



“Low Emission Capacity Building (LECB) Programme Philippine Project”

TERMS OF REFERENCE

National Individual Consultant for the

Final Project Evaluation (FPE) of the LECB PHL Project

A. Project Title

Philippines: Climate Change Capacity Building Project in the Framework of the Low-Emission Capacity Building Programme (LECB PHL Project). Project ID No. 00079132.

B. Project Description

This is the Terms of Reference for the UNDP Final Project Evaluation (FPE) of the project titled “Philippines: Climate Change Capacity Building Project in the Framework of the Low-Emission Capacity Building Programme (LECB PHL Project)” (PIMS 4807) implemented through the Climate Change Commission and executed by United Nations Development Programme-Country Office. The project started on April 20, 2012 and is set to end on June 30, 2017.

The Global Low Emission Capacity Building (LECB) Programme was launched in January 2011 as part of a joint collaboration between the European Union and UNDP. Since its inception, the Programme has grown both in scope and breadth, now including 25 participating countries and providing technical and institutional support through generous contributions from the European Commission, the German Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation, Building and Nuclear Safety or BMUB, and the Australian government.

The Philippines is among the countries to be provided support by the Global LECB Programme for their national efforts to integrate climate change into strategies and plans and ensure appropriate linkages between policy making and options for financing. The Global LECB Programme is being executed by UNDP and implemented by the Climate Change Commission through the LECB Philippine Project. The Global Programme will strengthen national capacities to: 1) Develop/establish greenhouse gas inventory management systems; 2) Formulate Nationally Appropriate Mitigation Actions (NAMAs) and/or low-emission development strategies (LEDS) in the context of national development; 3) Design MRV systems to support implementation and evaluation of NAMAs and LEDS; and, in a few select countries, 4) Facilitate the design and adoption of mitigation actions by selected industries; and 5) Support the design of the associated MRV systems for industrial mitigation measures.

In 2015, financing was extended to select countries to support preparation of Intended Nationally Determined Contributions. The Philippines is focused on Outcomes 1 to 3.

The LECB Philippine Project rationale is consistent with the Global LECB Programme rationale that countries need support in terms of providing technical expertise and assistance in developing capacity of the Public Sector. Capacity development is central to the country’s efforts to tackle climate change. This includes increasing institutional capacities to provide appropriate mechanisms of support and coordination when addressing climate risks. It includes strengthening technical knowledge in order to better understand and make use of climate information, and increasing relevant data and access to data for planning and decision-



based on a decision of the German Bundestag



making. In these areas, the LECB Programme can play an important role in helping the Philippines understand how to take climate change into account more effectively when developing planning strategies and designing and implementing policies.

The project includes cross-cutting practices such as gender, poverty reduction and capacity development and is linked with the UNDAF focus for the Philippines. The guiding strategy is for UNDP to ensure the necessary linkages of this national project with the UNDAF in close coordination with the GoP more specifically by:

- a) Understanding both the beneficial and detrimental linkages between climate change and development;
- b) Using this knowledge to strengthen the national development framework and UNDAF priorities;
- c) Addressing climate change related risks and opportunities as early as possible in UN-supported programmes and projects; and
- d) Tracking progress towards achievement of UNDAF outcomes, including their contribution to climate resilience and low-carbon development at the national level.

The project's activities and outcomes have been designed to likewise ensure sustainability and replicability beyond the LECB Global Programme's life. The project is guided by existing policies of the government on mitigation. It is consistent with the goal of the Philippines' National Climate Change Action Plan to "build the adaptive capacities of women and men in their communities, increase the resilience of vulnerable sectors and natural ecosystems to climate change, and optimize mitigation opportunities towards gender-responsive and rights-based sustainable development". In the institutional mapping exercise conducted by the Project, six (6) sectors have been identified that need climate change capacity building, namely: Agriculture, Waste management, Industry, Transport, Forestry/land use, and Energy (AWIT-FE sectors). While the initial focus was on the AWIT sectors, i.e., agriculture, waste, industry, and transport, the additional funding granted to the Project expanded to the other remaining sectors, namely, forestry and energy.

As part of Philippine participation in Area 1: Public Sector Capacity Building on GHG Inventory systems, NAMAs, LEDS, and MRV in the designated AWIT sectors (Project Component 1), the following are the expected outcomes from which the project objectives are directed to:

- a) Outcome 1: Robust national system for preparation of GHG emission inventories have been established at a national level;
- b) Outcome 2: NAMAs and 4 sectoral road maps have been formulated within the context of national development priorities; and
- c) Outcome 3: MRV systems have been designed to support implementation and evaluation of NAMAs and LEDS/sectoral road maps.

Additional support was received for Project Component 2: Enhanced Support Programme (ESP) to strengthen private sector participation in climate change mitigation activities. While the Project focused on the Public Sector in general, project activities and outputs now involve participation to great extent of the private sector as well. These linkages and synergies between the Public and Private sectors will identify opportunities for public-private partnerships to address key climate change priorities under the project in a coordinated manner. In this context, the country will be able to identify the most suitable options to engage the private sector in the formulation and implementation of the project and its activities. With this component, the Public sector can play a key role in the design of policies, regulations and





incentives to facilitate the active engagement of the private sector in efforts to address climate change concerns. On the other hand, the private sector can identify and implement concrete actions on the ground, at the sectoral or industrial level, to reduce GHG emissions while ensuring linkages with development needs and economic growth. The expected outcomes of the ESP are:

- a) Outcome 1: Enabling environment that accelerates scaling up mitigation has been created/improved;
- b) Outcome 2: Private sector has been engaged in defining enabling environments and stimulating investments in climate change mitigation;
- c) Outcome 3: An enabling environment to encourage the private sector to integrate mitigation strategies into their business plans has been created/improved; and
- d) Outcome 4: MRV schemes with support from private sector have been developed.

Outcomes 1 and 2 were combined into a single project outcome. Likewise, outcomes 3 and 4 were merged into a single project outcome.

Further support was also granted by the European Community for the Intended/Nationally Determined Contribution (I/NDC) Action Plan for the Philippines under Project Component 3. It provides technical assistance to the Philippine government to design, implement and report the results of its carbon emission reduction activities to the UNFCCC. The expected outcomes for this component are:

- a) Institutional structure/organization and arrangements for designing, formulating and implementing the INDCs are established;
- b) INDC preparation, planning, formulation and implementation are documented/institutionalized; and
- c) Systems to monitor INDC implementation are set up or put in place.

The major output for this component is the development of the country's NDC Roadmap/Framework.

C. Objective of the Assignment.

This final project evaluation is being conducted to provide conclusions and recommendations about the relevance, impact, efficiency, effectiveness and sustainability of the project. The evaluation should enable the UNDP Country Office (CO), the donor and other stakeholders to draw lessons from the implementation for future similar undertakings and to assess what are the next steps that may need to be taken to ensure the sustainability of the actions undertaken and by whom.

The overall objective of the evaluation is to assess the extent to which the specific project outputs have been achieved and what progress (attributable to the project) was made towards achieving the project outcomes. Specific objectives are:

1. To evaluate the relevance of the project for the main beneficiaries;
2. To evaluate the efficiency of the project and to assess the appropriateness of the integrated approach of the project;
3. To evaluate the effectiveness of the project;
4. To identify factors directly influencing the level of achievement of the desired results;



5. To evaluate the impact of the project;
6. To identify areas in which the implementation mechanism could have been improved; and
7. To identify the level of the ownership by stakeholders of the project results and provide prioritized list of recommendations for actions (with respective addressees) in case of any identified need for improvement/future similar undertakings.

DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

D. Scope of Work and Key Tasks

The Consultant will first conduct a review of project documents (i.e. Project Document, Project Inception Report, Financial and Administration guidelines used by PMU, project operational guidelines, manuals and systems, etc.) provided by the PMU and UNDP-CO. A Draft Final Report on the FPE of the project was conducted, focusing on the Efficiency aspect of the project. Building on the previous work focusing on Efficiency, the Consultant shall assess in depth the following four categories of project implementation/progress and produce a draft and final report.

1. Project Strategy

Project design:

- Review the problem addressed by the project and the underlying assumptions. Review the effect of any incorrect assumptions or changes to the context to achieving the project results as outlined in the project document.
- Review the relevance of the project strategy and assess whether it provides the most effective route towards expected/intended results.
- Review how the project addresses country priorities.
- Review decision-making processes.
- Review organizational structure of the PMU and any technical working groups established (e.g., members, numbers of meetings per year, how they interacted with other sections of the PMU).
- Review approach of technical support provided by “NAMA-net” consortium.

Results Framework/Logframe:

- Undertake a critical analysis of the project’s logframe indicators and targets, assess how “SMART” the midterm and end-of-project targets are (Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Relevant, Time-bound), and suggest specific amendments/revisions to the targets and indicators as necessary.
- Examine if progress so far has led to, or could in the future catalyze beneficial development effects (i.e. income generation, gender equality and women’s empowerment, improved governance etc...) that should be included in the project results framework and monitored on an annual basis.



2. Assessment of Project Results

The final evaluation will assess achievement of the project's objective, outcomes and outputs and will provide ratings for the targeted objective and outcomes. The assessment of project results seeks to determine the extent to which the project objective was achieved, or is expected to be achieved, and assess if the project has led to any other short term or long term and positive or negative consequences. While assessing a project's results, the final evaluation will seek to determine the extent of achievement and shortcomings in reaching the project's objective as stated in the project document and also indicate if there were any changes in scope and why. If the project did not establish a baseline (initial conditions), the evaluator should seek to estimate the baseline condition so that achievements and results can be properly established. Assessment of project outcomes should be a priority. Outcomes are the likely or achieved short-term and medium-term effects of an intervention's outputs. Examples of outcomes could include but are not restricted to stronger institutional capacities, higher public awareness (when leading to changes of behavior), and transformed policy frameworks or business environment. An assessment of impact is encouraged when appropriate. To improve learning, the final evaluation will seek to assess the key success factors and lessons learned for each project outcome, including any collateral (unintended) benefits. The evaluator should assess project results using indicators and relevant tracking tools. Key substantive products (e.g., technical reports, training manuals, institutional authorizations, etc.), list of training events (including number of participants, description of institutions, and key objectives), and notable visibility and communications products should be listed as an annex to the report.

To determine the level of achievement of the project's objective and outcomes, the following criteria will be assessed in the final evaluation study:

- a) Relevance: Were the project's outcomes consistent with the focal areas/operational program strategies and country priorities?
- b) Effectiveness: Are the actual project outcomes commensurate with the original or modified project objective?
- c) Efficiency: Was the project cost effective? Was the project the least cost option? Was the project implementation delayed and if it was, then did that affect cost effectiveness? Wherever possible, the evaluator should also compare the cost-time vs. outcomes relationship of the project with that of other similar projects.

The evaluation of relevancy, effectiveness and efficiency will be as objective as possible and will include sufficient and convincing empirical evidence. Ideally the project monitoring system should deliver quantifiable information that can lead to a robust assessment of the project's effectiveness and efficiency. Outcomes will be rated as follows for relevance, effectiveness and efficiency:

- Highly Satisfactory (HS): The project had no shortcomings in the achievement of its objective, in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency;
- Satisfactory (S): The project had minor shortcomings in the achievement of its objective, in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency;
- Moderately Satisfactory (MS): The project had moderate shortcomings in the achievement of its objective, in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency;
- Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): The project had significant shortcomings in the achievement of its objective, in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency;



- Unsatisfactory (U): The project had major shortcomings in the achievement of its objective, in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency;
- Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): The project had severe shortcomings in the achievement of its objective, in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency.

3. Assessment of Sustainability of Project Outcomes

The final evaluation will assess the likelihood of sustainability of outcomes at project termination, and provide a rating for this. Sustainability will be understood as the likelihood of continued benefits after the project ends. The sustainability assessment will give special attention to analysis of the risks that are likely to affect the persistence of project outcomes. The sustainability assessment should also explain how other important contextual factors that are not outcomes of the project will affect sustainability. The following four dimensions or aspects of sustainability will be addressed:

- a) Financial resources: Are there any financial risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project outcomes? What is the likelihood of financial and economic resources not being available once the LECB Global Programme assistance ends (resources can be from multiple sources, such as the public and private sectors, income generating activities, if any, and trends that may indicate that it is likely that in future there will be adequate financial resources for sustaining the project's outcomes)?
- b) Socio-political: Are there any social or political risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project outcomes? What is the risk 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 the project benefits continue to flow? Is there sufficient public/stakeholder awareness in support of the long term objectives of the project?
- c) Institutional framework and governance: Do the legal frameworks, policies and governance structures and processes pose risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project benefits? While assessing this parameter, also consider if the required systems for accountability and transparency, and the required technical know-how are in place.
- d) Environmental: Are there any environmental risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project outcomes? The final evaluation should assess whether certain activities will pose a threat to the sustainability of the project outcomes.

On each of the dimensions of sustainability of the project, outcomes will be rated as follows:

- Likely (L): There are no or negligible risks that affect this dimension of sustainability.
- Moderately Likely (ML): There are moderate risks that affect this dimension of sustainability.
- Moderately Unlikely (MU): There are significant risks that affect this dimension of sustainability.
- Unlikely (U): There are severe risks that affect this dimension of sustainability. All the risk dimensions of sustainability are critical. Therefore, the overall rating for sustainability will not be higher than the rating of the dimension with lowest ratings. For example, if a project has an 'Unlikely' rating in either of the dimensions then its overall rating cannot be higher than 'Unlikely'.



4. Catalytic Role

The final evaluation will also describe any catalytic or replication effect of the project. If no effects are identified, the evaluation will describe the catalytic or replication actions that the project carried out. No ratings are requested for the catalytic role.

5. Project Implementation and Adaptive Management

Among other factors, when relevant, the Consultant considers the following issues affecting project implementation and attainment of project results. However, evaluators are not expected to provide ratings or separate assessment on the following categories but they could be considered while assessing the performance and results sections of the report:

- Work Planning (Preparation and readiness). Were the project's objectives and components clear, practicable and feasible within its timeframe? Were the capacities of implementing institution and 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 the 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?
- Finance and co-finance. Did the project have the appropriate financial controls, including reporting and planning, that allowed management to make informed decisions regarding the budget and allowed for timely flow of funds? Was there due diligence in the management of funds and financial audits?
- Monitoring and Reporting Systems. The final evaluation will assess whether the project met the minimum requirements for project design of M&E and that: an M&E system was in place and facilitated timely tracking of progress towards the project objective and outcomes by collecting information on chosen indicators continually through the project implementation period; annual project reports were complete, accurate and with well justified ratings; the information provided by the M&E system was used during the project to improve project performance and to adapt to changing needs; and, projects had an M&E system in place with proper training for parties responsible for M&E activities to ensure data will continue to be collected and used after project closure.
- Communications. Did the project involve the relevant stakeholders through information-sharing, consultation and by seeking their participation in the project's design, implementation, and monitoring and evaluation? For example, did the project implement appropriate outreach and public awareness campaigns? Did the project consult and make use of the skills, experience and knowledge of the appropriate government entities, NGOs, community groups, private sector, local governments and academic institutions in the design, implementation and evaluation of project activities?
- Management Arrangements. Did Implementing/Executing Agency staff identify problems in a timely fashion and accurately estimate their seriousness? Did Implementing/Executing Agency staff provide quality support and advice to the project, approve modifications in time and restructure the project when needed? Did the Implementing/Executing Agencies provide the right staffing levels, continuity, and skill mix for the project/activities?

The Consultant will include a section in the FPE report setting out the report's evidence-based conclusions, in light of the findings. Additionally, the Consultant is expected to make



recommendations to the PMU to improve future programming and/or similar projects. Recommendations should be succinct suggestions for critical intervention that are specific, measurable, achievable, and relevant. A recommendation table should be put in the report's executive summary. The Consultant will make at least five key recommendations, and no more than 15 recommendations total.

An inception workshop/meeting shall be conducted to clarify the Consultant's understanding of the objectives and methods of the FPE, producing the inception report thereafter.

E. Expected Outputs and Deliverables

The Consultant shall prepare and submit:

Inception Report: The Consultant clarifies objectives and methods of the FPE no later than 2 weeks before the FPE mission. To be sent to the CCC and the UNDP Country Office.

Presentation: Initial Findings presented to project management and the UNDP Country Office at the end of the FPE mission.

Draft Final Report: Full report with annexes within 3 weeks of the mission. To be sent to the CCC and UNDP Country Office.

Final Report: Revised report with audit trail detailing how all received comment have (and have not) been addressed in the final report. To be sent to the CCC and the UNDP Country Office within 1 week of receiving comments on draft.

Comments on the Management Response: Review the Management Response to the Final FPE Report and provide comments. To be sent to the UNDP Country Office within one (1) week of receiving comments on the draft.

F. Institutional Arrangement

The principal responsibility for managing this FPE resides with the Commissioning Unit, i.e., the UNDP Country Office.

The LECB PHL Project Management Unit (PMU) will be responsible for liaising with the Consultant to provide all relevant documents, set up stakeholder interviews, and arrange field visits, if any. A tentative schedule of interviews with the stakeholders will be provided by the PMU.

G. Duration of the Work

The duration of the FPE will be for a maximum of four (4) weeks or 28 days.

H. Duty Station

The Consultant should be based in Manila for accessibility and availability should discussions/reporting on progress of activities is required by either the CCC or UNDP. Domestic travel contingent upon the scope of work may be required.



REQUIRED SKILLS AND EXPERIENCE

I. Qualifications of the Successful Applicant

The selection of the Consultant will be aimed at maximizing his/her overall qualities in the following areas:

- a) Recent experience with result-based management evaluation methodologies;
- b) Experience applying SMART targets and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios;
- c) Competence in adaptive management;
- d) Work experience in relevant technical areas for at least 10 years;
- e) At least 7 years in the area of climate change and environment.
- f) Excellent communication skills;
- g) Demonstrable analytical skills;
- h) Project evaluation/review experiences within United Nations system will be considered an asset. Likewise, experience working with the GEF or GEF-evaluations is an advantage; and
- i) A Master's degree in agriculture, industrial engineering, energy engineering, environmental planning, environmental science or other closely related field.

Consultant Independence:

The Consultant cannot have participated in the project preparation, formulation, and/or implementation (including the writing of the Project Document) and should not have a conflict of interest with project's related activities.

APPLICATION PROCESS

J. Scope of Price Proposal and Schedule of Payments

Financial Proposal:

- Financial proposals must be “all inclusive” and expressed in a lump-sum for the total duration of the contract. The term “all inclusive” implies all cost (professional fees, insurance, communication expenses, etc.);
- The lump sum is fixed regardless of changes in the cost components.

Schedule of Payments:

The Consultant shall receive payments based on the following schedule:

- 20% upon signing of contract;
- 20% upon submission and acceptance of the Inception Report;
- 20% upon submission and acceptance of the Draft Final Report; and
- 40% upon submission and acceptance of the Final Report and Comments on the Management Response.



K. Recommended Presentation of Offer

- Duly accomplished Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability using appropriate UNDP templates;
- Personal CV and a P11 Personal History form, 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;
- Brief description of approach to work/technical proposal of why the individual considers him/herself as the most suitable for the assignment, and a proposed methodology on how they will approach and complete the assignment; (max 1 page).
- Financial Proposal that indicates the all-inclusive fixed total contract price, supported by a breakdown of costs, as per template provided. If an applicant 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 applicant must indicate at this point, and ensure that all such costs are duly incorporated in the financial proposal submitted to UNDP. See Letter of Confirmation of Interest template for financial proposal template. Proposals should be clearly marked “Consultant for Low-Emission Capacity Building Philippine Project (LECB PHL Project) Final Project Evaluation” and should be submitted to the UNDP-Country Office in a sealed envelope. Incomplete applications will be excluded from further consideration.

L. Criteria for Selection of the Best Offer

The award of the contract will be made to the Individual Consultant whose offer has been evaluated using the “Combined Scoring method” and determined as:

- The selection will be made based on the educational background and experience on similar assignments, where the qualifications and methodology will be weighted a maximum of 70%; and
- The price proposal will weigh as 30% of the total scoring.

M. Approval

This TOR is approved by:

ASEC. ROMELL ANTONIO O. CUENCA
Deputy Executive Director, Climate Change Office
Project Manager, LECB PHL Project

Signed on: _____
(Date)