TERMS OF REFERENCE (TOR)

**FOR THE TERMINAL EVALUATION OF THE LDCF NAPA PROJECT**

***Type of consultancy: Individual Contractor (Intellectual Service)***

1. **Project title:** Implementing NAPA Priority Interventions to Build Resilience in the Agriculture and Water Sectors to the Adverse Impacts of Climate Change in Sudan
2. **Project description:**

|  |
| --- |
| In accordance with applicable policies for UNDP/GEF projects, all GEF-funded projects implemented by UNDP are subjective to a mid-term and a final independent evaluation. The purpose for this independent Terminal Evaluation (TE) is to undertake at the end of the last year of implementation an evaluation will determine whether the project has achieved its intended outcomes. The TE will focus on the effectiveness, efficiency and timeliness of project implementation; will highlight issues requiring actions for implementation of similar programmes; and will present the lessons learned about project design, implementation and management. Findings of this TE will be incorporated as recommendations for enhanced implementation of similar projects. The evaluation is to be undertaken in accordance with the “GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy” (see  <http://www.thegef.org/gef/sites/thegef.org/files/documents/ME_Policy_2010.pdf>  The project is being co funded by the Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF) for Adaptation to climate change (USD 3,300,000), and UNDP Sudan Country Office (USD 500,000) and in kind support from the government of Sudan (USD 3,000,000). The project is being implemented through the National Implementation Modality (NIM) by the Higher Council for Environment and Natural Resources (HCENR). In terms of project ‘supervision’ (as opposed to ‘implementation’), UNDP is the GEF Implementing Agency and provides strategic, technical and administrative support to the HCENR.  The project is currently implementing NAPA priority interventions to build resilience in the agriculture and water sectors to the adverse Impacts of Climate Change in Sudan which aims to minimize and reverse the food insecurity and enhance adaptive capacity of small-scale farmers and pastoralists resulting from climate change, including variability in (originally 5) vulnerable regions representing the different ecological settings in Sudan now reduced to (4 regions) due to cessation of the South Sudan. The project has been implemented over five -year period, having started in November 2009 and ending in late 2014.  This Terminal Evaluation will take place when key activities are showing results, and the project is gaining visibility all through the states where it operates.  The PRODOC has identified three components (outcomes) outcomes and several results-oriented indicators. The outcomes that will contribute to the achievement of the project  Objectives are:   1. Resilience of food production systems and food insecure communities in the face of climate change 2. Institutional and individual capacities to implement climate risk management responses in the agriculture sector strengthened 3. A better understanding of lessons learned and emerging best practices captured and up-scaled at the national level |
|  |
| **C: Scope of work**  The overall purpose of the evaluation is to measure the effectiveness and efficiency of project activities in relation to the stated objective, identify lessons learnt and to produce possible recommendations on how to expand and upscale the best climate change adaptation practices. The Terminal Evaluation serves as an agent of change and plays a critical role in supporting future climate change adaptation programming in the country. Its main objectives are:   * To document the lessons learnt on project management and monitoring functions of the climate change adaptation projects; * To document the best lessons learnt for enhancing accountability for the achievement of the climate change adaptation objectives; * To enhance organizational and development learning; * To enable informed decision-making for future climate change adaptation programming;   Particular emphasis should be put on the current project results and the extent of achieving all the outcomes in the given timeframe, taking into consideration the speed, at which the project is implemented. More specifically, the evaluation should assess:  This Terminal Evaluation of the UNDP/LDCF Project is initiated by UNDP as the GEF Implementing Agency. It aims to determine the achievement of the intended outcomes. It aims to provide the Implementation Agency (HCENR), UNDP-Sudan Country Office and UNDP-GEF at all levels with strategy and policy options and lessons for replicating the results.  The Terminal Evaluation will highlight lessons learned about project design, implementation and management.  The evaluators will assess the project design. They should review the problem addressed by the project and the project strategy, encompassing an assessment of the appropriateness of the objectives, outcomes, outputs, planned activities and inputs as compared to cost-effective alternatives. in relation to:  a) Development priorities at the national level;  b) Stakeholders – assess if the specific needs were met;  c) Country ownership / drivenness – participation and commitments of government, states, local authorities, and communities;  d) UNDP mission to promote assisting the country to build its capacities in the focal area of adaptation to climate change;  e) Meeting the LDCF adaptation guidelines: Demonstrating increases in adaptive capacity and resilience for climate change and assess whether and how the engagement of communities has had a particular contribution and added value to community adaptation to climate change;   * Develop a lesson-learning and replication strategy, and a strategy to integrate project results and lessons learnt into the wider dissemination and scale up plans.   The evaluation will assess the outcomes, outputs, and indicators achieved by the project as well as the likely inroads to sustainability of project results. This should encompass the following:  Attainment of objectives and planned results:   * Evaluate how, and to what extent, the stated project objectives are being achieved; taking into account the “achievement indicators”. In addition, the team will assess the indicators matrix as to its utility for determining sustainability and replicability impact. * Assess the level to which the project has followed guidelines of the LDCF Strategic Priority on Adaptation and recommend ways to further strengthen this linkage.   Achievement of outputs and activities:   * Assess the scope, quality and usefulness of the project outputs produced so far in relation to its expected results. * Assess the feasibility and effectiveness of the work plan in implementing the components of the project. * Assess the quality, appropriateness and timeliness of the project with regard to:   + Satisfying the following GEF objectives;   + Delivering global environmental benefits; and   + Achieving financial and environmental sustainability for the project intervention.   The evaluation must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful. It must be easily understood by project partners and applicable to the remaining period of project duration. The evaluation should provide as much gender disaggregated data as possible.  The evaluation will take place mainly in the field. The Consultant will also be accompanied a National Consultant forming a team. The evaluation team is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with the UNDP Country Office, states’ governments, Higher council for Environment and Natural Resources, the Ministry of Environment and Physical Development, Project Board, project team, and key stakeholders.  The evaluation team is expected to consult all relevant sources of information, such as the project document, project reports – incl. Annual Reports (PIRs), project budget revision, progress reports, project files, national strategic and legal documents, and any other material that the team may consider useful for evidence based assessment.  The evaluation team is expected to use interviews as a means of collecting data on the relevance, performance and success of the project. The evaluation team is also expected to visit the project sites.  The methodology to be used by the evaluation team should be presented in the report in detail. It shall include information on:   * Documentation reviewed; * Interviews; * Field visits; * Questionnaires; * Participatory techniques and other approaches for the gathering and analysis of data.   Although the evaluation team should feel free to discuss with the authorities concerned, all matters relevant to its assignment, it is not authorized to make any commitment or statement on behalf of UNDP, GEF, LDCF or the project management.  The evaluation team should reflect sound accounting procedures and be prudent in using the resources of the evaluation.  **D. Expected Outputs and Deliverables**  The output of the mission will be the Evaluation Report in English. The length of the Report should not exceed 30 pages in total (not including the annexes).  Initial draft of the Evaluation Report will be circulated for comments to UNDP (both CO and Bratislava Regional Office), and the Project Manager. After incorporation of comments, the Evaluation Report will be finalized.  The Evaluation Report template following the GEF requirements is attached in [Annex 1](#Annex1) of this TOR.  **Deliverables/ Outputs**  **Deliverable 1: preparation and pre-reading of project document, Project’s Midterm Evaluation report; NAPA document and any other relevant material**   * Duration: 2 Working Days; * Target: 1/November 2014.   Review and Approval:   * Head of  Energy& environment Unit; * Programme Specialist   **Deliverable 2: Conduct the filed mission**   * Duration: 10 Working Days * Target: 30 November 2014   Review and Approval:   * Head of Energy and environment Unit; * Programme Specialist   **Deliverable 3: Report writing and Submission of Draft Report also incorporating requirement mentioned in the Scope of Works (Section C)**   * Duration: 6 Working Days; * Target: 15 February 2015.   Review and Approval:   * Head of Energy and environment Unit; * Programme Specialist; * UNDP/GEF Regional Advisor - Climate Change Adaptation.   **Deliverable 4: Amend and revise the report until Final Report is accepted by UNDP**   * Date:2 Working Days; * Target: 28 February 2015.   Review and Approval:   * Head of Energy and environment Unit; * Programme analyst; * UNDP/GEF Regional Advisor - Climate Change Adaptation.   **E. Institutional Arrangement**  This is mainly a Home based Consultancy but requiring 10 days of field work in Sudan. The International Consultant, assisted by a National Consultant will performs his duties under the overall guidance of the Team Leader of the Energy and Environment Unit of UNDP Sudan Country Office and in coordination as informed by the technical guidance from the UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Advisor.    The consultant should liaise with the following institutions:   * The Ministry of Environment, Forests and Physical Development; * GEF- Operation Focal Point; * Agriculture Research corporations (ARC); * The State Ministries of Agriculture; * The Higher Council for Environment and Natural Resources (HCNER) * International Cooperation Directorate – Ministry of Finance   The role of these institutions is to avail their relevant information, reflect their views and participate in the consultative meetings and review of the evaluation document.  **F**. **Duration of the Work**  The consultancy service needs to be carried out in 4 months duration starting 1st November 2014 to 28th February 2015. However, given the amount of deliverables and it is home-based consultancy, the entire milestones mentioned in the Section D above must be completed in 20 working days.  **G. Duty Station**  It is a home-based consultancy, but the consultant is required to travel to Sudan and stay for 10 working days for conducting the field surveys and counterparts interviews. For such a reason, the Consultant is required to consider cost of ticket, terminal expenses, insurance, and Living allowance to meet the expenditures in Sudan. |
| **H. Qualifications of the Successful Individual Contractor** |
|  |
|  |
| a) Postgraduate University degree in economics, social sciences or environment related fields;  b) Extensive expertise in the field of climate change adaptation and natural resource management issues;  c) 7-10 years of work experience in the evaluating GEF and donors driven development projects. Project evaluation experiences within United Nations system will be considered an asset  d) Ability to analyze large amounts of data to identify key messages and indicators for easy visualization of complex analyses;  e) Demonstrated experience with result-based management evaluation methodologies.  **I**. **Scope of Price Proposal and Schedule of Payments:**  The consultancy will be remunerated through a Lump Sum amount which is “all-inclusive”. The Lump Sum is payable upon delivery and acceptance of all three products indicated in Section D above. The clearance of final products must be obtained by the persons identified in section D above. This contract price is fixed regardless of changes in the cost components.  **Schedule of Payment:**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Requirements | Payment % | | Deliverable 1: Project Preparation and pre-reading of project document completed | Nil | | Deliverable 2: Upon completion of Field Mission | 40% | | Deliverable 3: Report Writing and Submission of Draft Report to UNDP for review and feedback | Nil | | Deliverable 4: Amendment and Finalization of draft Report and its acceptance by UNDP | 60% | | Total | 100% |   **J. Recommended Presentation of Offer**   1. **Personal CV or P11**, indicating all past experience from similar projects, as well as the contact details (email and telephone number) of the Candidate and at least three (3) professional references; 2. **Brief description** of why you consider yourself as the most suitable for the assignment, and a methodology, on how you will approach and complete the assignment.   **K. Criteria for Selection of the Best Offer**  The offers received from the candidates will be evaluated using combined scoring method. The Combined Scoring method assesses the offers with technical merits of the proposals – where the qualifications and methodology will be weighted a max. of 70%, and later combined with the price offer which will be weighted a max of 30%.  **Technical Scoring Grid (700 Points, Pass Marks 490):**   |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | Assessment Criteria: | Maximum Obtainable Points | Weightage (%) | Evaluated Points Obtained by the Offerors | | | | A | B | C | | Postgraduate University degree in economics, social sciences or environment related fields | 150 | 21.5% |  |  |  | | Extensive expertise in the field of climate change adaptation and natural resource management issues | 150 | 21.5% |  |  |  | | 7-10 years of work experience in the evaluating GEF and donors driven development projects. Project evaluation experiences within United Nations system or equivalent will be considered an asset | 200 | 29% |  |  |  | | Ability to analyze large amounts of data to identify key messages and indicators for easy visualization of complex analyses | 100 | 14% |  |  |  | | Demonstrated experience with result-based management evaluation methodologies | 100 | 14% |  |  |  | | TOTAL | 700 | 100% |  |  |  |   The price proposals of candidates obtaining 490 points and higher (or 70% or above) will only be technically qualified; they will be reviewed and compared for the assessment of overall ranking of the proposals. Those obtaining lower than 490 points (or lesser than 70%) will be technically non-responsive proposals, price proposals of such candidate will not be compared.  **Assessment of the Price Proposals (300 Points) or 30%**  The lowest priced bid from among the technically qualified Offerors will obtain the full marks of 300 points in the price proposal. Price proposals of remaining qualified bidders will be prorated against the lowest priced bid using the following formula to derive the marks in their price proposal:  Marks obtained by a Bidder = Lowest Priced Bid (amount) / Bid of the Offeror (amount) X 300 (Full Marks)  **Award of the Contract/Award Criteria**:    The contract will be awarded to the candidate (bidder) whose proposal obtains the highest cumulative marks (points) when the marks obtained in technical and price proposals are aggregated together.  The contract award, however, is dependent on the conditions mentioned “Offerors Letter to UNDP – Confirming Interest and Availability for the Individual Contractor (IC) Assignment”. Candidates disagreeing to fulfill the applicable conditions will not be eligible for contract award and signing.  The key criteria for rating the qualification and methodology has been stated together with their equivalent percentage weight, so that Offerors can be evaluated objectively. Therefore, candidates are required to pay highest attention to these requirement while preparing the technical and price proposals.  **L. Annexes to the TOR**   1. The Evaluation Report template following the minimum GEF requirements (Annex 1); 2. Explanation on terminology provided in the GEF guidelines to terminal Evaluations (Annex 2); 3. Ethical code of conduct for UNDP Evaluations (Annex 3) 4. Sample IC Contract; 5. General Conditions of Contract for IC; 6. Offerors Letter to UNDP – Confirming Interest and Availability for the Individual Contractor (IC) Assignment”   **M. Approval**  **This TOR is approved by**:  Signature:  Name and Designation: Min Htut Yin, Team Leader- Environment and Energy Unit  Date of Signing:  Prepared By:  Signature: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Name and Designation: Hanan Mutwakil, Programme Specialist  Date of Signing: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ |
| **Annex 1**  **EVALUATION REPORT: SAMPLE OUTLINE**  **Minimum GEF Requirements**  **Executive summary**   * Brief description of the project * Context and purpose of the evaluation * Main conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned   **Introduction**   * Project background * Purpose of the evaluation * Key issues addressed * The outputs of the evaluation and how will they be used * Methodology of the evaluation * Structure of the evaluation   **The Project and its development context**   * Project start and its duration * Implementation status * Problems that the project seek to address * Immediate and development objectives of the project * Main stakeholders * Results expected * An analysis of the situation with regard to the outcomes, the outputs and the partnership strategy;   **Findings**  **Project formulation**   * Implementation approach * Analysis of Logical Framework Matrix- LFM (Project logic/strategy, indicators) * Country ownership/Driveness * Stakeholder participation * Replication approach * Cost-effectiveness * UNDP comparative advantage * Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector * Management arrangements   **Implementation**   * Implementation approach * LFM used during implementation as a management and M&E tool * Effective partnership arrangements established for implementation * Feedback from M&E activities used for adaptive management * Financial planning * Monitoring and evaluation * Execution and implementation modalities * Management by the UNDP country office * Coordination and operation issues * Identification and management of risks (adaptive management)   **Results**   * Attainment of objective * Prospects of sustainability * Contribution to upgrading skills of the national staff   **Conclusions and recommendations**   * Corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project * Actions to strengthen or reinforce benefits from the project * Proposals for future directions underlining main objectives * Suggestions for strengthening ownership, management of potential risks   **Lessons learned**   * Good and bad practices and lessons learned in addressing issues relating to effectiveness, efficiency and relevance.   **Annexes**   * TOR * Itinerary * List of persons interviewed * Summary of field visits * List of documents reviewed * Questionnaire used and summary of results   **Annex 2**  **Explanation on Terminology Provided in the GEF Guidelines to Terminal Evaluations**  **Implementation Approach** includes an analysis of the project’s logical framework, adaptation to changing conditions (adaptive management), partnerships in implementation arrangements, changes in project design, and overall project management.  Some elements of an effective implementation approach may include:   * The logical framework used during implementation as a management and M&E tool * Effective partnerships arrangements established for implementation of the project with relevant stakeholders involved in the country/region * Lessons from other relevant projects (e.g., same focal area) incorporated into project implementation * Feedback from M&E activities used for adaptive management.   **Country Ownership/Driveness** is the relevance of the project to national development and environmental agendas, recipient country commitment, and regional and international agreements where applicable. Project Concept has its origin within the national sectoral and development plans  Some elements of effective country ownership/driveness may include:   * Project Concept has its origin within the national sectoral and development plans * Outcomes (or potential outcomes) from the project have been incorporated into the national sectoral and development plans * Relevant country representatives (e.g., governmental official, civil society, etc.) are actively involved in project identification, planning and/or implementation * The recipient government has maintained financial commitment to the project * The government has approved policies and/or modified regulatory frameworksin line with the project’s objectives * Project’s collaboration with industry associations   **Stakeholder Participation/Public Involvement** consists of three related and often overlapping processes: information dissemination, consultation, and “stakeholder” participation. Stakeholders are the individuals, groups, institutions, or other bodies thathave an interest orstake in the outcome of the GEF-financed project. The term also applies to those potentially adversely affected by a project.  Examples of effective public involvement include:  Information dissemination   * Implementation of appropriate outreach/public awareness campaigns   Consultation and stakeholder participation   * Consulting and making use of the skills, experiences and knowledge of NGOs, community and local groups, the private and public sectors, and academic institutions in the design, implementation, and evaluation of project activities   Stakeholder participation   * Project institutional networks well placed within the overall national or community organizational structures, for example, by building on the local decision making structures, incorporating local knowledge, and devolving project management responsibilities to the local organizations or communities as the project approaches closure * Building partnerships among different project stakeholders * Fulfillment of commitments to local stakeholders and stakeholders considered to be adequately involved.   **Sustainability** measures the extent to which benefits continue, within or outside the project domain, from a particular project or program after GEF assistance/external assistance has come to an end. Relevant factors to improve the sustainability of project outcomes include:   * Development and implementation of a sustainability strategy**.** * Establishment of the financial and economic instruments and mechanisms to ensure the ongoing flow of benefits once the GEF assistance ends (from the public and private sectors, income generating activities, and market transformations to promote the project’s objectives). * Development of suitable organizational arrangements by public and/or private sector**.** * Development of policy and regulatory frameworks that further the project objectives**.** * Incorporation of environmental and ecological factors affecting future flow of benefits. * Development of appropriate institutional capacity (systems, structures, staff, expertise, etc.) **.** * Identification and involvement of champions (i.e. individuals in government and civil society who can promote sustainability of project outcomes)**.** * Achieving social sustainability, for example, by mainstreaming project activities into the economy or community production activities**.** * Achieving stakeholder’s consensus regarding courses of action on project activities.   **Replication approach**, in the context of GEF projects, is defined as lessons and experiences coming out of the project that are replicated or scaled up in the design and implementation of other projects. Replication can have two aspects, replication proper (lessons and experiences are replicated in different geographic area) or scaling up (lessons and experiences are replicated within the same geographic area but funded by other sources). Examples of replication approaches include:   * Knowledge transfer (i.e., dissemination of lessons through project result documents, training workshops, information exchange, a national and regional forum, etc). * Expansion of demonstration projects. * Capacity building and training of individuals, and institutions to expand the project’s achievements in the country or other regions. * Use of project-trained individuals, institutions or companies to replicate the project’s outcomes in other regions.   **Financial Planning** includes actual project cost by activity, financial management (including disbursement issues), and co-financing. If a financial audit has been conducted the major findings should be presented in the TE.  Effective financial plans include:   * Identification of potential sources of co-financing as well as leveraged and associated financing*[[1]](#footnote-1)*. * Strong financial controls, including reporting, and planning that allow the project management to make informed decisions regarding the budget at any time, allows for a proper and timely flow of funds, and for the payment of satisfactory project deliverables * Due diligence due diligence in the management of funds and financial audits.   *Co-financing includes:* Grants, Loans/Concessional (compared to market rate), Credits, Equity investments, In-kind support, other contributions mobilized for the project from other multilateral agencies, bilateral development cooperation agencies, NGOs, the private sector and beneficiaries. Please refer to Council documents on co-financing for definitions, such as GEF/C.20/6.  *Leveraged resources* are additional resources—beyond those committed to the project itself at the time of approval—that are mobilized later as a direct result of the project. Leveraged resources can be financial or in-kind and they may be from other donors, NGO’s, foundations, governments, communities or the private sector. Please briefly describe the resources the project has leveraged since inception and indicate how these resources are contributing to the project’s ultimate objective.  **Cost-effectiveness** assesses the achievement of the environmental and developmental objectives as well as the project’s outputs in relation to the inputs, costs, and implementing time. It also examines the project’s compliance with the application of the incremental cost concept. Cost-effective factors include:   * Compliance with the incremental cost criteria (e.g. GEF funds are used to finance a component of a project that would not have taken place without GEF funding.) and securing co-funding and associated funding. * The project completed the planned activities and met or exceeded the expected outcomes in terms of achievement of Global Environmental and Development Objectives according to schedule, and as cost-effective as initially planned. * The project used either a benchmark approach or a comparison approach (did not exceed the costs levels of similar projects in similar contexts)   **Monitoring & Evaluation**. Monitoring is the periodic oversight of a process, or the implementation of an activity, which seeks to establish the extent to which inputs, work schedules, other required actions and outputs are proceeding according to plan, so that timely action can be taken to correct the deficiencies detected. Evaluation is a process by which program inputs, activities and results are analyzed and judged explicitly against benchmarks or baseline conditions using performance indicators. This will allow project managers and planners to make decisions based on the evidence of information on the project implementation stage, performance indicators, level of funding still available, etc, building on the project’s logical framework.  Monitoring and Evaluation includes activities to measure the project’s achievements such as identification of performance indicators, measurement procedures, and determination of baseline conditions. Projects are required to implement plans for monitoring and evaluation with adequate funding and appropriate staff and include activities such as description of data sources and methods for data collection, collection of baseline data, and stakeholder participation. Given the long-term nature of many GEF projects, projects are also encouraged to include long-term monitoring plans that are sustainable after project completion.    **Annex** **3**  **Ethical Code of Conduct for UNDP Evaluations**  Evaluations of UNDP-supported activities need to be independent, impartial and rigorous. Each evaluation should clearly contribute to learning and accountability. Hence evaluators must have personal and professional integrity and be guided by propriety in the conduct of their business.  Evaluators:  Must present information that is complete and fair in its assessment of strengths and weaknesses so that decisions or actions taken are well founded  Must disclose the full set of evaluation findings along with information on their limitations and have this accessible to all affected by the evaluation with expressed legal rights to receive results.    Should protect the anonymity and confidentiality of individual informants. They should provide maximum notice, minimize demands on time, and: respect people’s right not to engage. Evaluators must respect people’s right to provide information in confidence, and must ensure that sensitive information cannot be traced to its source. Evaluators are not expected to evaluate individuals, and must balance an evaluation of management functions with this general principle.  Evaluations sometimes uncover evidence of wrongdoing. Such cases must be reported discreetly to the appropriate investigative body. Evaluators should consult with other relevant oversight entities when there is any doubt about if and how issues should be reported.  Should be sensitive to beliefs, manners and customs and act with integrity and honesty in their relations with all stakeholders. In line with the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights, evaluators must be sensitive to and address issues of discrimination and gender equality. They should avoid offending the dignity and self-respect of those persons with whom they come in contact in the course of the evaluation. Knowing that evaluation might negatively affect the interests of some stakeholders, evaluators should conduct the evaluation and communicate its purpose and results in a way that clearly respects the stakeholders’ dignity and self-worth.  Are responsible for their performance and their product(s). They are responsible for the clear, accurate and fair written and/or oral presentation of study limitations, findings and recommendations.  Should reflect sound accounting procedures and be prudent in using the resources of the evaluation. |
|  |

1. Please refer to Council documents on co-financing for definitions, such as GEF/C.20/6. The following page presents a table to be used for reporting co-financing. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)