



TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR THE FINAL EVALUATION

“Building adaptive capacity and resilience to climate change in the water sector in Cabo Verde - CIDA Fast Start Climate Change Funds”

Type of Consultant: National Consultant
Terms of Contract: Individual Contract
Location: Cabo Verde
Expected starting date: 14th November 2016
Duration of the consultancy: 30 days
Expected date for final report submission: 23th December
Closing Date: 31st October 23:59 CPV time

1. INTRODUCTION

In accordance with the UNDP and GEF M&E policies and procedures, a final evaluation of the full-size project “Building adaptive capacity and resilience to climate change in the water sector in Cape Verde” is required. This project, implemented through the Ministry of Agriculture and Environmental, since 2013. The Final Evaluation report is to be completed by December 2016. This phase of the project started in last quarter of 2013 and is in its final year of implementation. This Terms of Reference (TOR) sets out the expectations for this terminal evaluation.

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 | <i>at endorsement (Million US\$)</i> |
| ATLAS Project ID: | 00058318 | CIDA financing: | \$1,980,000 USD |
| Country: | Cape Verde | IA/EA own: | \$200,000 USD |
| Region: | West Africa | Government: | \$ 9,211,299 USD |
| Focal Area: | Climate Change Adaptation | Other: | \$ 54,487,736 USD |

| | | | |
|----------------------------------|---|-------------------------------|-----------------------|
| GEF Focal Area Strategic Program | | Total co-financing: | \$ 63,699,035 USD |
| Executing Agency: | Ministry of Agriculture and Environment (MAA) | Total Project Cost in cash: | \$1,980,000 US |
| Other Partners involved: | ProDoc Signature (date project began): | | September 2013 |
| | | Initial Planned closing date: | Revised closing date: |

2. Project background

The impacts of climate change on Cabo 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 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. Financial resources from the Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF) had been 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.

A mid-term review was completed by September 2013, and a follow-up project has been endorsed and financed by CIDA with a focus on climate change and food security.

During LDCF project implementation awareness on climate change risks and adaptation alternatives have been reinforced and adaptive measure have been demonstrated/ scaled up ((small-scale drip irrigation; biological and mechanical soil and water conservation measures). Through this additional funds, capacity to mainstream climate change adaptation in development planning will be further reinforced with a particular focus on analysing current and projected impacts of climate change on food security status of the country and building community resilience through a shift towards climate-smart agriculture and integrated water resources management.

In line with guidance and eligibility criteria of the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA) Fast Start Climate Change Funds, this proposal seeks to address food security issues associated with climate change, with special considerations afforded to gender issues in particular with respect to access to resources and exacerbated vulnerability under condition of strain.

The project aims at supporting the reinforcement of national applied-research programs targeted to climate resilient agriculture and food security in the context of a small island developing state (SIDS). Some priority measures identified in the NAPA, such as promotion of application of renewable energies for water mobilization in rural areas, will be also implemented with this additional funding.

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 Cabo Verde and to other countries through actions foreseen under Outcome 3

3. Final Evaluation objectives

Project evaluations assess the efficiency and effectiveness of a project in achieving its intended results. Terminal evaluation is expected as well to assess the relevance and sustainability of outputs as contributions to medium-term and longer-term outcomes.

The TE will be conducted according to the guidance, rules and procedures established by UNDP as reflected in the UNDP Evaluation Guidance.

The objectives of the evaluation are to assess the achievement of project results, and to draw lessons that can both improve the sustainability of benefits from this project, and aid in the overall enhancement of UNDP programming.

The Terminal Evaluation is intended to identify weaknesses and strengths of the project design and implementation strategy to come up with recommendations to avoid or address similar issues in the follow-up project.

The TE must provide evidence based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The evaluation team is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with government counterparts (executing agency), in particular with line ministries, UNDP Country Office, project team, UNDP Regional Technical Adviser based and key stakeholders.

The evaluation 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, specially targeting follow-up project endorsed by CIDA and the SGP interventions on the community base adaptation focal area.

Scope of the Terminal Evaluation

The scope of the Terminal Evaluation 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 should cover at minimum the five evaluation criteria considered by UNDP Evaluation Office:

| Box 3. UNDP Evaluation Criteria | |
|--|---|
| 1. Relevance | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▫ The extent to which the activity is suited to local and national development priorities and organizational policies, including changes over time. ▫ the extent to which the project is in line with the GEF Operational Programs or the strategic priorities under which the project was funded. ▫ Note: Retrospectively, the question of relevance often becomes a question as to whether the objectives of an intervention or its design are still appropriate given changed circumstances. |
| 2. Effectiveness | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▫ The extent to which an objective has been achieved or how likely it is to be achieved. |
| 3. Efficiency | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▫ The extent to which results have been delivered with the least costly resources possible; also called cost effectiveness or efficacy. |
| 4. Results | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▫ The positive and negative, foreseen and unforeseen changes to and effects produced by a development intervention. ▫ In GEF terms, results include direct project outputs, short to medium-term outcomes, and longer term impact including global environmental benefits, replication effects and other local effects. |
| 5. Sustainability | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▫ The likely ability of an intervention to continue to deliver benefits for an extended period of time after completion. ▫ Projects need to be environmentally, as well as financially and socially sustainable. |

The evaluation assessment should cover, at minimum, 3 general areas, for which conclusions and recommendations should be provided and lessons learned identified:

- i. Project formulation
- ii. Project implementation
- iii. Project results

The conclusions should be comprehensive and balanced, and highlight the strengths, weaknesses and outcomes of the project. They should be well substantiated by the evidence and logically connected to the terminal evaluation findings. They should respond to key evaluation questions and provide insights into the identification of and/or solutions to important problems or issues pertinent to project beneficiaries, UNDP and Canada-UNDP Climate Change Facility.

The recommendations should be feasible and directed to the intended users of the evaluation about what actions to take and decisions to make. The recommendations should be specifically supported by the evidence and linked to the findings and conclusions around key questions addressed by the evaluation.

The terminal evaluation report should also include, if available, lessons that can be taken from the evaluation, including best (and worst) practices that can provide knowledge gained from the particular circumstance (programmatic and evaluation methods used, partnerships, financial leveraging, etc.) that are applicable to other CIDA and UNDP interventions, especially for the follow-up project.

The evaluation 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 section 6 (Evaluation criteria & rating).

3.1. Project formulation:

i. Assess project formulation and relevance of the adopted strategy. For this purpose, those are some questions (not an exhaustive list) to be considered:

- Were the project's objectives and components clear, practicable and feasible within its time frame?
- Were the capacities of the executing institution(s) and its counterparts properly considered when the project was designed?
- Were lessons from other relevant projects properly incorporated in the project design?
- Were the partnership arrangements properly identified and roles and responsibilities negotiated prior to project approval?
- Were counterpart resources (funding, staff, and facilities), enabling legislation, and adequate project management arrangements in place at project entry?
- Were the project assumptions and risks well articulated in the PIF and project document?
- Were project outcomes and project indicators SMART?

ii. Assess the project assumptions and risks as set out in the project document and Log Frame/Results Framework, including:

- An assessment of the stated assumptions and risks, whether they are logical and robust, and have helped to determine activities and planned outputs.
- Externalities (i.e. effects of climate change, global economic crisis, etc.) which are relevant to the findings.

3.2. Project Implementation

Some elements to include in the assessment of implementation approach include:

a. M&E mechanisms

- The logical framework used during implementation as a management and M&E tool;
- Effective partnership arrangements established for implementation of the project with relevant stakeholders involved in the country/region, including the formation of a Project Board;
- Lessons from other relevant projects incorporated into project implementation;
- Feedback from M&E activities used for adaptive management.

b. Finance

i. Effectiveness of the financial planning

ii. *Cost-Effective factors*

c. 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;
- All recent financial audits, as available, should be taken into consideration. The evaluator(s) will receive assistance from the Country Office (CO) and 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) | UNDP own financing (mill. US\$) | | Government (mill. US\$) | | Partner Agency (mill. US\$) | | Total (mill. US\$) | |
|-------------------------------|------------------------------------|--------|----------------------------|--------|--------------------------------|--------|-----------------------|--------|
| | Planned | Actual | Planned | Actual | Planned | Actual | Actual | Actual |
| Grants | | | | | | | | |
| Loans/Concessions | | | | | | | | |
| * In-kind support | | | | | | | | |
| * Other | | | | | | | | |
| Totals | | | | | | | | |

d. CIDA implementing agency execution- UNDP

The evaluator should assess and rate the quality of UNDP execution of the project. The assessment should be established through consideration of the following issues:

- Whether there was an appropriate focus on results;
- The adequacy of UNDP support to the Implementing Partner and project team;
- Quality and timeliness of technical support to the Executing Agency and project team;
- Candour and realism in annual reporting;
- The quality of risk management;
- Responsiveness of the managing parties to significant implementation problems (if *any*).

e. Implementing partner execution

Similarly, the quality of execution by the Implementing Partner should be assessed, considering the following issues:

- Whether there was an appropriate focus on results and timeliness;
- Adequacy of management inputs and processes, including budgeting and procurement quality of risk management;
- Candour and realism in reporting Government ownership.

f. Project M&E mechanisms

The evaluation team should be expected to provide a project M&E assessment that provides:

- An analysis of the M&E plan at project start up, considering whether baseline conditions, methodology and roles and responsibilities are well articulated. Is the M&E plan well conceived? Is it articulated sufficient to monitor results and track progress toward achieving objectives
- The quality of M&E plan implementation: Was the M&E plan sufficiently budgeted and funded during project preparation and implementation?
- The effectiveness of monitoring indicators from the project document for measuring progress and performance;
- Compliance with the progress and financial reporting requirements/ schedule, including quality and timeliness of reports;
- The value and effectiveness of the monitoring reports and evidence that these were discussed with stakeholders and project staff;

To assess whether there were changes in the environmental and development objectives of the project during implementation, the following questions might be considered:

- Why these changes were made and what was the approval process did the project undergo significant changes as a result of recommendations from the mid-term review?
- If the changes were extensive, did they materially change the expected project outcomes?
- Were the project changes articulated in writing and then considered and approved by the project steering committee?

3.3. Project Results

The results include direct project outputs, short- to medium-term outcomes, and longer term impact including global environmental benefits, replication effects, and other local effects.

Assessing project results involves attention to the full scope of a results based management (RBM) chain, from inputs to activities, to outputs, outcomes and impacts. For UNDP supported GEF financed projects, the main focus of attention is at the outcome level, recognizing that global environmental benefit impacts are often difficult to discern and gauging outputs is straightforward but not sufficient to capture project effectiveness

To assess project outcomes, the evaluation should include consideration of results as measured by broader aspects such as:

i. Country ownership,

The evaluation should find evidence that reveals to what extent the project fits within stated sector development priorities, and also to what extent project outputs have been developed with involvement from government officials and have been adopted into national strategies, policies and/or legal codes.

Some relevant questions to assess ownership might be:

- Was the project concept in line with development priorities and plans of the country?
- Were the relevant country representatives from government and civil society involved in project implementation, including as part of project steering and technical committee?
- Have the government(s), enacted legislation and/or developed policies and regulations inline with the project's objectives?

ii. Mainstreaming,

Project terminal evaluation must assess how the projects is successfully mainstreaming other UNDP priorities, according to UNDP Strategic Plan, including poverty alleviation, improved governance, building resilience to disaster risk and women's empowerment.

The section on mainstreaming should assess:

1. Whether it is possible to identify and define positive or negative effects of the project on local populations and policy frameworks;
2. If the project objectives conform to agreed priorities in the UNDP country programme document (CCPD) and UNDAF;
3. Whether there is evidence that the project outcomes have contributed to enhance resilience and better preparation to cope with natural disasters;
4. Whether gender issues had been taken into account in project design and implementation and in what way has the project.

iii. Sustainability

Terminal Evaluation should at minimum assess "the likelihood of sustainability of outcomes at project termination, and provide a rating for this catalytic role and impact". Sustainability is generally considered to be the likelihood of continued benefits after the project ends. Consequently, the assessment of sustainability considers the risks that are likely to affect the continuation of project outcomes. The GEF Guidelines establish four areas for considering risks to sustainability. Each should be separately evaluated and then rated as to the likelihood and extent that risks will impede sustainability

- *Financial risks:* Are there financial risks that may jeopardize the sustainability of project outcomes? What is the likelihood of financial and economic resources not being available once GEF grant assistance ends?

- *Socio-economic risks:* Are there social or political risks that may threaten the sustainability of project outcomes? What is the risk for instance that the level of stakeholder ownership (including ownership by governments and other key stakeholders) will be insufficient to allow for the project outcomes/benefits to be sustained? Do the various key stakeholders see that it is in their interest that project benefits continue to flow? Is there sufficient public/stakeholder awareness in support of the project’s long-term objectives?
- *Institutional framework and governance risks:* Do the legal frameworks, policies, and governance structures and processes within which the project operates pose risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project benefits? Are requisite systems for accountability and transparency, and required technical know-how, in place?
- *Environmental risks:* Are there ongoing activities that may pose an environmental threat to the sustainability of project outcomes?

| Box 6. Project Sustainability Ratings | | |
|--|---------------------------------|---|
| 4 | Likely (L) | negligible risks to sustainability, with key outcomes expected to continue into the foreseeable future. |
| 3 | Moderately Likely (ML) | moderate risks, but expectations that at least some outcomes will be sustained |
| 2 | Moderately Unlikely (MU) | substantial risk that key outcomes will not carry on after project closure, although some outputs and activities should carry on. |
| 1 | Unlikely (UL) | severe risk that project outcomes as well as key outputs will not be sustained. |
| Not Applicable (N/A) Unable to Assess (U/A) | | |

iv. Catalytic Role

The evaluation team should consider the extent to which the project has demonstrated: a) production of a public good, b) demonstration, c) replication, and d) scaling up.

v. 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 ecological status, b) verifiable reductions in stress on ecological systems, or c) demonstrated progress towards these impact achievements.

In the discussion on impacts it will be important at a minimum to:

- Identify the mechanisms at work (i.e. the causal links to project outputs and outcomes);
- Assess the extent to which changes are taking place at scales commensurate to natural system boundaries;
- Assess the likely permanence (long lasting nature) of the impacts.

4. Evaluation Approach and method

An overall approach and method for conducting project terminal evaluations of UNDP supported GEF financed projects have developed over time. The evaluator is expected to frame the evaluation effort using the criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and impact, as defined and explained in the UNDP Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of projects.

A set of questions covering each of these criteria have been drafted and are included with this TOR. The evaluation team is expected to amend, complete and submit matrix as part of an evaluation inception report, and shall include it as an annex to the final report.

The evaluation must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The evaluation team is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with government counterparts, in particular the Ministry of Agriculture and Environment, UNDP Country Office, project team, UNDP Technical Adviser based in the region and key stakeholders. The evaluation team is expected to conduct a field mission to Cabo Verde including the following project intervention sites (Santo Antão and Santiago Islands).

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. Interview with RTA (Regional Technical Advisor) responsible for this thematic and geographic area;
- f. Interview with the National Director of Environment;
- g. Interview with the Director of Agriculture
- h. Finance and Operation Manager at UNDP CO authorizing direct payments;

- i. Interview with project executing agency: DGPOG Ministry of Agriculture and Environment, finance Officer and The project coordinating team and the executing technical branches of the ministry (INIDA, Extension, Island wide Representation of Ministry of Agriculture and Environment);
- j. 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.
- k. Field visit to interview project beneficiaries (community associations, local officials, farmers, water boards, etc.)

5. Evaluation criteria & rating

An assessment of project performance will be carried out, based against expectations set out in the Project Logical Framework/Results Framework which provides performance and impact indicators for project implementation along with their corresponding means of verification. The evaluation will at a minimum cover the criteria of: relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact.

Ratings must be provided on the following performance criteria. The completed table must be included in the evaluation executive summary.

The following rating system is to be applied:

| Table 1. Rating Scales | | |
|---|---|--|
| Ratings for Outcomes, Effectiveness, Efficiency, M&E, I&E Execution 6: Highly Satisfactory (HS): The project had no shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives in terms of relevance, effectiveness, or efficiency 5: Satisfactory (S): There were only minor shortcomings 4: Moderately Satisfactory (MS): there were moderate shortcomings 3. Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): the project had significant shortcomings 2. Unsatisfactory (U): there were major shortcomings in the achievement of project objectives in terms of relevance, effectiveness, or efficiency 1. Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): The project had severe shortcomings | Sustainability ratings: 4. Likely (L): negligible risks to sustainability 3. Moderately Likely (ML): moderate risks 2. Moderately Unlikely (MU): significant risks 1. Unlikely (U): severe risks | Relevance ratings: 2. Relevant (R) 1. Not relevant (NR) Impact Ratings: 3. Significant (S) 2. Minimal (M) 1. Negligible (N) |
| <i>Additional ratings where relevant:</i> Not Applicable (N/A) Unable to Assess (U/A) | | |

A useful table to include in the evaluation report is set out below.

| Rating Project Performance | | |
|---|--------------------|--|
| Criteria | Comments | |
| Monitoring and Evaluation: Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S) Moderately Satisfactory (MS), Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU), Unsatisfactory (U), Highly Unsatisfactory (HU) | | |
| Overall quality of M&E | (rate 6 pt. scale) | |
| M&E design at project start up | (rate 6 pt. scale) | |
| M&E Plan Implementation | (rate 6 pt. scale) | |
| IA & EA Execution: Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S) Moderately Satisfactory (MS), Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU), Unsatisfactory (U), Highly Unsatisfactory (HU) | | |
| Overall Quality of Project Implementation/Execution | (rate 6 pt. scale) | |
| Implementing Agency Execution | (rate 6 pt. scale) | |
| Executing Agency Execution | (rate 6 pt. scale) | |

| | | |
|---|--------------------|--|
| Outcomes Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S) Moderately Satisfactory (MS), Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU), Unsatisfactory (U), Highly Unsatisfactory (HU) | | |
| Overall Quality of Project Outcomes | (rate 6 pt. scale) | |
| Relevance: relevant (R) or not relevant (NR) | (rate 2pt. scale) | |
| Effectiveness | (rate 6 pt. scale) | |
| Efficiency | (rate 6 pt. scale) | |
| Sustainability: Likely (L); Moderately Likely (ML); Moderately Unlikely (MU); Unlikely (U). | | |
| Overall likelihood of risks to Sustainability: | (rate 4pt. scale) | |
| Financial resources | (rate 4pt. scale) | |
| Socio-economic | (rate 4pt. scale) | |
| Institutional framework and governance | (rate 4pt. scale) | |
| Environmental | (rate 4pt. scale) | |
| Impact: Significant (S), Minimal (M), Negligible (N) | | |
| Environmental Status Improvement | (rate 3 pt. scale) | |
| Environmental Stress Reduction | (rate 3 pt. scale) | |
| Progress towards stress/status change | (rate 3 pt. scale) | |
| Overall Project Results | (rate 6 pt. scale) | |

6. Evaluation 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 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. National Consultant recruitment process will be conducted separately by UNDP Country Office.

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 Cabo Verde, and for submitting the final report following the country mission. The consultants will sign an agreement with UNDP Cabo Verde and will be bound by its terms and conditions set in the agreement. The national consultant is also responsible for the preparation and submission of the Portuguese final version of the evaluation report. Additionally, she/he will present the draft TE report with national partners and stakeholders to facilitate their understanding. National consultant will ensure that any specific comments, inputs and questions registered on this draft report discussion are addressed on the final report.

Qualifications of the National consultant

- a) Academic degree (BSc or MSc) and professional background in fields related to Climate Change Adaptation, Agriculture and Integrated Water Resource Management, social sciences, etc.
- b) A minimum of 5 years of working experience in the development sector in Cabo Verde is required;
- c) Understanding of climate change adaptation and integrated water resource management;
- d) Demonstrated skills and knowledge in participatory monitoring and evaluation processes;
- e) Experience in monitoring and evaluation of climate change adaptation and development projects, supported by UN agencies and/or major donor agencies;
- f) Proficient in writing and communicating both in English and in Portuguese. Ability to interpret to the international counterpart and also to translate necessary written documents to English;
- g) Understand gender analysis and approach is an asset;
- h) Excellent in human relations, coordination, planning and team work.

Qualifications of International consultant (as an indicative reference for national consultancy applicants; please note that procurement for this position will be conducted separately by UNDP CO)

1. International consultant with advanced academic degree (MSC or PhD) 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, French 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 Cabo Verde or similar SIDS (Small Islands Developing States) countries;
9. Excellent in human relations, coordination, planning and team work, and
10. Excellent feedback-giving skills and culture sensitiveness

7. EVALUATOR ETHICS

Evaluation consultants will be held to the highest ethical standards and are required to sign a Code of Conduct upon acceptance of the assignment. UNDP evaluations are conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluations'.

8. Proposed schedule

The review will start in November 2016 and it requires a **minimum of 10 working 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. The draft Final Report should be submitted to UNDP Cabo Verde for circulation to relevant agencies/national counterpart within three weeks after the completion of the review mission to Cabo Verde. The consultants will finalize the report within two weeks upon receiving comments and feedback from stakeholders compiled by UNDP CO.

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 | | | | |
| Inception Report (including an evaluation matrix) * | Evaluation team clarifies timing and method of Evaluation | No later than 1 week before the field mission | Review team submits to UNDP Country Office | 20% Upon satisfactory approval |
| Presentation of initial findings | Initial Findings: discussed in a wrap-up discussion with project team and CO; and presented on a stakeholder workshop. | End of review mission | To project management and UNDP Country Office; and key stakeholders | 40% Upon satisfactory approval |
| Draft Final Report + Executive summary | Full report covering all items detailed on section 4 "Scope of the FE" 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 matrix and leveraged resources, etc.) | Within 3 weeks of the review mission | Sent to UNDP CO, reviewed by RTA, PCU, MAA, GEF Operational and Political Focal Point | |
| Final Report & Evaluation Matrix | Revised report with audit trail detailing how all received comment have (and have not) been addressed in the final review report). | Within 2 weeks of receiving UNDP, executing agency (MAA) and GEF OFP comments on draft | Sent to UNDP CO | 40% Upon satisfactory approval |

*According to UNDP TE Policies and guidelines, an inception report should detail the evaluators understanding of the project being evaluated and why, showing how each evaluation question will be answered by way of: proposed methods, proposed sources of data and data collection procedures. The inception report should include a proposed schedule of tasks, activities and deliverables, designating a

team member with the lead responsibility for each task or product. The Inception Report will be shared with the Ministry of Agriculture and Environment and other key stakeholders, to ensure a common understanding of the mission plan, methodology and timing.

The final 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 AND DURATION

The principal responsibility for managing this review resides with the UNDP Country Office (UNDP CO) in Praia, Cabo 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 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 evaluation team with local travel arrangements and scheduling. The PCU is responsible as well for providing logistics for debriefing session.

Expected date for starting work: 14th November 2016

Duration of the consultancy: 30 days

Expected date for final report submission: 23rd December

11. APPLICATION PROCESS

The applications should be submitted to the email address, procurement.cv@cv.jo.un.org indicating the following reference “National Consultant for **“Terminal Evaluation - Building adaptive capacity and resilience to climate change in the water sector in Cabo Verde - CIDA Fast Start Climate Change Funds”** by 31st October 2016 23:59 CPV time. **Incomplete applications will be excluded from further consideration. Only selected candidate will be contacted.**

Recommended Presentation of Proposal:

- Duly accomplished Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability using the template provided by UNDP;
- Personal Curriculum Vitae (CV) and 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;
- Technical proposal - Proposed evaluation methodology, approach to conduct on the field mission and desk-review phase and work plan;
- Financial Proposal: the financial proposal must be expressed in the following pricing option: Lump Sum Amount - The lump sum amount must be “all-inclusive” (honorariums, living allowance, trips¹, health insurance, etc.); the price should be in USD

¹ Information on domestic inter-islands flights can be found on the national company: www.flytacv.com.

indicates the all-inclusive fixed total contract price, supported by a breakdown of costs, as per template provided. If an Offeror is employed by an organization/company/institution, and he/she expects his/her employer to charge a management fee in the process of releasing him/her to UNDP under Reimbursable Loan Agreement (RLA), the Offeror must indicate at this point, and ensure that all such costs are duly incorporated in the financial proposal submitted to UNDP;

Criteria for Evaluation of Proposal: The selection will be made based on the educational background (10), experience on similar assignments (15) and the quality of the technical proposal (35). The financial proposal will weigh as 30% of the total scoring.

Contact for additional information: Debora.sousa@cv.jo.un.org ; Sandra.martins@cv.jo.un.org

Terms of reference approved by:

Ilaria Carnevali



(Deputy of the Joint Office of UNDP/UNFPA/UNICEF)

Praia, 17th October 2016

PROPOSED EVALUATION REPORT OUTLINE²

- i. Opening page:
- 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 Manual³)
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 rated⁴)
- 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 interventions within the sector
 - 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
 - Overall quality of M&E
 - Quality of UNDP Implementation
 - Quality of Execution - Executing Agency
 - Overall quality of Implementation / Execution - coordination, and operational issues

²The Report length should not exceed 40 pages in total (not including annexes).

³ UNDP Style Manual, Office of Communications, Partnerships Bureau, updated November 2008

⁴ Using the standard rating table in this ToR and the standard rating scales listed in Annex D in this ToR.

3.3

Project Results

- Attainment of objectives (Overall Project Outcome*)
- Relevance (*)
- Effectiveness (*)
- Efficiency (*)
- Country ownership
- Mainstreaming
- Sustainability: Financial resources, Socio-political, Institutional framework and governance, Environmental, Overall likelihood of 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
- 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 B: LIST OF DOCUMENTS TO BE REVIEWED BY THE EVALUATORS

Indicative, but not exhaustive:

- PRODOC;
- Technical documents: Terms of Reference; consultancies report, Management plans; proposals; staff review & comments on consultancies deliverables
- Annual and Quarter Work Plans & Reports
- Financial Reports
- Communication materials
- Training Materials
- Training and events reports
- Memorandum of understanding for activity execution
- Cabo Verde national policy documents on environment, climate change, gender
- Relevant legislation and regulations