

## **TERMS OF REFERENCE**

### ***End of Project Review (EPR) of the Women in Leadership in Samoa (WILS) Project*** **Ref: IC2022/WSM/010**

#### **A. Introduction:**

The project started in April 2018 and is in its final year of implementation. In line with the UNDP-Guidance on End of Project Reviews (EPR), this EPR process is initiated before the project closure. This ToR sets out the expectations for this EPR. The EPR process must follow the guidance outlined in the document Guidance For Conducting End of Project Reviews of UNDP-Supported, Financed Projects.

#### **B. Project Description or Context and Background:**

The UNDP and UN Women, grounded in the vision of equality enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations, works for the elimination of discrimination against women and girls; the empowerment of women; and the achievement of equality between women and men as partners and beneficiaries of development, human rights, humanitarian action and peace and security.

Through the Governance and Poverty Reduction Unit (GPRU) of the UNDP and the Women's Political Empowerment and Leadership Programme (WPEL) of the UNWomen, the WILS joint programme works with regional partners to address country-specific barriers to women's full political participation. It works with government, non-governmental organizations, state-owned corporations, civil society organizations and communities to help create an institutional and social environment that welcomes and supports women's participation in leadership and decision making, political participation, increasing the number of women candidates and enhancing their support networks.

The WILS Project seeks to build and reinforce progress already made on gender equality and women's leadership in Samoa. It is Phase II of the Increasing Political Participation of Women in Samoa (IPPWS) Project and builds on the work completed since the project began in 2015.

WILS targets the 'leadership' development of women as individuals and as a group, to work together to address women's leadership and gender equality issues, and to enhance their exercise of leadership. The Women in Leadership in Samoa (WILS) Project is a three-year joint programme implemented by the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), UN Women with funding from the Australian Government in partnership with the Government of Samoa under the overall leadership of the WILS Steering Committee. The Steering Committee comprises of representatives from the Government of Samoa (Ministry of Women, Community & Social Development, Ministry of Finance and Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade), community (SUNGO), DFAT and participating UN agencies (UNDP and UN Women).

Recent achievements for gender equality progress in Samoa included the 2013 Constitutional 10 per cent quota for women parliamentary seats, establishment of the Family Court Act (2014), Family Safety Act (2013) and the National Policy for Gender Equality (2016-2020), the 2017 Ombudsman Inquiry into Domestic Violence, the Samoa Law Reform Commission's 2016 Report into CEDAW Compliance, as well as the 2017 Samoa Family Safety Study.

However, despite significant advances made in promoting and addressing gender equality in Samoa, there remain enduring systemic, institutional, cultural, attitudinal and financial barriers that continue to prevent women from engaging effectively in decision making roles at the community, village and national parliament levels, and including boards of public enterprises (see Table1 of the project document). Women's leadership contribution at all levels of society needs encouragement, support and acknowledgement. Working with men and youth across different levels to address these barriers is also needed to address gender equality issues.

Within its limited scope, resourcing and timeframe, this project will not address all those barriers, most of which are deeply rooted in societal belief systems and practices. Social change takes time and requires sustained leadership, partners' cooperative commitment and stakeholders' support. A key lesson from the IPPWS is that the work to increase the number of women representation needs sustained and long-term investment and support. Within a targeted focus on 'Women in Leadership, this Project is one stepping stone to building and encouraging such a long term process of looking at addressing some of the key women representation issues in Samoa. Effective implementation of initiatives under this Project relies on genuine collaboration amongst key partners and stakeholders. It seeks to give more emphasis and recognition to women's leadership in all forms, not just formal political leadership, but also women's leadership (current, potential and emerging) in families, villages, communities, businesses, and the government, as well as the private sector.

The Project Theory of Change and a set of indicative activities and partnerships were validated by partners and stakeholders in August 2017. The Project has four major outputs and a long-term outcome: strengthened women's leadership and gender equality in Samoa.

Three concepts: women in leadership, theory of change, and Samoanisation guide the conceptual underpinning of this Project. These are defined below.

The Project targets the 'leadership' development of women as individuals and most importantly as a group - to try and work together to address women's leadership and gender equality issues and to enhance their exercise of leadership for the common good of their villages, constituencies and the country. This Project adopts the following definition in its 'Women in Leadership' focus:

A political process of women mobilising people and resources in pursuit of shared and negotiated goals within government, private sector, and civil society (Kenway, Bradley & Lokot, 2013, p. iii)

Samoa's system of governance is a blend of neo-traditional and contemporary systems of governance. The Project has adopted a Samoanisation concept where learning from international best practices is valued, but local involvement and partnerships facilitate a participative process for the Project to have value-added. Samoanisation is about localization – making interventions relevant to local context and seeking locally driven strategies. Specialist and technical expertise are provided when needed, complemented with the involvement of partners and local counterparts to provide local insights and contextual knowledge. This Samoanisation hopes to contribute to the sustainability and continuity of initiatives and activities beyond the Project's timeframe.

The project is implemented over the course of 3.5 years and started in 2018 and ends in June 2022. WILS is a joint programme between UNDP and UN Women, with funding from the Australian Government in partnership with the Government of Samoa.

Project monitoring and evaluation is conducted in accordance with established UNDP and UNWomen procedures and is provided by the project team and the UNDP Multi-Country Office (UNDP-MCO) in Apia with support from the UNDP Regional Bureau for Asia-Pacific (RBAP) region in Bangkok.

The total funds for this project is AUD3 million.

### **C. Objectives of the EPR:**

The objective of this consultancy is to undertake the end of project review of the WILS Phase 1 joint programme.

The EPR will assess progress towards the achievement of the project objectives and outcomes as specified in the Project Document and assess signs of project success or failure with the goal of making key recommendations to be made for a Next Phase of the WILS Project so that results are produced in Phase 1 of the WILS project are sustained. The EPR will also review the project's strategy, its risks to sustainability.

### **D. Approach and Methodology**

The EPR must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The EPR consultant will review all relevant sources of information including documents prepared during the preparation phase (i.e. the Project Document, Mid Term Review Report & Recommendations, project reports including Annual Project Review/PIRs, 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).

The EPR consultant is expected to follow a collaborative and participatory approach<sup>1</sup> ensuring close engagement with the Project Team, government counterparts, the UNDP Country Office(s), UNDP Technical Adviser, UN Women and other key stakeholders.

The engagement of stakeholders is vital to a successful EPR. Stakeholder involvement should include interviews with stakeholders who have project responsibilities, including but not limited to the WILS stakeholders and agencies including Government, NGOs, Private Sector and Community Representatives, Project Management Unit, executing agencies, senior officials and task team/ component leaders, key experts and consultants in the subject area, Project Board, project stakeholders, academia, local government and CSOs, etc. Additionally, the EPR consultant is expected to conduct field missions in Samoa including the selection of the project sites on Samoa.

The final EPR report should describe the full EPR 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. A list of documents that the project team will provide to the evaluator for review is included in Annex A of this Terms of Reference.

<sup>1</sup> For ideas on innovative and participatory Monitoring and Evaluation strategies and techniques, see [UNDP Discussion Paper: Innovations in Monitoring & Evaluating Results](#), 05 Nov 2013.

### **E. Detail Scope of the EPR:**

The EPR consultant will assess the following four categories of project progress. See the *Guidance For Conducting End of Project Reviews of UNDP-Supported*, for extended descriptions.

#### **I. 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. 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 especially women and girls, 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 *Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, Financed Projects* for further guidelines.
- If there are major areas of concern, recommend practical areas for improvement for the remaining lifespan of the project.

##### Performance Monitoring Framework:

- Undertake a critical analysis of the project's Performance Monitoring framework 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. Progress Towards Results**

##### Progress Towards Outcomes Analysis:

- Review the Performance Monitoring Framework (revised by the WILS MTR and approved by the WILS Steering Committee) indicators against progress made towards the end-of-project targets using the Progress Towards Results Matrix and following the *Guidance For Conducting End of Project Reviews of*

*UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects*; 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).

- Propose a new Performance Monitoring Framework for Project Phase 2.

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

Project Strategy	Indicator <sup>2</sup>	Baseline Level <sup>3</sup>	Level in 1 <sup>st</sup> PIR (self-reported)	Midterm Target <sup>4</sup>	End-of-project Target	Midterm Level & Assessment <sup>5</sup>	Achievement Rating <sup>6</sup>	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.

### **III. Project Implementation and Adaptive Management**

#### Management Arrangements:

- Review the 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 Partner Agency (UNDP) and recommend areas for improvement.
- Review the PMU implementation and reporting in 2021 to assess if the recommendations from the WILS MTR were implemented, if not, why?

<sup>2</sup> Populate with data from the Logframe and scorecards

<sup>3</sup> Populate with data from the Project Document

<sup>4</sup> If available

<sup>5</sup> Colour code this column only

<sup>6</sup> Use the 6 point Progress Towards Results Rating Scale: HS, S, MS, MU, U, HU

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 the 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?

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?

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 the achievement of project objectives?
- Are there risks (social, political, economic, etc) or structural barriers that have jeopardized the full participation of women and girls in the project? How has the project addressed these? Suggest ways to minimize/remove these risks and barriers.

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 UNDP-UNW funded reporting requirements (i.e. how have they addressed poorly-rated PIRs, 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.

**iv. Sustainability**

- Validate whether the risks identified in the Project Document, Annual Project Review/PIRs 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.
- Propose recommendations for the sustainability of the WILS Phase 1 project results.
- 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 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 the 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 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 the 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 the sustenance of project outcomes?



## Conclusions & Recommendations

The EPR consultant will include a section of the report setting out the EPR's evidence-based conclusions, in light of the findings.<sup>7</sup>

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 End of Project Reviews of UNDP-Supported, Financed Projects* for guidance on a recommendation table.

The EPR consultant should make no more than 15 recommendations total.

## Ratings

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

**Table. EPR Ratings & Achievement Summary Table for WILS Project**

Measure	MTR Rating	Achievement Description
<b>Project Strategy</b>	N/A	
<b>Progress Towards Results</b>	Objective Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale)	
	Outcome 1 Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale)	
	Outcome 2 Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale)	
	Outcome 3 Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale)	
	Etc.	
<b>Project Implementation &amp; Adaptive Management</b>	(rate 6 pt. scale)	
<b>Sustainability</b>	(rate 4 pt. scale)	

<sup>7</sup> Alternatively, MTR conclusions may be integrated into the body of the report.



**F. Duration of assignment:**

The total duration of the EPR will be approximately 30 working days over a time period of approximately two months from date of hire of the consultant and shall not exceed six months. The tentative EPR timeframe is as follows:

TENTATIVE TIMEFRAME	ACTIVITY
2 May 2022	Prep the EPR Consultant (handover of Project Documents)
3 – 9 May 2022	Document review and preparing EPR Inception Report
17 – 18 May 2022	Finalization and Validation of EPR Inception Report- latest start of EPR mission
21 – 31 May 2022	EPR mission: stakeholder meetings, interviews, field visits
9 June 2022	Presentation of initial findings to UNDP & UN Women management & Steering Committee
13 - 17 June 2022	Preparing draft report
24 – 25 June 2022	Incorporating audit trail from feedback on draft report/Finalization of EPR report
27 - 28 June 2022	Preparation & Issue of Management Response
29 - 30 June 2022	Expected date of full EPR completion

**G. Expected Deliverables:**

#	Deliverable	Description	Timing	Responsibilities
1	<b>EPR Inception Report</b>	EPR consultant clarifies objectives and methods of End of Project Review	No later than 2 weeks before the EPR mission:	EPR consultant submits to the Commissioning Unit and project management
2	<b>Presentation</b>	Initial Findings	End of EPR mission:	EPR consultant presents to project management and the Commissioning Unit

<b>3</b>	<b>Draft Final Report</b>	Full report (using guidelines on the content outlined in Annex B) with annexes	Within 3 weeks of the EPR mission:	Sent to the Commissioning Unit, reviewed by RTA, Project Coordinating Unit,
<b>4</b>	<b>Final Report*</b>	Revised report with audit trail detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final EPR report	Within 2 weeks of receiving UNDP comments on draft:	Sent to the Commissioning Unit

\*The final EPR 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.

#### **H. EPR arrangement:**

The principal responsibility for managing this EPR resides with the Commissioning Unit. The Commissioning Unit for this project's EPR is the UNDP Samoa Multi-country office for the Cook Islands, Niue, Samoa and Tokelau based in Samoa.

The commissioning unit will contract the consultant and ensure the timely provision of per diems and travel arrangements within the country for the EPR consultant. There will also be expected travel up to a maximum of 8 days only to Savaii.

The Project Team will be responsible for liaising with the EPR consultant to provide all relevant documents, set up stakeholder interviews, and arrange field visits.

#### **I. Team Composition:**

An independent national consultant usually from the country of the project will conduct the EPR. 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 the project's related activities.

The selection of the consultant will be aimed at qualities in the following areas:

- At least a Post-graduate degree in political science, development studies, law, legislative studies, public administration or related field; 20%
- Minimum of 5 years experience in project evaluations, results-based monitoring, and/or evaluation methodologies; 25%
- Sound understanding of the UNDP Project Cycle Management, with demonstrated experience in designing and facilitating processes to enhance project implementation and its adaptive management through the application of M&E tools, including results-based management logical frameworks; 20%

- Experience working in engaging with parliamentary development, gender equality, community development and women in leadership and in the Pacific region; 25%
- Fluency in English (oral and written) is a requirement, with excellent written and presentation skills; 10%

**J. Term of Payments and Specifications:**

30% of payment upon approval of the final EPR Inception Report  
 30% upon submission of the draft EPR report  
 40% upon finalization of the EPR report

**K. RECOMMENDED PRESENTATION OF PROPOSAL**

**Kindly note to upload only ONE document to the Jobs site link (refer to the Reference number of this consultancy to find the correct link).**

Incomplete applications will not be considered and only candidates for whom there is further interest will be contacted. Proposals must include:

- **CV** or P11 form addressing the evaluation criteria and why you consider yourself the most suitable for this assignment. The selected candidate must submit a signed P11 prior to contract award.
- **3 professional references most recent** (must be dated within six (6) months)
- **A brief methodology** on how you will approach and conduct the work,
- **Financial Proposal** specifying the daily rate and other expenses, if any. The total amount quoted shall be all-inclusive and include all costs components required to perform the deliverables identified in the TOR, including professional fee, travel, communication, and any other applicable cost to be incurred by the IC in completing the assignment. The contract price will be fixed output-based price regardless of extension of the herein specified duration. Payment terms around specific and measurable (qualitative and quantitative) deliverables (i.e. whether payments fall in instalments or upon completion of the entire contract).
- **Letter of interest and availability specifying the available date to start and other details**

Queries about the consultancy can be directed to the UNDP Procurement Unit [procurement.ws@undp.org](mailto:procurement.ws@undp.org).

This TOR is approved by: Assistant Resident Representative for Governance and Poverty Reduction Unit (GPRU)

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

Name and Designation: Christina Mualia-Lima, ARR GPRU

Date of Signing: \_\_\_\_\_