TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR THE MID-TERM REVIEW

"Building adaptive capacity and resilience to climate change in the water sector in Cape Verde"

INTERNATIONAL CONSULTANT

1. INTRODUCTION

In accordance with the UNDP and GEF M&E policies and procedures, a mid-term review of the full-size project" Building adaptive capacity and resilience to climate change in the water sector in Cape Verde " implemented through the National Institute for Water Resource Management (INGRH) is to be undertaken in 2013. The project started on the, 2009 and is in its third year of implementation of full implementation. This Terms of Reference (TOR) sets out the expectations for this mid-term review.

The essentials of the project to be reviewed are as follows:

Project Title:	Building adaptive capacity and resilience to climate change in the water sector in Cape Verde			
UNDP Project ID:	PIMS 4091	**Project financing**	*at endorsement (Million US$)*	*at MTE (Million US$)*
ATLAS Project ID:	00072399	GEF financing:	$3,000,000 USD	
Country:	Cape Verde	IA/EA own:	$200,000 USD	
Region:	West Africa	Government:		
Focal Area:	Climate Change Adaptation	Other:		
GEF Focal Area Strategic Program		Total co-financing:		
Executing Agency:	National Institute for Water Resource Management (INGRH)	Total Project Cost **in cash**:	$3,200,000 US	
Other Partners involved:		ProDoc Signature (date project began):		15 October 2009
			Planned closing date: June, 2013	Revised closing date: June 2014

2. Project background

The impacts of climate change on Cape Verde water resources, particularly on water availability, are predicted to adversely affect human health, agricultural production and food security in both rural and urban areas. Predicted climate change scenarios are likely to constrain long-term development through: (i) increased frequency and severity of drought; (ii) increased rainfall variability, including more frequent events of short and intense rains, causing flash-floods in several catchment areas; and (iii) progressive sea level rise and salt water intrusion in freshwater reservoirs closer to coastal areas. Consequently, a major challenge for Cape Verde is to mainstream climate change adaptation measures into integrated water resource management across different institutional, social and spatial frameworks. Technical capacity of both government and local communities to manage the emerging threats imposed by climate change is required. The likely impacts of climate change are still poorly understood and the need for adaptation not sufficiently incorporated into relevant frameworks

The objective of the project is to build adaptive capacity and increase the water sector's resilience to climate change. Financial resources from the Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF) will be used to address systemic, institutional and individual capacity gaps to manage water resources for human, agricultural and other uses in the face of a changing climate.

2. Project objectives and expected outputs

The project's goal is to ensure that water availability, supply and quality are maintained in the face of changed climatic conditions.

The project objective is to increase resilience and enhance key adaptive capacity to address the additional risks posed by climate change to the water sector in Cape Verde. In order to achieve the above objective, and based on a barrier analysis, the project's intervention has been organised in three components under which three 'outcomes' are expected from the project:

- *Outcome 1:* Climate change risks and adaptation measures integrated into key national policies, plans and programs for water resource management.

- *Outcome 2*: Small and medium scale climate change adaptation practices for water resource management are demonstrated and implemented in selected hydrographical basins.

- *Outcome 3:* Lessons learned and best practices from pilot activities, capacity development initiatives and policy changes are disseminated.

Outcome 1 will deal with the 'governance framework' for climate change adaptation. The fact that climate risk, vulnerability and adaptation measures are only superficially integrated (or mainstreamed) in policies, plans and programs is a symptom of incipient and limited capacity of key stakeholders at the national level to plan in response to climate change. Outcome 2 will, in turn, show how pilot demonstration investment at the site level can make a difference in terms of improving resilience

locally. Overall, the lessons learnt and experiences acquired under Outcomes 1 and 2 will be disseminated across Cape Verde and to other countries through actions foreseen under Outcome 3

3. Mid-Term Review (MTR) objectives

The objective of the MTR is to provide an independent analysis of the progress of the project so far. The MTR will identify potential project design problems, assess progress towards the achievement of the project objective and outcomes, identify and document lessons learned (including lessons that might improve design and implementation of other UNDP-GEF supported projects), and make recommendations regarding specific actions that should be taken to improve the project. The MTR will assess early signs of project success or failure and identify the necessary changes to be made.
The review will include both the evaluation of the progress in project implementation, measured against planned outputs set forth in the Project Document (PRODOC) in accordance with rational budget allocation and the assessment of features related to the process involved in achieving those outputs, as well as the initial and potential impacts of the project. The review will also address underlying causes and issues contribution to targets not adequately achieved.

The Mid-Term Review is intended to identify weaknesses and strengths of the project design and implementation strategy to come up with recommendations for any necessary changes in the overall design and orientation of the project by evaluating the adequacy, efficiency, and effectiveness of its implementation, as well as assessing the project outputs and outcomes to date. The overall project performance will be measured based on the indicators of the project's logical framework.
Consequently, the review mission is also expected to make detailed recommendations on the work plan for the remaining project period. It will also provide an opportunity to assess early signs of the project success or failure and prompt necessary adjustments.
The MTR must provide evidence based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The review team is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with government counterparts, in particular the GEF operational focal point, UNDP Country Office, project team, UNDP GEF Regional Technical Adviser based and key stakeholders.

The review mission will also identify lessons learnt and best practices from the project which could be applied to future and other on-going projects. The international consultant for this review is expected to identify lessons learnt and best practices from other climate change adaptation project that could guide technical recommendations and improvements.

4. Scope of the Mid-Term Review

The scope of the Mid-Term Review will cover all activities undertaken in the framework of the project. The evaluators will compare planned outputs of the project to actual outputs and assess the actual results to determine their contribution to the attainment of the project objectives. The evaluation will diagnose problems and suggest any necessary corrections and adjustments. It will evaluate the efficiency of project management, including the delivery of outputs and activities in terms of quality,

quantity, timeliness and cost efficiency. The evaluation will also determine the likely outcomes and impact of the project in relation to the specified goals and objectives of the project.

The review team will assess the following three categories of project progress. For each category, the review team is required to rate overall progress using a six-point rating scale outlined in 8

4. 1 Progress towards Results

Project design:

- Review the problem addressed by the project and the underlying assumptions. Review the effect of any incorrect assumptions made by the project. Identify new assumptions (if necessary)
- Assess whether the project design is clear, logical and commensurate with time and resources available;
- Review the relevance of the project strategy and assess whether it provides the most effective route towards expected/intended results.
- Review how the project addresses country priorities.
- Review the baseline data included in the project results framework and suggest revisions as necessary.
- Review indicators and target reformulation suggested on the PIR (Project Implementation Review) 2012 and reviewed by governing bodies and propose improved formulation if needed.

Progress:

- Assess the scope, quality and significance of the projects outputs produced to date in relation to expected results
- Assess the outputs and progress toward outcomes achieve so far and the contribution to attaining the overall objective of the project.
- Conduct an evaluation of project performance in relation to the indicators, assumptions and risks specified in the logical framework matrix and the project document
- Identification and, to the extent possible, quantification of any additional benefits, impacts resulting from project implementation beyond those specified in the project document;A qualified assessment of the extent to which project outputs to data have scientific credibility;

An assessment of the extent to which scientific and technical information and knowledge have influenced the execution of the project activities;

- Examine if progress so far has led to, or could in the future catalyze, 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.
- Examine whether progress so far has led to, or could in the future lead to, potentially adverse environmental and/or social impacts/risks that could threaten the sustainability of the project

outcomes. Are these risks being managed, mitigated, minimized or offset? Suggest mitigation measures as needed.

- Review the extent to which the implementation of the project has been inclusive of relevant stakeholders and to which it has been able to create collaboration between different partners. Identify opportunities for stronger substantive partnerships.
- An analysis of the extent of cooperation on engendered and synergy created by the project in each of its component activities;
- A prognosis of the degree to which the overall objectives and expected outcomes of the project are likely to be met;

4. 2 Adaptive management

Work Planning

a) Analyse adaptative management and result-based focus in project implementation and adherence to the governance structure. Assess to what point work planning processes are result-based? If not, suggest ways to re-orientate work planning to focus on results.
b) Examine the use of the project document logical/results framework as a management tool and review any changes made to it since project start. Ensure any revisions meet UNDP-GEF requirements and assess the impact of the revised approach on project management.
c) Identify any programmatic and financial variance and/or adjustments made during the first three years of the project and an assessment of their conformity with decisions of the Project governing bodies and their appropriateness in terms of overall objectives of the project;
d) Provide recommendations regarding any necessary corrections and adjustments to the overall project work plan and timetable for the purposes of enhancing the achievement of project objectives and outcomes
e)

Finance and co-finance:

a) Consider the financial management of the project, with specific reference to the cost-effectiveness of interventions.
b) Complete the co-financing monitoring table .
c) Identify and quantify additional co-financing mobilized
d) Review the changes to fund allocations as a result of budget revisions and assess the appropriateness and relevance of such revisions.
e) Assess financial management of the project, including the balance between expenditures on administrative and overhead charges in relation to those on the achievement of substantive outputs.

Monitoring Systems.

a) Review the monitoring tools currently being used: Do they provide the necessary information? Do they involve key partners? Do they use existing information? Are they efficient? Are they cost-effective? Are additional tools required?
b) Ensure that the monitoring system, including performance indicators, meet GEF minimum requirements. Develop SMART indicators as necessary.
c) Ensure broader development and gender aspects of the project are being monitored effectively. Develop and recommend SMART indicators, including gender disaggregated indicators as necessary.
d) Examine the financial management of the project monitoring and evaluation budget. Are sufficient resources being allocated to M&E? Are these resources being allocated effectively?

Risk Management

a) Validate whether the risks identified in the project document, 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. Give particular attention to critical risks.
b) Describe any additional risks identified and suggest risk ratings and possible risk management strategies to be adopted.

Reporting

a) Assess how adaptive management changes have been reported by the project management, and shared with the Project Board.
b) Assess how lessons derived from the adaptive management process have been documented, shared with key partners and internalized by partners.

4. 3 Management arrangements

a) 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.
b) Conduct an evaluation of project coordination, management and administration provided by the project management unit. This evaluation should include specific reference to organizational/institutional arrangements for collaboration among the various agencies and institutions involved in project arrangements and execution;
c) Assess any administrative, operational and/or technical problems and constraints that influenced the effective implementation of the project and present recommendations for any necessary operational changes;
d) Assess the functionality of the institutional structure established and the role of the project governing bodies (steering committee and technical committee), the Technical Support and Advisory Team

e) Review the quality of execution of the project Implementing Partners and recommend areas for improvement.
f) Review the quality of support provided by UNDP and recommend areas for improvement.

5. Review methodology

The Mid-Term Review will be conducted in a participatory manner working on the basis that its essential objective is to assess the project implementation and impacts in order to provide basis for improvement in the implementation and other decisions.

The mission will start with a desk review of project documentation and also take the following process:

a. Desk review of project document, outputs, monitoring reports, such as Project Inception Report, Minutes of Project Board meetings and Technical Support and Advisory Team meetings, Project Implementation Review (PIR), Quarterly Progress Reports, M&E framework, mission reports and other internal documents including financial reports and relevant correspondence;
b. Review of specific products including datasets, management and action plans, publications, audiovisual materials, technical packages, consultancies reports and other materials and reports;
c. Interviews with the Project Managers, technical specialist and other project staff
d. Interview with Program Officers in charge of project oversight at UNDP CO;
e. Finance and Operation Manager at UNDP CO authorizing direct payments;
f. Interview with project executing agency: INGRH president, finance Officer and Program Officer at executing partner;
g. Field visits to conduct consultations and/or interviews with relevant stakeholders involved, including government's representatives, local communities, NGO's, private sector, donors, other UN agencies and organizations.
h. Field visit to interview project beneficiaries (community associations, local officials, farmers, water boards, etc.)

6. Rating project success

The evaluators may also consider assessing the success of the project based on outcome targets and indicators and using the performance indicators established by GEF for Climate Change Adaptation projects. The following items should be considered for rating purposes:

- Achievement of objectives and planned results
- Attainment of outputs and activities
- Cost-effectiveness
- Coverage
- Impact
- Sustainability

- Replicability
- Implementation approach
- Stakeholders participation
- Country ownership
- Acceptability
- Financial planning
- Monitoring and evaluation
- Impact on disaster risk management

The evaluation will rate the success of the project on a scale from 1 to 5, with 1 being the highest (most successful) rating and 5 being the lowest. Each of the items above should be rated separately with comments and then an overall rating given. The following rating system is to be applied:

Rating:	Achievement:
1= excellent	90-100%
2= very good	75-90%
3= good	60-74%
4= Satisfactory	50-59%
5= unsatisfactory	49% and below

7. Review team

Two consultants with the following qualifications shall be engaged to undertake the evaluation working concurrently according to the planned schedule. The international consultant, who will have in depth understanding of UNDP and GEF projects including evaluation experience, will be designated as the team leader and will have the overall responsibility of organizing and completing the review, and submitting the final report. The national consultant will provide supportive roles both in terms of professional back up, and conduct of local meetings.

The collection of documents is to be done by National Consultant prior to commencing the work. The International Consultant has the overall responsibility for completing the desk review prior to the country mission to Cape Verde, and for submitting the final report following the country mission. The consultants will sign an agreement with UNDP Cape Verde and will be bound by its terms and conditions set in the agreement.

Qualifications of Team Leader (International consultant)

1. International consultant with academic and professional background in fields related to Climate Change Adaptation, Agriculture and Integrated Water Resource Management. A minimum of 5 years of relevant experience is required;
2. Substantive experience in reviewing and evaluating similar projects, preferably those involving UNDP/GEF or other United Nations development agencies or major donors;

3. Excellent English writing and communication skills. Portuguese or Spanish reading and communication skills. The consultant must bring his/her own computing equipment;
4. Demonstrate ability to assess complex situations, succinctly distils critical issues, and draw forward-looking conclusions and recommendations;
5. Highly knowledgeable of participatory monitoring and evaluation processes, and experience in evaluation of technical assistance projects with major donor agencies;
6. Ability and experience to lead multi disciplinary and national teams, and deliver quality reports within the given time;
7. Familiarity with the challenges developing countries face in adapting to climate change;
8. Familiarity with Cape Verde or similar SIDS (Small Islands Developing States) countries; and
9. Excellent in human relations, coordination, planning and team work.
10. Excellent feedback-giving skills and culture sensitiveness

Qualifications of National consultant

i. Academic and professional background in fields related to Climate Change Adaptation, Agriculture and Integrated Water Resource Management. A minimum of 5 years of working experience in the development sector in Cape Verde is required;
j. Understanding of climate change adaptation and integrated water resource management in Cape Verde;
k. Demonstrated skills and knowledge in participatory monitoring and evaluation processes;
l. Experience in monitoring and evaluation of climate change adaptation and development projects, supported by UN agencies and/or major donor agencies;
m. Proficient in writing and communicating both in English and in Portuguese/Spanish. Ability to interpret to the international counterpart and also to translate necessary written documents to English;
n. Excellent in human relations, coordination, planning and team work.

8. Proposed schedule

The review will start in the beginning of April, 2013 and it requires a 12-days country mission in Cape Verde (Santiago and S.Antão island) as well as a desk review (prior to the country mission) and drafting and finalization of the report (following the country mission). The consultant will be paid on lump sum basis including international and local travel, fees and living allowance upon satisfactory delivery. The draft Final Report should be submitted to UNDP and UNDP/GEF-LDCF for circulation to relevant agencies/national counterpart within two weeks after the completion of the review mission to Cape Verde. The consultants will finalize the report within three weeks upon receiving comments and feedback from stakeholders compiled by UNDP and UNDP/GEF-LDCF.

9. Deliverables

The review team will produce the following deliverables to UNDP, INGRH, GEF Operational and Political Focal Points, UNDP/GEF-LDCF and the Project Board (Steering and Technical Committee):

Deliverable	Content	Timing	Responsibilities	Payment Schedule
Contract signing				10%
Inception Report	Review team clarifies timing and method of review	No later than 1 weeks before the review mission	Review team submits to UNDP Country Office	15%
Presentation	Initial Findings	End of review mission	To project management and UNDP Country Office; and key stakeholders	
Draft Final Report + Executive summary	Full report covering all items detailed on section 4 "Scope of the MTR" with detailed attention to lessons learnt and recommendations and with annexes minimally including (List of Persons interviewed, summary of field visits, list of documents reviewed, questionnaire and summary of results, co-financing and leveraged resources, etc.)	Within 2 weeks of the review mission	Sent to UNDP CO, reviewed by RTA, PCU, INGRH, GEF Operational and Political Focal Point	40%
Final Report	Revised report with audit trail detailing how all received comment have (and have not) been addressed in the final review report).	Within 1 week of receiving UNDP, executing agency (INGRH) and GEF OFP comments on draft	Sent to UNDP CO	35%

The report together with the annexes shall be written in English and Portuguese and shall be presented in electronic form in MS Word format to facilitate comments and PDF format.

10. IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS

The principal responsibility for managing this review resides with the UNDP Country Office (UNDP CO) in Praia, Cape Verde. The UNDP CO will contract the consultants and ensure the timely provision of schedule payments. The Head of Environment, Energy and Disaster Prevention at the Joint Office of UNDP/UNFPA/UNICEF (Antonio Querido) will be the supervisor of this consultancy.

The NAPA Follow up project team will be responsible for liaising with the review team to set up stakeholder interviews, arrange field visits with missions. The project coordination unit (PCU) will

assist the review team with travel arrangements and scheduling. The PCU is responsible as well for providing logistics for debriefing session.

11. APPLICATION PROCESS

All applications including P11 form, CV, and technical and financial proposals should be submitted to the email address, procurement.cv@cv.jo.un.org indicating the following reference "International Consultant for "**MTR - Building adaptive capacity and resilience to climate change in the water sector in Cape Verde"** by 25 March 2013 COB. Incomplete applications will be excluded from further consideration.

Recommended Presentation of Proposal:

- Introduction about the consultant/CV;
- Proposed review methodology and workplan;
- Financial proposal, including proposed fee and all other travel related costs (such as flights tickets, living allowance, etc).
- Sample of executive summary of a mid-term review or any other type of evaluation report leaded by the applicant

Criteria for Evaluation of Proposal: The selection will be made based on the educational background, experience on similar assignments and the quality of the technical proposal (70%). The financial proposal will weigh as 30% of the total scoring

Terms of reference approved by:

António Querido

(Head of Environment, Energy and Disaster Prevention at the Joint Office of UNDP/UNFPA/UNICEF)

Praia, 6th March 2013