allowance proposed by the consultant |
| Air ticket | To and from place of origin |

**Evaluation Method**

The proposals will be evaluated using the UNDP cumulative analysis method whereby the total score is obtained upon the combination of weighted technical and financial attributes.

The highest combined weighted score which provides the best value for money will be awarded the contract.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | **Technical** | **(70%)** |
| i) | Substantive experience in reviewing and evaluating similar technical assistance projects, preferably those involving UNDP/GEF or other United Nations agencies, development agencies and major donors | 15% |
| ii) | International/regional consultant with academic and/or professional background in natural resource management or related fields with experience in land management, with in-depth understanding of land issues as well as community-based natural resource management. A minimum of 10 years of working experience is required | 10% |
| iii) | Familiar with SLM approaches in Asia and/or developing countries either through management and/or implementation or through consultancies in evaluation of land related projects. Understanding of local actions contributing to global benefits is crucial | 15% |
| iv) | knowledgeable of participatory monitoring and evaluation processes | 10% |
| v) | Experience in leading multi-disciplinary and multi-national teams to deliver quality products in high stress and short deadline situations | 10% |
| vi) | Knowledge and experience with local/regional stakeholders and customary protocols. Ability to converse, communicate in local language/directs advantageous.  | 10% |
| **B** | **Financial** | **(30%)** |
|  | **Total** | **(100%)** |

**Reporting Requirements**

The consultant will be monitored, overseen and supervised by UNDP Maldives Country Office in consultation and coordination with Ministry for Housing and Urban Development.

The consultant is expected to submit a terminal evaluation report upon successful completion of activities according to the agreed schedules. The consultant is expected to provide for his/her own laptop.

**Deadline of Application Submission**

All applications must include all documents mentioned in the section of “Proposal Requirements” above to be submitted by 8 October 2012 at 16:30 time either electronically to aminath.shooza@undp.org

Annex 1

**Evaluation Report Outline**

1. Executive Summary

Brief description of project, context and purpose of the evaluation, main conclusion, recommendations and lessons learned

1. Introduction

Purpose of the evaluation, key issues addressed, methodology of the evaluation, structure of the evaluation

1. The project and its development context

Project start and its duration, problems that the project seek to address, objectives of the project, main stakeholders, results expected

1. Findings and Conclusions
* Project formulation
* Implementation approach
* Country ownership/driveness
* Stakeholder participation
* Replication approach
* Cost-effectiveness
* UNDP comparative advantage
* Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector
* Indicators
* Management arrangements
* Implementation
* Financial planning
* Monitoring and evaluation
* Execution and implementation modalities
* Management by the UNDP sub-office
* Coordination and operational issues
* Results
* Attainment of objectives
* Sustainability
* Contribution to upgrading skills of the national staff
1. Recommendations
* Actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the project
* Proposal for future directions underlining main objectives
1. Future Project Strategy
* Corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project
1. Lessons Learned
* Best and worst practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance and success

Annexes

* TOR
* Itinerary
* List of persons interviewed
* Summary of field visits
* List of documents reviewed
* Questionnaire used and summary of results
* Overview of co-financing and leverage resources
* Summary of Evaluation Findings (see Annex 2)

Annex 2

**Summary of Evaluation Findings**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Objective | Measurable indicators from project log frame | Term target | Status of delivery \*1 | Rating \*2 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Outcomes | Measurable indicators from project log frame | Term target | Status of delivery | Rating |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

\*1: Status of delivery

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Green/Completed | Indicators show successful achievement |
| Yellow | Indicators show expected completion by end of project |
| Red | Indicators show poor achievement – unlikely to be completed by end of project |

\*2: Rating

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| HS | Highly satisfactory |
| S | Satisfactory |
| MS | Marginally satisfactory |
| U | Unsatisfactory |