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| **SFinal Evaluation** **Capacity Building of SIDS Climate Change Negotiators****UNDP Barbados and The OECS Sub-Regional Office** |

**Terms of Reference**

Job Title: Capacity Building of SIDS Climate Change Negotiators Consultancy

Contract Type: Individual Contact (IC)

Duty Station: Home Country Based

Contracting Authority: United Nations Development Programme

Contraction Duration: 26 May - 13 June 2014

Start Date: 26 May 2014

1. **Background and Context**

**Project Description**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Executing Agency* | United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) Barbados and OECS  |
| *Coverage* | SIDS  |
| *Timeframe* | July 01, 2013 to June 30, 2014 |
| *Focus area* | Environment, Energy and Climate Change |
| *Contributions* | AUS$ 750,000.00 |
| *Implementing Partners*  | UNDP Barbados and the OECS Sub Regional Office |
| *Contact persons*  | * Mr. Ricky Wilson, Programme Manager: Environment, Energy and Climate Change,
* Mr. Musaad Al Saleh, Programme Analyst, Environment, Energy and Climate Change,
 |

**Brief Description:**The objective of the “Capacity Building for SIDS Climate Change Negotiators” training initiative was to bolster SIDS officials’ negotiating skills. Designed to increase their capacity to engage effectively in global climate change discussions from a national as well as a group perspective, both inside and outside the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC). The primary focus of capacity building was to deepen the institutional capacity of SIDS government agencies leading climate change by(i) focusing on their junior officials and (ii) gender equality principles underpinning Australia’s overseas development assistance and UNDP’s sustainable human development mandate, encouraging female participation. Facilitated by the Australian Government and implemented by UNDP, the “Capacity Building for SIDS Climate Change Negotiators” project’s design had benefited from the assistance of the Australian Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade, and international and regional technical partners.This project addressed capacity building in SIDS through strengthening negotiating skills and understanding the mechanics of the negotiation process within the framework of climate change negotiations. Accomplished through the delivery of an online course, and two face-to-face interaction (orientation, practical exercise) workshops, with two parallel streams.1. Negotiating Skills to address SIDS Issues
2. Technical Knowledge of Climate Change and their impact on SIDS

The three achieved areas of focus in the training programmes: 1. An emphasis on training junior officials who will form the next generation of negotiators, thus providing an early opportunity to advance their skills and knowledge and ensuring effective succession processes, as well as through a system of mentorship by the senior officials
2. Training of trainers sessions within both streams of the course in order to help to inculcate a culture of shared learning between SIDS and amongst government agencies
3. Efforts to increase the participation of women in such roles of leadership and decision making, as their participation in governance mechanisms in SIDS continues to be low

**Project Objectives :**The principle objective of this intervention was to strengthen the negotiating skills of the SIDS Climate Change negotiators and their understanding of the technical content of the UNFCCC negotiations and work programmes. Due to the technical capacity resource constraints faced by SIDS, the intervention targeted both experienced and novice negotiators. The strategy was aimed at addressing expected loss of personnel in country and ensuring the sustainability of key resources in the respective countries.Consequently the structure of the intervention was in capitalizing on existing learning mechanisms and technical expertise of global organisations involved in climate change. It was accomplished through the delivery of an online course, with face-to face interaction (orientation, practical exercises), with two parallel streams.Strategically, the thrust of capacity building was to :* Assess strengths and weaknesses within the SIDS to identify opportunities to leverage existing assets and facilitate transfer of skills. This will include identifying technical resource persons and institutions committed to continuous support of the negotiators’ knowledge capacity.
* Encourage coordination and cooperation between ministries, countries, and junior and senior negotiators.
* Reinforce the knowledge of the science, local and regional impacts of climate change.

**Project Expected Outcomes:** 1. Adapted course material for negotiating skills to address SIDS issues, especially within the context of climate change (Stream 1)
2. Training and knowledge sharing tools prepared on UNFCCC work programme topics (e.g. climate finance, mitigation, technology transfer), including SIDS-specific case studies (Stream 2)
3. Assessment completed on the implementation of the training programme, including effectiveness, lessons learned and identification of gaps
 |

**Context**

|  |
| --- |
| Small island developing states (SIDS) are extremely vulnerable to the impacts of climate variability and change given their size, geography and economic base. These countries are among the smallest emitters of greenhouse gases but are likely to experience the greatest negative impact from climate change. Because of limited finance and available human capacity, these countries struggle to make their case and get fair representation on the world stage. A country’s ability to represent and negotiate is crucial to the successful prosecution of their positions in international fora. In this regard developing the capacity of policy makers involved in negotiations is of growing importance in the countries’ efforts to encourage global mitigation of greenhouse gas emissions and pursue sustainable development and climate resilience. In May 2008, the Environment and Energy Group (EEG) of UNDP launched a ground-breaking global project, Capacity Development for Policy Makers to Address Climate Change. This project assisted up to 20 developing countries to strengthen their capacity and develop policy options for addressing climate change across different sectors and economic activities. This allowed these countries to determine their financial needs, better articulate policy decisions and facilitate access to climate financing resources. Through the assessments of investments and financial flows, participating countries calculate the amount of funds needed to tackle climate change now and in the long term in the context of their national development priorities. Since 2009, UNDP Barbados and the OECS Sub-regional Office has been providing policy and technical advice to members of CARICOM and AOSIS in preparation for successive UNFCCC COPs. This has supported policy makers throughout the negotiating process, and through research into the specific impacts anticipated for SIDS.UNITAR also continues to partner with global organisations to deliver online and on-site training for climate change negotiators. These are intended to provide participants with the information, skills and techniques needed to participate effectively in the COPs and in UNFCCC negotiation sessions, and to develop participants’ understanding of the climate change policy framework, by building an appreciation of the science, causes and impacts of climate change, the history of the policy making process and the UNFCCC framework. They have also provided more specialised sessions on topics such as adaptation, loss and damage and climate finance.The Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environment Programme (SPREP) in its Strategic Plan 2011-2015 states that “By 2015, all Members will have strengthened capacity to respond to climate change through policy improvement, implementation of practical adaptation measures, enhancing ecosystem resilience to the impacts of climate change, and implementing initiatives aimed at achieving low-carbon development.” SPREP has been engaged in supporting the Pacific Island Countries (PICs) in the climate change negotiation process since 1991, and has developed a negotiating skills training framework, with ad hoc sessions running since 2008. Regional Heads of Government have mandated SPREP to lead the coordination of the region’s response to the multiple climate change challenges already being faced.Similarly, the Caribbean Community Climate Change Centre (CCCCC) has been designated by CARICOM Heads of Government as the regional coordinating agency for the response to climate change, guided by the Regional Framework for Achieving Development Resilient to Climate Change 2011-2021 and its Implementation Plan[[1]](#footnote-1), as well as a repository for regional climate change information and data. It has also been designated by UNITAR as a Centre of Excellence. Presently, CCCCC is developing evidence-based policy papers which will be used to build consensus and joint policy positions amongst Caribbean states for international negotiations. They are also working with the Caribbean Development Bank to help governments develop proposals to access investment and financial flows for adaptation.These collective technical and capacity building efforts have been critical in strengthening the climate change negotiators’ advocacy during the COPs, but more strategically in supporting the development of national policies and strategies on climate change. Globally, SIDS continue to advocate the need for stronger action on climate change in light of their disproportionately adverse impacts compared to their greenhouse gas contribution. The UNFCCC process provides the primary forum for SIDS to articulate these issues. |

1. **Evaluation Purpose**

|  |
| --- |
| The evaluation exercise, to be conducted at the request of UNDP and in accordance with the Project Monitoring and Evaluation Plan for 2014, aims to:1. Determine the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability of outcomes achieved during the implementation of the project;
2. Determine and document lessons learned and identification of any gaps in the project
3. Identify improvements in implementation and make recommendations for replication of activity;
 |

1. **Evaluation Scope, Objectives, Criteria and Guiding Questions**

|  |
| --- |
| In accordance with the Prodoc the evaluation exercise will cover all the project components including but not limited to (i) training sessions (at Garden City, Singapore) ,(ii) online training session (iii) knowledge products produced and (iv) implementation of the project .The evaluation exercise will assess: * The relevance of the project actions implemented in contributing to the project outcomes and outputs
	+ To what extent is UNDP’s engagement a reflection of strategic considerations, including UNDP’s role in a particular development context and its comparative advantage?
	+ To what extent was UNDP’s selected method of delivery appropriate to the development context?
	+ Is the initiative aligned with regional and national strategies?
	+ Is it consistent with human development needs and the specific development challenges in the country?
* The effectiveness of the project implementation in contributing to the project outcomes and outputs
	+ What progress towards the expected results has been achieved (strengths, weaknesses, obstacles, problems, causes)?
	+ Did the project or programme implementation set dynamic changes and processes that move towards the long-term outcomes?
	+ What has been the contribution of partners and other organizations to the results, and how effective have UNDP partnerships been in contributing to achieving the outcome?
	+ To what extent the intended beneficiaries have been reached?
* The efficiency of the project implementation in contributing to the project outcomes and outputs to date
	+ To what extent have the programme or project outputs resulted from economic use of resources?
	+ To what extent were partnership modalities conducive to the delivery of outputs?
	+ Has the project been implemented to date within deadline and cost estimates?
	+ Was there any identified synergy between UNDP initiatives that contributed to reducing costs while supporting results?
* The sustainability of the project actions implemented in contributing to the project outcomes and outputs
	+ What indications are there that the outcomes will be sustained, e.g. through requisite capacities (systems, structures, staff, etc,)?
	+ Were initiatives designed to have sustainable results given the identifiable risks? Did they include an exit strategy?
	+ What issues emerged during implementation as a threat to sustainability? What were the corrective measures that were adopted?
 |

1. **Methodology**

|  |
| --- |
| The consultant will design the methodology for the project evaluation. The following will be taken into consideration for the design: * Evaluation methods should be selected for their rigor in producing empirically based evidence to address the evaluation criteria, to respond to the evaluation questions, and to meet the objectives of the evaluation.
* The type of information and methods selected must produce evidence. The evaluation findings must include primary and secondary data (disaggregated by gender if available) in the narrative text, as well as a presentation of the results matrix of the initiative, updated with the new indicator status, but delimited by the restrictions identified in the analysis of the evaluation.
* The central focus of the evaluation is the contribution to outcomes, without excluding other levels of results – outputs.

It is expected that the exercise will entail, but not limited to, the following methods to collect qualitative and quantitative data: * Desk review of relevant documents;
* Consultation with stakeholders and counterparts ;
* Consultation with beneficiaries .
 |

1. **Outputs / Deliverables**

|  |
| --- |
| Draft Evaluation Report -   The report should contain an evaluation matrix that displays for each of the evaluation criteria, the questions and sub questions that the evaluation will answer, and for each question, the data that will be collected to inform that question and the methods that will be used to collect that data[[2]](#footnote-2) . In addition, the report should make explicit the underlying theory or assumptions about how each data element will contribute to understanding the development results—attribution, contribution, process, implementation and so forth—and the rationale for data collection, analysis and reporting methodologies selected. The draft report will be circulate for review and feedback on the initial findings and recommendationsFinal Evaluation Report The final report should be 20 paged (maximum) analytical report, excluding annexes, detailing key findings, good practices and clear recommendations. The report should be presented in English. The Evaluation report format should meet with the standard Evaluation Report Template of the UNDP and quality Standards established[[3]](#footnote-3) |

1. **Evaluation Ethics**

|  |
| --- |
| For the development of this evaluation, the consultant will follow the ethical principles and guidelines established by UNDP and the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG). Among other aspects, this includes the rights and confidentiality must be guaranteed to the people providing information, explicit requirements for its use, necessary permission for interviewing children and young people and in accordance with protocols that allow for the safeguarding of information and preservation of anonymity and confidentiality. The evaluator shall operate in such a manner so as to guarantee the independence and impartiality of the process and outputs of the evaluation. The evaluator is expected to agree with the Code of Conduct for Evaluators in the UN System. |

1. **Implementation arrangements**

|  |
| --- |
| * UNDP will provide a pre-evaluation briefing to the consultant.
* UNDP will provide any relevant technical assistance and background information/documents to the consultant.
 |

1. **Timeframe for the evaluation process**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| The evaluator is expected to work for a period of 15 working day between May 26, 2014 and June 13, 2014. The indicative timelines are as follows: Indicative Schedule

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Phase | Duration in working days  |
| Desk Review | 03 days |
| Consultations | 03 days  |
| Draft evaluation report | 05 Days  |
| Final evaluation report | 04 days |
|  |  |

 |

1. **Payment**

|  |
| --- |
| Payments would be made upon submission and approval of the following deliverables as highlighted in section 9 above:1. Draft evaluation report and presentation of findings, conclusions and recommendation - (6 June ) – 50%
2. Final evaluation report – (13 June 2014) – 50%
 |

1. **Travel and allowances**

|  |
| --- |
| Desk Study, no Travel anticipated.  |

1. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. UNDP Handbook, P172 [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Annex 7 of the UNDP Handbook (2009), and UNEG Quality Checklist for Evaluation Reports UNEG/G(2010)/2 [↑](#footnote-ref-3)