**Terms of Reference (TORS)**

**Individual Consultant**

**Annex I**

 Date: April, 2015

|  |
| --- |
| Services required: “Consultancy services to carry out the Terminal Evaluation of the project”.Time of contract: 2 months Begins: June 2015 Ends: August 2015Project: 00079208 “Reinforcing REDD+ Readiness in Mexico and enabling South-South cooperation”Objective: Analyze the implementation of the project, review the achievements made by the project to deliver the specified objectives and outcomes, and comment on the added value of non-specified and un-intended achievements. The evaluation will establish the relevance, performance and success of the project, including the sustainability of results, and provide recommendations on follow-up activities to reinforce initial benefits. The evaluation will also collate and analyze specific lessons and good practices pertaining to the strategies employed, and implementation arrangements, which may be of relevance for REDD+ processes in the country and elsewhere in the world.Name of supervisor of products and services: Project director and UNDP Sustainable Development Programme DirectorTravel requirements: 5 days in Mexico City, 6 days Guadalajara and 3 days in Yucatán for field visits, interviews and preparation of the report.Payments: 4 payments upon receipt and acceptance of deliverables |

1. **BACKGROUND**
	1. **Brief project description**

On May 27, 2010, the Governments of Norway and Mexico signed, through their respective Ministries of Environment, a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) on Cooperation in the field of Environment, Forest and Climate Change. The MoU includes specific areas of cooperation with relevance to the implementation of strategies and policies for reducing emissions from deforestation and forest degradation, as well as the role of conservation, sustainable management of forests, and enhancement of forest carbon stocks (REDD+).

The Goal of the Project is to strengthen REDD+ implementation in Mexico and to expand the global knowledge base on REDD+ - related methodologies and approaches. This will be achieved by developing national Mexican capacities for the measurement, reporting and verification (MRV) necessary for the implementation of REDD+, conducting research related to local incentives for REDD+ in Mexico, and promoting Mexico as a Centre of Excellence for South-South cooperation.

The cooperation covers three specific lines of actions:

* The development and implementation of a Measurement, Reporting and Verification system (MRV) as part of the post-2012 REDD+ regime;
* The promotion of Mexico as a Centre of excellence for South-South cooperation to exchange experiences and capacities on MRV systems and REDD+ implementation, and
* Characterization of local incentives: research on REDD+ funding through experiences and case studies in Mexico.
	1. **Evaluation purpose**

The independent Terminal Evaluation (TE) is a requirement for the project and is mandated by the UNDP regulations. This evaluation was carried out according to the guidelines, rules and procedures of the UNDP so as to be able to measure the extent to which its goals, objectives and actions were successful, and to analyze its sustainability towards the future.

The results of this TE are expected to contribute in the design of future projects related with the preparation for REDD+ trough the dissemination of lessons learned which may be relevant to other similar projects in the country and in other countries around the world. The use of this information will be relevant for NORAD, CONAFOR, UNDP and FAO, as well as other national and international counterparts.

Furthermore, this TE is expected to make recommendations on the continuation of the establishment and functioning of the National Forestry Monitoring System (NFMS) –one of the Project’s longer-lasting contributions-, as the Government of Mexico is to secure bridge financing to support the execution of the NFMS in the short term.

* 1. **Objectives of the evaluation**

The overall objective of the TE is to analyze the implementation of the project, review the achievements made by the project to deliver the specified objectives and outcomes. It will establish the relevance, performance and success of the project, including the sustainability of results and it will collect and analyze specific lessons and best practices regarding the strategies used and the implementation arrangements. The evaluation should also comment on potential impacts of the project on the wider REDD+ efforts in Mexico, for example in relation to the national REDD+ strategy development and Mexico’s Emission Reduction proposal to the World Bank carbon fund.

The TE should also define the extent to which the Project has an effect on REDD+ initiatives in the subnational, national, regional and global levels.

The evaluation will also collate and analyze specific lessons and good practices pertaining to the strategies employed, and implementation arrangements, which may be of relevance to REDD+ processes and identify the inputs that the Project generated above and beyond the scope of work originally defined in the Project Document in the country and elsewhere in the world. Additionally, the evaluation will analyze the impact and relevance of the project’s use of a Technical Advisory Committee (TAC). The evaluation must provide clearly documented evidence and analysis, and unbiased assessment

* 1. **Scope of the evaluation**

The evaluation will cover five major criteria as defined in UNDP’s Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results, which are relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, results and sustainability. These five evaluation criteria should be further defined through a series of questions covering all aspects of the project intervention, broken out in three main sections:

* Project Formulation: Logical framework, Assumptions and Risks, Budget (co-finance), institutional arrangements and Timing
* Project Implementation: Implementing Agency supervision and support, monitoring (including use of tracking tools) and evaluation, stakeholder participation, adaptive management.
* Achievement of Results: outcomes, impacts, sinergies, sustainability, mainstreaming (e.g. links to other UNDP priorities, including related support programmes set out in the UNDAF and CPAP, as well as cross cutting issues).
	1. **Methodology or evaluation approach**

Evaluation findings and judgements should be based on sound evidence and analysis, clearly documented in the evaluation report. Information will be triangulated (i.e. verified from different sources) to the extent possible, and when verification is not possible, the single source will be mentioned. Analysis leading to evaluative judgements should always be clearly spelled out. The limitations of the methodological framework should also be spelled out in the evaluation reports.

The evaluation will assess the programme with respect to a minimum set of evaluation criteria.

In attempting to attribute any outcomes and impacts to the programme, the evaluators should consider the difference between what has happened with and what would have happened without the programme. This implies that there should be consideration of the baseline conditions and trends in relation to the intended programme outcomes and impacts. This also means that there should be plausible evidence to attribute such outcomes and impacts to the actions of the project. Sometimes, adequate information on baseline conditions and trends is lacking. In such cases this should be clearly highlighted by the evaluators, along with any simplifying assumptions that were taken to enable the evaluator to make informed judgements about project performance.

As this is a final evaluation, particular attention should be given to learning from the experience. Therefore, the “why?” question should be at the front of the consultants’ minds throughout the evaluation exercise. This means that the consultants need to go beyond the assessment of “what” the programme performance was, and make a serious effort to provide a deeper understanding of “why” the performance turned out the way it did, i.e. of processes affecting attainment of programme results.

This should provide the basis for the lessons that can be drawn from the programme. In fact, the usefulness of the evaluation will be determined to a large extent by the capacity of the consultant to explain “why things happened” as they happened and are likely to evolve in this or that direction, which goes well beyond the mere assessment of “where things stand” today. The consultant could also provide recommendations for the way forward.

The methodology will be based on the UNDP Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results (attached). An overall approach and method for conducting project terminal evaluations of UNDP has developed over time. The evaluator is expected to frame the evaluation effort using the criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and impact.

Evaluation methodology includes the following steps: collecting the information needs to address the evaluation criteria and answer the evaluation questions, analyzing the data, interpreting the findings and report the results.

The methodology used in this evaluation should be based on:

* Preparation and review of the work plan approved by the Government of Norway, CONAFOR, UNDP and FAO.
* Collection of the project documentation
* Analysis of the project documentation with primary focus on:
* Project document
* Logical framework and the Indicator Monitoring System of the project
* Legal agreement between Norway and UNDP,
* National strategic and legal documents,
* Reports produced
* Field visits reports
* Outputs developed (documents, workshops reports, capacity development materials, communication and dissemination materials, etc.)
* Audit reports
* Any other materials that the evaluator considers useful for this evidence-based assessment.
* Evaluation of project impacts
* Evaluation of the institutional capacity and governance of the project and the exit strategy
* Evaluation of the human and financial management of the project
* Evaluation of the use of human, technical and financial resources of the project
* Evaluation of compliance with regulations and project reports - whether they comply with the UNDP rules.
* Evaluation of the performance and achievements
* Produce a report with the whole evaluation
* Final report with the observations and comments received

To obtain project information and documents we had the support of the Project Coordination Unit, UNDP Mexico, FAO and CONAFOR, which is the project-executing agency. The evaluation must provide evidence‐based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The evaluator is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with government counterparts, donors, UNDP Country Office, project team and key stakeholders. The evaluator is expected to conduct a field mission to (to one of the intensive Carbon Monitoring Sites in Yucatán´s Peninsula), including the following project sites (list). Also, relevant information was obtained for analysis of the project through a series of interviews with the following stakeholders:

OUTCOME 1

* Norway’s International Climate and Forest Initiative, including Norad and Ministry of Climate and Environment
* National Forestry Commision (CONAFOR)
* Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources (SEMARNAT)
* National Comission for Knowledge and Use of Biodiveristy (CONABIO)
* National Institute of Ecology and Climate Change (INECC)
* National Geography and Statistics Institute (INEGI)
* National Comission of Protected Areas (CONANP)
* National Autonomous University of Mexico (UNAM)
* Yucatan Scientific Research Center (CICY)
* The College of the Southern Border (ECOSUR)
* The College of Postgraduates (COLPOS)
* U Yool Che
* Canadian Forest Service
* US Forest Service
* North American Commission for Environmental Cooperation
* UNDP Mexico
* FAO Mexico

OUTCOME 2

* Norway’s International Climate and Forest Initiative, including Norad and Ministry of Climate and Environment
* National Forestry Commision (CONAFOR)
* UNDP Mexico
* EMSA Executive Management and Technical Secretariat
* Mexican Agency for International Cooperation and Development (AMEXCID)
* MREDD Program
* REDD Program/CCAD-GIZ
* UNREDD-Regional MRV expert
* Honduras (ICF)
* Costa Rica (FONAFIFO)
* Colombia (IDEAM)

OUTCOME 3

* Norway’s International Climate and Forest Initiative, including Norad and Ministry of Climate and Environment
* National Forestry Commission (CONAFOR)
* UNDP Mexico

A set of questions covering each of these criteria has been drafted and is included with this TOR (fill in Annex E) The evaluator is expected to amend, complete and submit this matrix as part of an evaluation inception report, and shall include it as an annex to the final report.

* 1. **Implementation arrangements**

The TE is a requirement of UNDP and Norad, and led by the UNDP Mexico Country Office as project Implementing Agency. The Project Coordination Unit (PCU) has overall responsibility for the coordination and logistical arrangements of the evaluation as well as day-to-day support to the evaluator (travel, accommodation, office space, communications, etc). The Project will also organize the site missions (if required).

The evaluation consultancy will be briefed by the UNDP Country Office, the PCU and CONAFOR upon the commencement of the assignment, and will also provide a terminal briefing. Other briefing sessions may be scheduled, if deemed necessary.

Payment modalities and specifications: The evaluators will be contracted directly from the project budget. The quality of the evaluator’s work will be assessed by the assigned evaluation office in UNDP. If the quality does not meet the expectations, the evaluators will be required to re-do or revise (as appropriate) the work before being paid final installments.

The final work plan will be agreed upon by the UNDP CO, Project coordination unit, and the CONAFOR. The final report must be cleared and accepted by UNDP before being made public, therefore, the UNDP-CO, with the advice and support from the PCU, will have to formally clear the report.

* 1. **Timeframe, resources, logistical support and deadlines**

The total duration of the evaluation will be 45 days according to the following plan:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  Activity | Timing |
| Preparation | 4 days (recommended: 2-4) |
| Evaluation Mission | 14 days (r: 7-15) |
| Draft Evaluation Report | 16 days (r: 5-10) |
| Final Report | 6 days (r;: 1-2) |

Preparation before field work: (5 days including travel time)

* Acquaintance with the project document and other relevant materials with information about the project (Annual Work Plans, Semiannual reports, etc.);
* Familiarization with overall development situation of country (based on reading of UNDP- Common Country Assessment and other reports on the country).
* Detailed mission programme preparation, including methodology, in cooperation with the UNDP Country office
* Initial telephone discussion with UNDP CO and the Project coordination unit

Mission: (14 days)

* Meeting with UNDP Country office team, FAO staff, Project Coordination Staff and CONAFOR staff;
* Meetings with key stakeholders in country
* Joint review of all available materials with focused attention to project outcomes and outputs
* Visit to Project site

Observation and review of completed and ongoing activities,(capacity development, awareness /education, sustainable use demonstration activities, community development, etc)

Interviews with key stakeholders on:

* + Guadalajara, Jalisco
	+ Distrito Federal (Mexico City)
	+ Campeche, Campeche
	+ Pachuca, Hidalgo
	+ Felipe Carrillo Puerto, Quintana Roo
	+ Mérida, Yucatán

Draft report (16 days):

* Final interviews / cross checking with UNDP CO, PCU, and CONAFOR
* Drafting of report in proposed format
* Telephone review of major findings with UNDP CO, PCU, and CONAFOR
* Completing of the draft report and presentation of draft report for comments and suggestions within 2 weeks.

Final Report (6 days)

* Presentation of final evaluation report
* Validation by Norad, UNDP CO, the PCU, and CONAFOR

The final report should consider the outline provided in Annex D

* 1. **Aspects to be considered in the evaluation**
		1. **Project finance/co-finance**

The Evaluation will assess the key financial aspects of the project, including the extent of co-financing planned and realized. Project cost and funding data will be required, including annual expenditures. Variances between planned and actual expenditures will need to be assessed and explained. Results from recent financial audits, as available, should be taken into consideration. The evaluator(s) will receive assistance from the Country Office (CO) and the Project Team to obtain financial data in order to complete the co-financing table below, which will be included in the terminal evaluation report.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Co-financing(type/source) | Partner Agency(mill. US$) | Total(mill. US$) |
| Planned | Actual | Actual | Actual |
| Grants  |  |  |  |  |
| Loans/Concession |  |  |  |  |
| * In-kind support
 |  |  |  |  |
| * Other
 |  |  |  |  |
| Totals |  |  |  |  |

* + 1. **Impact**

The evaluators will assess the extent to which the project is achieving impacts or progressing towards the achievement of impacts. Key findings that should be brought out in the evaluations include whether the project has demonstrated: a) verifiable improvements in Mexico’s MRV capacity, b) verifiable increases in regional MRV capacity through south-south cooperation, c) Observable impacts of the South-South cooperation strategy (such as the positioning of Mexico as a reference in forest monitoring in Mesoamerica and the project’s capability to meet the specific cooperation demands from EMSA countries on forest monitoring, and/or d) demonstrated progress towards these impact achievements.[[1]](#footnote-1)

Additionally, the evaluators will comment on the potential impact of the project in the context of; 1) Mexico’s national REDD+ efforts, 2) UN-REDD’s regional REDD+ efforts.

* + 1. **Conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned**

The evaluation report must include a chapter providing a set of conclusions, recommendations for follow-up activities, and lessons learned.

The chapter should provide a strategic outline and recommendations through which the inputs generated by the Project can be sustained after its lifetime, and in the eventual implementation of a national REDD+ process.

* + 1. **Implementation agreements**

The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation resides with the UNDP CO in Mexico. The UNDP CO will contract the evaluator and ensure the timely provision of per diems and travel arrangements within the country for the evaluation team. The Project Team will be responsible for liaising with the Evaluators team to set up stakeholder interviews, arrange field visits, coordinate with the Government etc.

* 1. **Evaluation deliverables**

The evaluation team is expected to deliver the following:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Deliverable | Content  | Timing | Responsibilities |
| Inception Report | Evaluator provides clarifications on timing and method  | No later than 2 weeks before the evaluation mission.  | Evaluator submits to UNDP CO  |
| Presentation | Initial Findings  | End of evaluation mission | To project management, UNDP CO |
| Draft Final Report  | Full report, (per annexed template) with annexes | Within 3 weeks of the evaluation mission | Sent to CO, Norad, PCU |
| Final Report\* | Revised report  | Within 1 week of receiving Norad and UNDP comments on draft  | UNDP  |

\*When submitting the final evaluation report, the evaluator is required also to provide an 'audit trail', detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final evaluation report.

1. **Responsibilities, activities and products**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | To implement a methodological framework as per the Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results for the evaluation of the project, which ensures the analysis of the relevance, performance and success of the project, including the sustainability of results |
|  | The consultant will be responsible of presenting the evaluation report. It will define the methodology to be used, and the timeline for the inputs required for the report and the final revision. |
|  | Analysis of the associated information of the project, and its implementation to prepare and present the evaluation report. |
|  | Coordinate with other team members, if applicable, to comply with the timeline agreed for the reports and final revisions. |
|  | With the support with the CONAFOR focal point and the UNDP CO, hold interviews with project associates. Take care of the logistics of the field visit, and ensure the timely delivery of the inputs for the consultancy. |
|  | The consultant will be responsible to evaluate the design of the project and its advancements towards its established goals. |
|  | Evaluate the relevance, sustainability, appropriation, monitoring, evaluation, effectiveness, efficiency, impact achievement, among other aspects. |
|  | Evaluate the execution capacity of the different instances of the project, closely monitoring the capacity to fulfill its specific responsibilities. |
|  | Evaluate how the project associates interact, keeping a clear definition of the specific roles. |
|  | Make recommendations on the continuation of the functioning of the NFMS in the short, and medium terms |
|  | Systematize and edit the information, and prepare a final report as per the Terms of Reference. |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Activities** | **Products** | **% payment** |
| **1.** | Present the inception report, including the work plan, and the evaluation methodology in coordination with the rest of the evaluating team | Inception report, presenting the work plan (delivered in Microsoft word file document through email or USB). |  20%Week 2 |
| **2.**  | Review project documentation. This documentation includes background, and the project design documents. Read and analyze informs and semiannual reports, meeting minutes of the Project Board, informs of the Project Coordination Unit, and internal and external audit reports (4 days, including transportation) | List of the required information for the analysis provided by the Project Coordination Unit and the UNDP CO. Analysis of the project information for the preparation of the report. (delivered in Microsoft word file document through email or USB).  |
| **3.** | Agree on the list of people, institution and organizations that will be interviewed, with at least 10 days of notice to the Project Coordination Unit, so as to be able to schedule those meetings, which will take place in Guadalajara. | List of people, institutions, and organizations to be interviewed, approved by the project, Norad, CONAFOR and UNDP (delivered in Microsoft word file document through email or USB)..Work plan approved by Norad, CONAFOR and UNDP (delivered in Microsoft word file document through email or USB).. |
| **4.** | After the document revision, hold a meeting with the UNDP CO, the Project director and team of consultants for orientation and initial interviews (1 day) | Report of the initial interviews (delivered in Microsoft word file document through email or USB).. | 30%Week 4 |
| **5.** | Validation of the preliminary findings with the UNDP CO, and project associates, such as Norad, CONAFOR, and FAO through a verbal presentation (1 day).Globally evaluate the fulfillment of the norms and procedures of the administrative, financial, and reporting system, verifying that they are compliant with the financial rules and regulations of UNDP. | Preliminary interviews and validation of the information for the report (delivered in Microsoft word file document through email or USB).Minutes of the meetings held with UNDP CO, and the Project’s associates (delivered in Microsoft word file document through email or USB). |
| **6.** | Prepare the draft report and share it for comments (4 days)There will be a 10 days period so as to allow the stakeholders to review the report and send comments. These comments will focus particularly in possible errors, not in questioning the evaluator’s impressions.If differences exist in views and findings of the evaluating team and the stakeholders, these will be included in an clarifying annex in the final report | First draft of the report for comments and clarifications (delivered in Microsoft word file document through email or USB).. |
| **7.** | Final revision of the report, including comments of stakeholders and team members | Mainstream comments and clarifications to the report in the final version (delivered in Microsoft word file document through email or USB).. | 50%Week 8 |
| **8.** | Oral presentation of the main conclusions of the evaluation. The presentation will be delivered in the UNDP CO before the review mission has concluded, so as to be able to verify, validate and make clarifications on the conclusions of the evaluation. | Executive powerpoint presentation where the main findings are highlighted, as well as its associated recommendations. |
| **9.** | Final review of the project, which will allow validation and/or gap identification regarding the criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact. | Final report approved by Norad, UNDP CO, and CONAFOR (delivered in Microsoft word file document through email or USB). |

1. **REQUIRED EXPERIENCE AND DEGREES**
2. ***Academic degrees:***
* Academic Degree in Forest or Environmental Sciences, Engineering, Climate Change, Public Policy or related fields.
1. ***Previous experience:***
* Experience with projects on climate change, forestry management, international cooperation, natural resources management or related topics
* Experience in evaluations, monitoring and evaluation of the project under UNDP guidelines and/or Norad-funded projects
* Experience in projects with complex institutional arrangements
* Experience in projects related with the forestry sector, and institutional capacity building on monitoring processes and/or public policy evaluation.
* Experience in the design, implementation, monitoring and/or evaluation of projects linked to institutional capacity building, forestry development or similar projects in scale and scope.
* Experience in projects reviewing the fulfillment of administrative, financial and reporting rules, verifying that they comply financial rules of the UNDP and/or NORAD.
* Command over spoken and written English and Spanish (proof with language examination results, in case of non-native speakers)
1. ***Competencies:***
* Working knowledge on governmental organizations, private sector and Civil Society Organizations related to the forestry sector
* Consultants with previous experience in monitoring and evaluation of UNDP implemented projects are invited to apply
* Knowledge of the environmental, political and economic reality of Mexico
* Command over the Logical Framework Methodology
* Experience in evaluating managerial and administrative projects designed on a results based focus
* Capacity to coordinate, lead and direct groups
* Ensure the independence of evaluation. The consultant will be free of potential conflicts of interests with institutions and associates of the project
* Skill to work under pressure and tight deadlines
* Communication skills
1. **Proposal evaluation.**

The individual consultants will be evaluated with the following criteria:

***\*Cummulative analysis:*** The contract will be awarded to the consultant that achieves the best technical-economic proposal. The technical proposal will be equivalent to 70% of the total, and the economic proposal 30%

Only those proposals totaling at least 700/1000 of the technical score points available will be susceptible of economic analysis.

**Technical factor in % = (Score of the proponent/Maximum Score) x 70**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Evaluation criteria** | **Maximum points** | **Offerors** |
| **A** | **B** |
| 1.1 | Academic degree in natural resources management, forestry management, social sciences or similarPostgraduate degree – 50 pointsBachelor’s degree – 20 points  | 50 |  |  |
| 1.2 | Experience with projects on climate change, forestry management, international cooperation, natural resources management or related topics3 + projects – 100 points2 projects – 50 points | 100 |  |  |
| 1.3 | Experience in evaluations, monitoring and evaluation of the project under UNDP guidelines and/or Norad-funded projects More than 5 years – 150 points5 years – 100 pointsLess than 5 years – 0 points | 100 |  |  |
| 1.4 | Experience in projects with complex institutional arrangements 2 or more projects – 100 points1 project – 50 pointsNo previous experience – 0 points | 100 |  |  |
| 1.5 | Experience in projects related with the forestry sector, and institutional capacity building on monitoring processes and/or public policy evaluation. 2 or more projects – 150 points1 project – 75 pointsNo previous experience – 0 points | 150 |  |  |
| 1.6 | Working knowledge on governmental organizations, private sector and Civil Society Organizations related to the forestry sector. This parameter will be evaluated through experience or studies on this matter on the CV. .Existing knowledge – 50 pointsNo existing knowledge – 0 points | 50 |  |  |
| 1.7 | Experience in projects reviewing the fulfillment of administrative, financial and reporting rules, verifying that they comply financial rules of the UNDP and/or NORAD 2 or more projects – 150 points1 project – 75 pointsNo previous experience – 0 points | 150 |  |  |
| 1.8 | Mastery over the Logical Framework methodology, demonstrated with experience evaluating international projects (UNDP, GEF, etc.)Work experience with 2 or more projects – 100 pointsWork experience with 1 project – 50 points | 100 |  |  |
| 1.9 | Experience evaluating managerial aspects and project administration under a results based focus 2 or more projects – 100 points1 project – 50 pointsNo previous experience – 0 points | 100 |  |  |
| 1.10 | Command over the English language.Criteria to be demonstrated on CV, and with an executive summary of another project in English (details can be blurred out, it is merely for reference) | 100 |  |  |
| **Total possible points** | 1000 |  |  |

**Financial factor in % = (Price of the proponent/Minimum price) x 30**

1. **Evaluation ethics.**

The consultant will assume the highest level of ethical commitment and will sign the Code of Conduct upon accepting the contract (Annex C). UNDP evaluations will comply with the principles indicated in the UNEG Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation.

1. **Payment methods and specifications.**

The consultancy will be funded with project funds, and the payment scheme is determined in section 2 of this document.

The quality of the final report will be evaluated by the UNDP CO, CONAFOR, and Norad. If the quality does not meet the requirements of the UNDP, the consultant will be required to rewrite or review the document before the last ministration.

The final report will have to be cleared by the UNDP CO, CONAFOR and Norad before being publicly used.

1. **Documents to be included in the offer**

The consultants will be required to provide the following documents:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **#** | **Document** | **Format** |
| 1 | Technical proposal which includes a brief description of:* The reasons that position the consultant as the best candidate
* The methodological approach for the consultancy
* The consultant must attach to his/her proposal a signed copy of the UNEG Code of conduct (See annex C)
 | **Free format** |
| 2 | Economic proposalUse Format 1.The fees must include all taxes | **Format 1** |
| 3 | ResumePersonal CV including past experience in similar projects with at least 3 references. | **Free format** |
| 4 | General conditionsThe general conditions of the contract that will be signed with the consultant  | **Annex III** |

1. **Economic proposal**

The financial proposal shall specify the amount of overall spending, and payment terms in relation to specific deliverables and measurable (qualitative and quantitative). Payments are based on the delivery of services specified on the table of expected results and activities. For the comparison of financial proposals, they shall contain a breakdown of the amount of overall spending (including travel, per diem, and anticipated number of working days subdivided in days for course preparation, travel, course implementation, post-processing and online support per person).

* **Trips**

All the travel expenses mentioned within this TOR MUST be included in the economic proposal. This will include all the trips necessary to and from the duty station. In general, UNDP will not accept travel expenses on fares over coach class. If a consultant wishes to travel in a better class, the expenses will not be covered by UNDP.

5 days in Mexico City, 6 days Guadalajara and 3 days in Yucatán for field visits, interviews and preparation of the report should be considered in the economic proposal.

If additional trips beyond the scope of this document are required, they will be covered by the Project.

Substantive annexes

Annex A: UNDP Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results

Annex B: Addendum June 2011 – Updated Guidance on Evaluation in the Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results

Annex C: Evaluation consultant code of conduct and agreement form

Annex D: Evaluation report Outline

Annex E: Sample evaluation questions

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Cuenta presupuestal:**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Account** | **O.Unit** | **Fund** | **Depart.** | **B Unit** | **Project** | **Activity** | **Imp- Ag.** | **Donor** |
| **71300** | **MEX** | **30000** | **51405** | **MEX10** | **00079208** | **4** | **004144** | **10503** |

 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Fecha de Elaboración: Mayo 2015  | Fecha de Aprobación \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ |
|  |  | Por el PNUD |
| Dr. Enrique Serrano GálvezLíder de Proyecto |   | Edgar GonzálezOficial de programas |

Annex A

<http://web.undp.org/evaluation/guidance.shtml#handbook>

Annex B

<http://web.undp.org/evaluation/evaluations/documents/handbook/addendum/Evaluation-Addendum-June-2011.pdf>

Annex C: Evaluation Consultant Code of Conduct and Agreement Form

Evaluators:

1. Must present information that is complete and fair in its assessment of strengths and weaknesses so that decisions or actions taken are well founded.
2. 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.
3. 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.
4. Sometimes uncover evidence of wrongdoing while conducting evaluations. 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.
5. 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.
6. 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 imitations, findings and recommendations.
7. Should reflect sound accounting procedures and be prudent in using the resources of the evaluation.

Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form[[2]](#footnote-2)

Agreement to abide by the Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN System

Name of Consultant: \_\_     \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Name of Consultancy Organization (where relevant): \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

I confirm that I have received and understood and will abide by the United Nations Code of Conduct for Evaluation.

Signed at place on date

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Annex D: Evaluation Report Outline

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| i. | Opening page:* Title of the project
* UNDP project ID#s.
* Evaluation time frame and date of evaluation report
* Implementing Partner and other project partners
* Evaluation team members
* Acknowledgements
 |
| ii. | Executive Summary* Project Summary Table
* Project Description (brief)
* Evaluation Rating Table
* Summary of conclusions, recommendations and lessons
 |
| iii. | Acronyms and Abbreviations(See: UNDP Editorial Manual[[3]](#footnote-3)) |
| 1. | Introduction* Purpose of the evaluation
* Scope & Methodology
* Structure of the evaluation report
 |
| 2. | Project description and development context* Project start and duration
* Problems that the project sought to address
* Immediate and development objectives of the project
* Baseline Indicators established
* Main stakeholders
* Expected Results
 |
| 3. | Findings (In addition to a descriptive assessment, all criteria marked with (\*) must be rated[[4]](#footnote-4))  |
| 3.1 | Project Design / Formulation* Analysis of LFA/Results Framework (Project logic /strategy; Indicators)
* Assumptions and Risks
* Lessons from other relevant projects (e.g., same focal area) incorporated into project design
* Planned stakeholder participation
* Replication approach
* UNDP comparative advantage
* Linkages between project and other REDD+ efforts in Mexico and the Meso-American region
* Management arrangements
 |
| 3.2 | Project Implementation* Adaptive management (changes to the project design and project outputs during implementation)
* Partnership arrangements (with relevant stakeholders involved in the country/region)
* Feedback from M&E activities used for adaptive management
* Project Finance:
* Monitoring and evaluation: design at entry and implementation (\*)
* UNDP and Implementing Partner implementation / execution (\*) coordination, and operational issues
 |
| 3.3 | Project Results* Overall results (attainment of objectives, including un-intended) (\*)
* Relevance(\*)
* Effectiveness & Efficiency (\*)
* Country ownership
* Mainstreaming
* Sustainability (\*)
* Impact
 |
| 4.  | Conclusions, Recommendations & Lessons* Corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project
* Actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the project on the national and international dimensions
* Proposals for future directions underlining main objectives
* Best and worst practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance and success
 |
| 5.  | Annexes* ToR
* Itinerary
* List of persons interviewed
* Summary of field visits
* List of documents reviewed
* Evaluation Question Matrix
* Questionnaire used and summary of results
* Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form
 |

**Annex E: Sample Evaluation Questions**

It is expected that as part of the work plan of the consultancy, the evaluator prepare a set of questions for interviews that allows to define the information that evaluation will generate. Questions that, when answered, will give intended users of the evaluation the information they seek in order to make decisions, take action or add to knowledge. Some examples:

* Were stated outcomes or outputs achieved?
* What progress towards the outcomes has been made?
* What factors have contributed to achieving or not achieving intended outcomes?
* What factors contributed to effectiveness or ineffectiveness?

Other questions may include:



1. A useful tool for gauging progress to impact is the Review of Outcomes to Impacts (ROtI) method developed by the GEF Evaluation Office:  [ROTI Handbook 2009](http://www.thegef.org/gef/sites/thegef.org/files/documents/M2_ROtI%20Handbook.pdf) [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. UNDP Style Manual, Office of Communications, Partnerships Bureau, updated November 2008 [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. Using a six-point rating scale: 6: Highly Satisfactory, 5: Satisfactory, 4: Marginally Satisfactory, 3: Marginally Unsatisfactory, 2: Unsatisfactory and 1: Highly Unsatisfactory, see section 3.5, page 37 for ratings explanations. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)