United Nations Development Programme

TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR INTERIM EVALUATION OF THE INTEGRATED FLOOD MANAGEMENT TO CLIMATE RESILIENCE OF THE VAISIGANO RIVER CATCHMENT IN SAMOA PROJECT (INTERNATIONAL CONSULTANT)

A. Introduction:

This is the Terms of Reference (ToR) for the Interim Evaluation of the UNDP-supported GCF-financed project titled *Integrated Flood Management to Enhance Climate Resilience for the Vaisigano River Catchment (PIMS 5919) also as known as the Vaisigano Catchment Project (VCP)* implemented through the Ministry of Finance (MoF), which is to be undertaken in 2020. The project started on 9th June 2017 and is in its third year of implementation. This ToR sets out the expectations for this Interim Evaluation. The MTR process must follow the guidance outlined in the document Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects

B. Project Description or Context and Background:

As a Small Island Developing State (SIDS) in the Pacific, Samoa has been heavily impacted by increasingly severe tropical storms. Given the topography of the country, these extreme events have caused significant river discharge that results in flooding of lowland areas. Recent tropical storms like Cyclone Evan have caused floods resulting in serious health impacts and significant damage to both public and private assets. The resulting damages have been estimated at US$200 million. Urban infrastructure has suffered considerably and is expected to further degrade as extreme weather events are becoming more frequent

The project was designed to strengthen the adaptive capacity, and to reduce exposure to extreme weather events of vulnerable communities, infrastructure, and the built environment in the Vaisigano River Catchment area. This is the river that flows through the Apia Urban Area (AUA)

The project represents the Government of Samoa's initial steps in operationalizing a comprehensive flood management solution and it promotes a paradigm shift through its integrated and holistic approach to both hard and soft flood protection of the Greater Apia Catchment, and specifically, the Vaisigano River through three inter-linked outputs:

a) Assessments and mechanisms in place for an integrated approach to reduce vulnerability towards flood-related risks
b) Infrastructure in the Vaisigano River are flood-proofed to increase resilience to negative effects of excessive water
c) Drainage in downstream areas upgraded for increased regulation of water flows.

In conjunction with Government of Samoa co-financing leveraged for this project, GCF resources will be used to address a number of key technical issues including infrastructure; capacity and information-based barriers to enhancing the effectiveness of flood management systems. The primary direct beneficiaries include approximately 26,528 people in the Vaisigano river catchment area and 37,000 people indirect beneficiaries.

The total GCF funds for this project are US$57,717,748 with government co-financing of US$8,000,000. The project document was signed on the 21st July 2017. The Accredited Entity for this project is the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), whilst the Executing Agency (EA)_is the Ministry of Finance (MoF). The Responsible Parties are

United Nations Development Programme

the Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment (MNRE), Ministry of Works, Transport and Infrastructure (MWTI) Land Transport Authority (LTA), Ministry of Health (MoH), and the United Nations Development Programme.

Samoa in COVID-19

A national state of emergency has been in place since 20 March, restricting flights to and from the country and limiting public gatherings. As of 7 May 2020, Samoa does not have any confirmed cases of COVID-19. The Government of Samoa is focused on prevention of an outbreak, implementing strict point of entry arrangements. With this controls in place the project has experienced delays in project implementation with procurement and implementation of consultancies of feasibility studies, infrastructure works, postponed consultations and activities with communities.

C. Scope of Work:

The objective of this consultancy is to undertake the Interim Evaluation of the Integrated Flood Management to Enhance Climate Resilience for the Vaisigano River Catchment project (otherwise known as the "Vaisigano Catchment Project" or " VCP").

1. OBJECTIVES OF THE INTERIM EVALUATION

The Interim Evaluation will assess implementation of the VCP and its alignment with Funded Activity Agreement (FAA) obligations and progress towards the achievement of the VCP objectives and outcomes as specified in the Project Document. The evaluation will assess early signs of project success or failure with the goal of identifying the necessary changes to be made in order to set the project on-track to achieve its intended results. The Interim Evaluation will assess the following:

- Implementation and adaptive management
- Risks to sustainability
- Relevance, effectiveness and efficiency of projects and programmes;
- Coherence in climate finance delivery with other multilateral entities;
- Gender equity;
- Country ownership of projects and programmes;
- Innovativeness in results areas (extent to which interventions may lead to paradigm shift towards low-emission and climate resilient development pathways);
- Replication and scalability – the extent to which the activities can be scaled up in other locations within the country or replicated in other countries (this criterion, which is considered in document GCF/B.05/03 in the context of measuring performance could also be incorporate d in independent evaluations); and
- Unexpected results, both positive and negative.

2. INTERIM EVALUATION APPROACH & METHODOLOGY

The Interim Evaluation must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The Interim Evaluation team will review all relevant sources of information including documents prepared during the preparation phase (i.e. baseline Funding proposal submitted to the GCF, UNDP Environmental & Social Safeguard Policy, the Project Document, project reports including Annual Performance Reports (APR), Quarterly Progress Reports (QPR), project budget revisions, lesson learned reports, national strategic and legal documents, and any other materials that the team considers useful for this evidence-based review).

United Nations Development Programme

The Interim Evaluation team, comprising of a home-based lead Evaluator (international consultant) and support consultant (national consultant), is expected to follow a collaborative and participatory approach[1] ensuring close engagement with the Project Team, government counterparts (the GCF National Designated Authority), the UNDP Multi-country Office, UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Specialist, and other key stakeholders.

Engagement of stakeholders is vital to a successful Interim Evaluation.[2] Stakeholder involvement should include interviews with stakeholders who have project responsibilities, including but not limited to the *Ministry of Finance and responsible parties are the MNRE, MWTI , LTA, MoH, Samoa Business Hub (SBH), Civil Society Support Programme (CSSP), SUNGO, relevant community members and beneficiaries;* senior officials and team leaders, key experts and consultants in the subject area, VCP Board, Technical Advisory Groups (TAG), project stakeholders, academia, communities and villages within the Vaisigano River Catchment Area (VRCA) and Civil Society Organisations (CSOs) etc. Additionally, the National Consultant is expected to conduct field visits to a selection of the project sites in Samoa.

As of 11 March 2020, The World Health Organization (WHO) declared COVID-19 a global pandemic as the new coronavirus rapidly spread to all regions of the world. Travel to Samoa has been restricted since 20 March 2020 and travel is currently not restricted within the country there are some restrictions on public gatherings.

Due to the travel restrictions, the lead evaluator will be home-based and will work closely with the national consultant in engaging stakeholders via irtual consultations via telephone or online (Zoom, Skype, etc.). Field missions will be conducted by the national consultant and findings shared with the lead evaluator. Furthermore, all stakeholder engagement will be strongly supported by the PMU and the UNDP MCO in Samoa. Consideration should be taken for stakeholder availability, ability and willingness to be interviewed remotely and the constraints this may place on the Interim Evaluation. These limitations must be reflected in the final Interim Evaluation report. No stakeholders, consultants or UNDP staff should be put in harm's way and safety is the key priority.

The Interim Evaluation team is expected to develop a methodology and approach that takes into account the COVID-related restrictions. This will require the use of remote interview methods, extended desk reviews, data analysis, surveys and evaluation questionnaires. These approaches and methodologies must be detailed in the Inception Report and agreed with the Commissioning Unit.

The final Interim Evaluation report should describe the full Interim Evaluation approach taken and the rationale for the approach making explicit the underlying assumptions, challenges, strengths and weaknesses about the methods and approach of the review.

3. **DETAILED SCOPE OF THE INTERIM EVALUATION**

The Interim Evaluation team will assess the following categories of project progress.

   i. **Project Strategy**

---

[1] For ideas on innovative and participatory Monitoring and Evaluation strategies and techniques, see UNDP Discussion Paper: Innovations in Monitoring & Evaluating Results, 05 Nov 2013.
[2] For more stakeholder engagement in the M&E process, see the UNDP Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results, Chapter 3, pg. 93.

United Nations Development Programme

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. Were lessons from other relevant projects properly incorporated into the project design?
- Review how the project addresses country priorities. Review country ownership. Was the project concept in line with the national sector development priorities and plans of the country (or of participating countries in the case of multi-country projects)?
- Review decision-making processes: were perspectives of those who would be affected by project decisions, those who could affect the outcomes, and those who could contribute information or other resources to the process, taken into account during project design processes?
- Review the extent to which relevant gender issues were raised in the project design. See Annex 9 of the Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects for further guidelines.
- If there are major areas of concern, recommend areas for improvement.

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.
- Are the project's objectives and outcomes or components clear, practical, and feasible within its time frame?
- Examine if progress so far has led to or could in the future catalyse 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.
- Ensure broader development and gender aspects of the project are being monitored effectively. Develop and recommend SMART 'development' indicators, including sex-disaggregated indicators and indicators that capture development benefits.

ii.   Relevance, Effectiveness and Efficiency

- Were the context, problem, needs and priorities well analysed and reviewed during project initiation?
- Are the planned project objectives and outcomes relevant and realistic to the situation on the ground?
- Is the project Theory of Change (ToC) and intervention logic coherent and realistic? Does the ToC and intervention logic hold or does it need to be adjusted?
- Do outputs link to intended outcomes which link to broader paradigm shift objectives of the project?
- Are the planned inputs and strategies identified realistic, appropriate and adequate to achieve the results? Were they sequenced sufficiently to efficiently deliver the expected results?
- Are the outputs being achieved in a timely manner? Is this achievement supportive of the ToC and pathways identified?
- What and how much progress has been made towards achieving the overall outputs and outcomes of the project (including contributing factors and constraints)?
- To what extent is the project able to demonstrate changes against the baseline (assessment in approved Funding Proposal) for the GCF investment criteria (including contributing factors and constraints)?
- How realistic are the risks and assumptions of the project?
- How did the project deal with issues and risks in implementation?

United Nations Development Programme

- To what extent did the project's M&E data and mechanism(s) contribute to achieving project results?
- Have project resources been utilized in the most economical, effective and equitable ways possible (considering value for money; absorption rate; commitments versus disbursements and projected commitments; co-financing; etc.)?
- Are the project's governance mechanisms functioning efficiently?
- To what extent did the design of the project help or hinder achieving its own goals?
- Were there clear objectives, ToC and strategy? How were these used in performance management and progress reporting?
- Were there clear baselines indicators and/or benchmark for performance measurements? How were these used in project management? To what extent and how the project apply adaptive management?
- What, if any, alternative strategies would have been more effective in achieving the project objectives?

iii.   Progress Towards Results

Progress Towards Outcomes Analysis:
- Review the logframe indicators against progress made towards the end-of-project targets using the Progress Towards Results Matrix; colour code progress in a "traffic light system" based on the level of progress achieved; assign a rating on progress for each outcome; make recommendations from the areas marked as "Not on target to be achieved" (red).

Table. Progress Towards Results Matrix (Achievement of outcomes against End-of-project Targets)

Project Strategy	Indicator[3]	Baseline Level[4]	Level in 1st APR (self-reported)	Midterm Target[5]	End-of-project Target	Midterm Level & Assessment[6]	Achievement Rating[7]	Justification for Rating
Objective:	Indicator (if applicable):							
Outcome 1:	Indicator 1:							
	Indicator 2:							
Outcome 2:	Indicator 3:							
	Indicator 4:							
	Etc.							
Etc.								

Indicator Assessment Key

Green= Achieved	Yellow= On target to be achieved	Red= Not on target to be achieved

In addition to the progress towards outcomes analysis:
- Identify remaining barriers to achieving the project objective in the remainder of the project.
- By reviewing the aspects of the project that have already been successful, identify ways in which the project can further expand these benefits.

iv. Project Implementation and Adaptive Management

---

[3] Populate with data from the Logframe and scorecards
[4] Populate with data from the Project Document
[5] If available
[6] Colour code this column only
[7] Use the 6 point Progress Towards Results Rating Scale: HS, S, MS, MU, U, HU

United Nations Development Programme

Management Arrangements:
- Review overall effectiveness of project management as outlined in the Project Document. Have changes been made and are they effective? Are responsibilities and reporting lines clear? Is decision-making transparent and undertaken in a timely manner? Recommend areas for improvement.
- Review the quality of execution of the Executing Agency/Implementing Partner(s) and recommend areas for improvement.
- Review the quality of support provided by the Accredited Entity (UNDP) and recommend areas for improvement.

Work Planning:
- Review any delays in project start-up and implementation, identify the causes and examine if they have been resolved.
- Are work-planning processes results-based? If not, suggest ways to re-orientate work planning to focus on results?
- Examine the use of the project's results framework/ logframe as a management tool and review any changes made to it since project start.

Finance and co-finance:
- Consider the financial management of the project, with specific reference to the cost-effectiveness of interventions.
- Review the changes to fund allocations as a result of budget revisions and assess the appropriateness and relevance of such revisions.
- Does the project have the appropriate financial controls, including reporting and planning, that allow management to make informed decisions regarding the budget and allow for timely flow of funds?
- Informed by the co-financing monitoring table to be filled out, provide commentary on co-financing: is co-financing being used strategically to help the objectives of the project? Is the Project Team meeting with all co-financing partners regularly in order to align financing priorities and annual work plans?

Coherence in climate finance delivery with other multilateral entities:
- Who are the partners of the project and how strategic are they in terms of capacities and commitment?
- Is there coherence and complementarity by the project with other actors for local other climate change interventions?
- To what extent has the project complimented other on-going local level initiatives (by stakeholders, donors, governments) on climate change adaptation or mitigation efforts?
- How has the project contributed to achieving stronger and more coherent integration of shift to low emission sustainable development pathways and/or increased climate resilient sustainable development (GCF RMF/PMF Paradigm Shift objectives)? Please provide concrete examples and make specific suggestions on how to enhance these roles going forward.

Project-level Monitoring and Evaluation Systems:
- Review the monitoring tools currently being used: Do they provide the necessary information? Do they involve key partners? Are they aligned or mainstreamed with national systems? Do they use existing information? Are they efficient? Are they cost-effective? Are additional tools required? How could they be made more participatory and inclusive?
- Examine the financial management of the project monitoring and evaluation budget. Are sufficient resources being allocated to monitoring and evaluation? Are these resources being allocated effectively?

United Nations Development Programme

Stakeholder Engagement:
- Project management: Has the project developed and leveraged the necessary and appropriate partnerships with direct and tangential stakeholders?
- Participation and country-driven processes: Do local and national government stakeholders support the objectives of the project? Do they continue to have an active role in project decision-making that supports efficient and effective project implementation?
- Participation and public awareness: To what extent has stakeholder involvement and public awareness contributed to the progress towards achievement of project objectives?

Reporting:
- Assess how adaptive management changes have been reported by the project management and shared with the Project Board.
- Assess how well the Project Team and partners undertake and fulfil GCF reporting requirements (i.e. how have they addressed poorly rated APRs, if applicable?)
- Assess how lessons derived from the adaptive management process have been documented, shared with key partners and internalized by partners.

Communications:
- Review internal project communication with stakeholders: Is communication regular and effective? Are there key stakeholders left out of communication? Are there feedback mechanisms when communication is received? Does this communication with stakeholders contribute to their awareness of project outcomes and activities and investment in the sustainability of project results?
- Review external project communication: Are proper means of communication established or being established to express the project progress and intended impact to the public (is there a web presence, for example? Or did the project implement appropriate outreach and public awareness campaigns?)
- For reporting purposes, write one half-page paragraph that summarizes the project's progress towards results in terms of contribution to sustainable development benefits, as well as global environmental benefits.

v. Sustainability
- Validate whether the risks identified in the Project Document, Annual Project Review and the ATLAS Risk Management Module are the most important and whether the risk ratings applied are appropriate and up to date. If not, explain why.
- In addition, assess the following risks to sustainability:

Financial risks to sustainability:
- What is the likelihood of financial and economic resources not being available once the GCF assistance ends (consider potential resources can be from multiple sources, such as the public and private sectors, income generating activities, and other funding that will be adequate financial resources for sustaining project's outcomes)?

Socio-economic risks to sustainability:
- Are there any social or political risks that may jeopardize sustainability 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

United Nations Development Programme

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? Are lessons learned being documented by the Project Team on a continual basis and shared/ transferred to appropriate parties who could learn from the project and potentially replicate and/or scale it in the future?

Institutional Framework and Governance risks to sustainability:
- Do the legal frameworks, policies, governance structures and processes pose risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project benefits? While assessing this parameter, also consider if the required systems/ mechanisms for accountability, transparency, and technical knowledge transfer are in place.

Environmental risks to sustainability:
- Are there any environmental risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project outcomes?

vi. Country Ownership

- To what extent is the project aligned with national development plans, national plans of action on climate change, or sub-national policy as well as projects and priorities of the national partners?
- How well is country ownership reflected in the project governance, coordination and consultation mechanisms or other consultations?
- To what extent are country level systems for project management or M&E utilized in the project?
- What level and types of involvement for all Is the project as implemented responsive to local challenges and relevant/appropriate/strategic in relation to SDG indicators, National indicators, GCF RMF/PMF indicators, AE indicators, or other goals?
- Were the modes of deliveries of the outputs appropriate to build essential/necessary capacities, promote national ownership and ensure sustainability of the result achieved?

vii. Gender equity

- Does the project only rely on sex-disaggregated data per population statistics?
- Are financial resources/project activities explicitly allocated to enable women to benefit from project interventions?
- Does the project account in activities and planning for local gender dynamics and how project interventions affect women as beneficiaries?
- Do women as beneficiaries know their rights and/or benefits from project activities/interventions?
- How do the results for women compare to those for men?
- Is the decision-making process transparent and inclusive of both women and men?
- To what extent are female stakeholders or beneficiaries satisfied with the project gender equality results?
- Did the project sufficiently address cross cutting issues including gender?

viii. Innovativeness in results areas

- What role has the project played in the provision of "thought leadership," "innovation," or "unlocked additional climate finance" for climate change adaptation/mitigation in the project and country context? Please provide concrete examples and make specific suggestions on how to enhance these roles going forward.

United Nations Development Programme

---

ix. Unexpected results, both positive and negative

- What has been the project's ability to adapt and evolve based on continuous lessons learned and the changing development landscape? Please account for factors both within the AE/EE and external.
- Can any unintended or unexpected positive or negative effects be observed as a consequence of the project's interventions?
- What factors have contributed to the unintended outcomes, outputs, activities, results?

x. Replication and Scalability

- What are project lessons learned, failures/lost opportunities to date? What might have been done better or differently?
- How effective were the exit strategies and approaches to phase out assistance provided by the project including contributing factors and constraints?
- What factors of the project achievements are contingent on specific local context or enabling environment factors?
- Are the actions and results from project interventions likely to be sustained, ideally through ownership by the local partners and stakeholders?
- What are the key factors that will require attention in order to improve prospects of sustainability, scalability or replication of project outcomes/outputs/results?

xi. Impact of COVID-19

- Review of the impact of COVID-19 on overall project management, implementation and results (including on indicators and targets).
- Assess the project's response to COVID-19 impacts including and not limited to responses related to stakeholder engagement, management arrangements, work planning and adaptive management actions.

Conclusions & Recommendations
The Interim Evaluation team will include a section of the report setting out the Interim Evaluation's evidence-based conclusions, in light of the findings.[8]

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. See the Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects for guidance on a recommendation table.

The Interim Evaluation team should make no more than 15 recommendations total.

Ratings
The Interim Evaluation team will include its ratings of the project's results and brief descriptions of the associated achievements in a *Interim Evaluation Ratings & Achievement Summary Table* in the Executive Summary of the Interim Evaluation report. See Annex E for ratings scales. No rating on Project Strategy and no overall project rating is required.

---

[8] Alternatively, Interim Evaluation conclusions may be integrated into the body of the report.

United Nations Development Programme

Table. Interim Evaluation Ratings & Achievement Summary Table for GCF Vaisigano Catchment Project

Measure	Interim Evaluation Rating	Achievement Description
Project Strategy	N/A	
Progress Towards Results	Objective Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale)	
	Outcome 1 Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale)	
	Outcome 2 Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale)	
Project Implementation & Adaptive Management	(rate 6 pt. scale)	
Sustainability	(rate 4 pt. scale)	

D. Expected Outcomes and Deliverables:

#	Deliverable	Description	Timing	Responsibilities
1	Interim Evaluation Inception Report	Interim Evaluation team clarifies objectives and methods of Interim Evaluation	No later than 1 week before the Interim Evaluation field work: 28th July 2020	Interim Evaluation team submits to the Commissioning Unit and MoF/Project Management Unit (GCF-PMU)
2	Presentation	Initial Findings	End of Interim Evaluation field work: 13th August 2020	Interim Evaluation Team presents to MoF/Project Management Unit (GCF-PMU) and the Commissioning Unit
3	Draft Interim Evaluation Report	Full report (using guidelines on content outlined in Annex B) with annexes	Within 3 weeks of the Interim Evaluation mission (21st August 2020)	Sent to the Commissioning Unit, reviewed by RTA, Project Coordinating Unit, MoF/GCF NDA/GCF-PMU
4	Final Interim Evaluation Report*	Revised report with audit trail detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final Interim Evaluation report	Within 2 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft: 24th August 2020	Sent to the Commissioning Unit

*The final Interim Evaluation report must be in English. If applicable, the Commissioning Unit may choose to arrange for a translation of the report into a language more widely shared by national stakeholders.

United Nations Development Programme

E. Institutional Arrangement:

The principal responsibility for managing this Interim Evaluation resides with the Commissioning Unit. The Commissioning Unit for the International Consultant of this Interim Evaluation is the UNDP Samoa Multi-country office for Cook Islands, Niue, Samoa and Tokelau based in Samoa.

The UNDP Samoa Multi-country office for Cook Islands, Niue, Samoa and Tokelau based in Samoa and the MoF/GCF Project Management Unit (PMU) will be responsible for liaising with the Interim Evaluation team to provide all relevant documents, set up stakeholder interviews, and arrange field visits for the National Consultant, etc.

Due to the travel restrictions, the lead evaluator will be home-based and will work closely with the national consultant in engaging stakeholders via virtual consultations via telephone or online (Zoom, Skype, etc.). Field missions will be conducted by the national consultant and findings shared with the lead evaluator

F. Duration of the Work:

The total duration of the Interim Evaluation will be *26 working days* over a time period of *18 weeks* starting *15th July 2020* and shall not exceed five months from when the consultant(s) are hired. The tentative Interim Evaluation timeframe is as follows:

COMPLETION DATE	NUMBER OF WORKING DAYS	ACTIVITY
1st July 2020		Application closes
15th July 2020		Select Interim Evaluation Team
20th July 2020		Prep the Interim Evaluation Team (handover of Project Documents)
24th July 2020	7 working days	Document review and preparing Interim Evaluation Inception Report
28th July 2020		Finalization and Validation of Interim Evaluation Inception Report- latest start of Interim Evaluation mission
28th July - 17th August 2020	7 working days	Interim Evaluation fieldwork/stakeholder meetings, interviews, field visits
13th August 2020		Mission wrap-up meeting & presentation of initial findings- earliest end of Interim Evaluation mission
21st August 2020	7 working days	Preparing draft report
24th August 2020	5 working days	Incorporating audit trail from feedback on draft report/Finalization of Interim Evaluation report (note: accommodate time

United Nations Development Programme

		delay in dates for circulation and review of the draft report)
28th August 2020		Preparation & Issue of Management Response
31st August 2020		Expected date of full Interim Evaluation completion

Options for site visits should be provided in the Inception Report.

G. Duty Station:

Home-based. It is expected that the consultant will conduct stakeholder interviews and site visit via virtual means (Zoom, skype etc.) in lieu of the International consultant's mission in Samoa due to COVID19 travel restrictions

H. Qualifications of the Successful Contractor:

A team of two independent consultants will conduct the Interim Evaluation – **International consultant/team leader (with experience and exposure to projects and evaluations in other regions globally)** and National consultant/team expert (separate TOR), from the country of the project. The consultants cannot have participated in the project preparation, formulation, and/or implementation (including writing of the project document) and should not have a conflict of interest with project activities.

Education:
- A Master's degree in environmental/climate science, development studies, disaster risk management, international development, coastal engineering, hydrology or other closely related field (20%);

Experience:
- Minimum of 10 years of relevant professional experience in climate change adaptation, disaster risk management and coastal or flood management (20%);
- 5 years' experience in project evaluations, results-based management, and/or evaluation methodologies (20%);
- Experience in applying SMART targets and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios (10%);
- Project evaluation experience within the United Nations system will be considered an asset (10%);
- Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender and climate change adaptation; experience in gender sensitive evaluation and analysis (5%)
- Experience working in the Pacific region or SIDS preferred (5%)
- Fluency in English (oral and written) is a requirement, with excellent written and presentation skills (10%)

I. Scope of Bid Price & Schedule of Payments:

DELIVERABLES	DUE DATE (%)	AMOUNT IN USD TO BE PAID AFTER CERTIFICATION BY UNDP OF SATISFACTORY

United Nations Development Programme

		PERFORMANCE OF DELIVERABLES	
Upon approval and certification by the Commissioning Unit of the final Interim Evaluation Inception Report	28th July 2020 (20%)	$xxx	
Upon approval and certification by the Commissioning Unit of the draft Interim Evaluation report	21st August 2020 (40%)	$xxx	
Upon approval and certification by the Commissioning Unit and UNDP-GEF RTA of the final Interim Evaluation report and completed Audit Trail	24th August 2020 (40%)	$xxx	
TOTAL	26 working days	$xxx	

J. **Recommended Presentation of Proposal**:

`

Complete proposals must be submitted by **1 July 2020** electronically via email: procurement.ws@undp.org. Incomplete applications will not be considered and only candidates for whom there is further interest will be contacted. Proposals must include:

- Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability using template provided by UNDP;
- **CV or P11 Form** indicating all past experience from similar projects, as well as the contact details (email and telephone number) and at least three (3) professional references (most recent)
- **Statement of capabilities addressing the evaluation criteria** of why the you consider yourself the most suitable for the assignment,
- **A brief methodology** on how you will approach and conduct the work (2 pages maximum),
- **Financial Proposal** specifying the daily rate in US Dollars and other expenses, if any (Annex II)

Queries about the consultancy can be directed to the UNDP Procurement Unit procurement.ws@undp.org

K. **Criteria for Selection of Best Offer**

Offers will be evaluated according to Combined Scoring Method – where the technical criteria will be weighted a maximum of 70% (refer to section H. for breakdown of technical criteria) and the and the financial offer will be weighted at 30%.

A. **Annexes to the TOR**
ToR ANNEX A: List of Documents to be reviewed by the Interim Evaluation Team
1. Funding Proposal
2. UNDP Project Document
3. UNDP Environmental and Social Screening results

United Nations Development Programme

---

4. Project Inception Report
5. All Annual Performance Reports (APRs)
6. Progress reports and work plans of the various implementation task teams
7. Audit reports
8. Mission reports
9. All monitoring reports prepared by the project
10. Financial and Administration guidelines used by Project Team

The following documents will also be available:

11. Project operational guidelines, manuals and systems
12. UNDP country/countries programme document(s)
13. Minutes of the Project Board Meetings and other meetings (i.e. Technical Advisory Group meetings)
14. Project site location maps

ToR ANNEX B: Guidelines on Contents for the Midterm Review Report[9]

i. *Basic Report Information (for opening page or title page)*
- Title of UNDP supported GCF financed project
- UNDP PIMS# and GCF project ID#
- Interim Evaluation time frame and date of Interim Evaluation report
- Region and countries included in the project
- Executing Agency/Implementing Partner and other project partners
- Interim Evaluation team members
- Acknowledgements

ii. **Table of Contents**

iii. **Acronyms and Abbreviations**

1. **Executive Summary** *(3-5 pages)*
- Project Information Table
- Project Description (brief)
- Project Progress Summary (between 200-500 words)
- Interim Evaluation Ratings & Achievement Summary Table
- Concise summary of conclusions
- Recommendation Summary Table

2. **Introduction** *(2-3 pages)*
- Purpose of the Interim Evaluation and objectives
- Scope & Methodology: principles of design and execution of the Interim Evaluation, Interim Evaluation approach and data collection methods, limitations to the Interim Evaluation
- Structure of the Interim Evaluation report

---

[9] The Report length should not exceed *40* pages in total (not including annexes).

United Nations Development Programme

3. **Project Description and Background Context** *(3-5 pages)*
   - Development context: environmental, socio-economic, institutional, and policy factors relevant to the project objective and scope
   - Problems that the project sought to address, threats and barriers targeted
   - Project Description and Strategy: objective, outcomes and expected results, description of field sites (if any)
   - Project Implementation Arrangements: short description of the Project Board, key implementing partner arrangements, etc.
   - Project timing and milestones
   - Main stakeholders: summary list

4. **Findings** *(12-14 pages)*
   4.1 Project Strategy
      - Project Design
      - Results Framework/Logframe
   4.2 Relevance
   4.3 Effectiveness and Efficiency
   4.4 Progress Towards Results
      - Progress towards outcomes analysis
      - Remaining barriers to achieving the project objective
   4.5 Project Implementation and Adaptive Management
      - Management Arrangements
      - Work planning
      - Finance and co-finance
      - Project-level monitoring and evaluation systems
      - Stakeholder engagement
      - Reporting
      - Communications
   4.6 Sustainability
      - Financial risks to sustainability
      - Socio-economic to sustainability
      - Institutional framework and governance risks to sustainability
      - Environmental risks to sustainability

   4.7 Country Ownership
   4.8 Innovativeness in results areas
   4.8 Unexpected results, both positive and negative
   4.10 Replication and Scalability
   4.11 Gender Equity

5. **Conclusions and Recommendations** *(4-6 pages)*
   5.1 Conclusions

United Nations Development Programme

- Comprehensive and balanced statements (that are evidence-based and connected to the Interim Evaluation's findings) which highlight the strengths, weaknesses and results of the project
  - **5.2** Recommendations
    - 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

6. **Annexes**
- Interim Evaluation ToR (excluding ToR annexes)
- Interim Evaluation evaluative matrix (evaluation criteria with key questions, indicators, sources of data, and methodology)
- Example Questionnaire or Interview Guide used for data collection
- Ratings Scales
- Interim Evaluation mission itinerary
- List of persons interviewed
- List of documents reviewed
- Co-financing table (if not previously included in the body of the report)
- Signed UNEG Code of Conduct form
- Signed Interim Evaluation final report clearance form
- *Annexed in a separate file:* Audit trail from received comments on draft Interim Evaluation report
-

ToR ANNEX C: Interim Evaluation Review Evaluative Matrix Template

Evaluative Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
Project Strategy: To what extent is the project strategy relevant to country priorities, country ownership, and the best route towards expected results?			
(include evaluative question(s))	(i.e. relationships established, level of coherence between project design and implementation approach, specific activities conducted, quality of risk mitigation strategies, etc.)	(i.e. project documents, national policies or strategies, websites, project staff, project partners, data collected throughout the Interim Evaluation mission, etc.)	(i.e. document analysis, data analysis, interviews with project staff, interviews with stakeholders, etc.)
Progress Towards Results: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved thus far?			

United Nations Development Programme

Project Implementation and Adaptive Management: Has the project been implemented efficiently, cost-effectively, and been able to adapt to any changing conditions thus far? To what extent are project-level monitoring and evaluation systems, reporting, and project communications supporting the project's implementation?				
Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, socio-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?				

ToR ANNEX D: UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluators/Midterm Review Consultants[10]

Evaluators/Consultants:

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 limitations, findings and recommendations.
7. Should reflect sound accounting procedures and be prudent in using the resources of the evaluation.
8. Must ensure that independence of judgement is maintained and that evaluation findings and recommendations are independently presented.

---

[10] www.undp.org/unegcodeofconduct

United Nations Development Programme

9. Must confirm that they have not been involved in designing, executing or advising on the project being evaluated.

Interim Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form

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: _____

ToR ANNEX E: Interim Evaluation Ratings

Ratings for Progress Towards Results: (one rating for each outcome and for the objective)		
6	Highly Satisfactory (HS)	The objective/outcome is expected to achieve or exceed all its end-of-project targets, without major shortcomings. The progress towards the objective/outcome can be presented as "good practice".
5	Satisfactory (S)	The objective/outcome is expected to achieve most of its end-of-project targets, with only minor shortcomings.
4	Moderately Satisfactory (MS)	The objective/outcome is expected to achieve most of its end-of-project targets but with significant shortcomings.
3	Moderately Unsatisfactory (HU)	The objective/outcome is expected to achieve its end-of-project targets with major shortcomings.
2	Unsatisfactory (U)	The objective/outcome is expected not to achieve most of its end-of-project targets.
1	Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)	The objective/outcome has failed to achieve its midterm targets, and is not expected to achieve any of its end-of-project targets.

Ratings for Project Implementation & Adaptive Management: (one overall rating)		
6	Highly Satisfactory (HS)	Implementation of all seven components – management arrangements, work planning, finance and co- finance, project-level monitoring and evaluation systems, stakeholder engagement, reporting, and communications – is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management. The project can be presented as "good practice".
5	Satisfactory (S)	Implementation of most of the seven components is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management except for only few that are subject to remedial action.

United Nations Development Programme

4	Moderately Satisfactory (MS)	Implementation of some of the seven components is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management, with some components requiring remedial action.
3	Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)	Implementation of some of the seven components is not leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive, with most components requiring remedial action.
2	Unsatisfactory (U)	Implementation of most of the seven components is not leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management.
1	Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)	Implementation of none of the seven components is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management.

Ratings for Sustainability: (one overall rating)		
4	Likely (L)	Negligible risks to sustainability, with key outcomes on track to be achieved by the project's closure and expected to continue into the foreseeable future
3	Moderately Likely (ML)	Moderate risks, but expectations that at least some outcomes will be sustained due to the progress towards results on outcomes at the Midterm Review
2	Moderately Unlikely (MU)	Significant risk that key outcomes will not carry on after project closure, although some outputs and activities should carry on
1	Unlikely (U)	Severe risks that project outcomes as well as key outputs will not be sustained

ToR ANNEX F: Interim Evaluation Report Clearance Form
(to be completed by the Commissioning Unit and UNDP-GEF RTA and included in the final document)

Midterm Review Report Reviewed and Cleared By:

Commissioning Unit

Name: _____

Signature: _____   Date: _____

Regional Technical Advisor (Nature, Climate and Energy)

Name: _____

Signature: _____   Date: _____

Principal Technical Advisor (Nature, Climate and Energy)

Name: _____

Signature: _____   Date: _____

United Nations Development Programme

ToR ANNEX G: Audit Trail Template

Note: The following is a template for the Interim Evaluation Team to show how the received comments on the draft Interim Evaluation report have (or have not) been incorporated into the final Interim Evaluation report. This audit trail should be included as an annex in the final Interim Evaluation report.

To the comments received on (*date*) from the Interim Evaluation of (*project name*) (UNDP Project ID-*PIMS #*)

The following comments were provided in track changes to the draft Midterm Review report; they are referenced by institution ("Author" column) and track change comment number ("#" column):

Author	#	Para No./ comment location	Comment/Feedback on the draft Interim Evaluation report	Interim Evaluation team response and actions taken

B. Approval

This TOR is approved by:

Signature

Name and Designation   Verena Linneweber, Deputy Resident Representative, UNDP Samoa

Date of Signing   17 June 2020