



Empowered lives.
Resilient nations.

INDIVIDUAL CONSULTANT PROCUREMENT NOTICE

NATIONAL GEF TERMINAL EVALUATION CONSULTANT – COASTAL PROJECT
PROCUREMENT NOTICE No. UNDP/IC/E&E/001/2017 Date: 4 January 2017

Country: Liberia

Duty Station: Monrovia, Liberia

Description of the assignment: National & International GEF Terminal Evaluation Consultants - Coastal Project

Project name: Energy & Environment Project

Duration: 23 days - 4 weeks

Proposals should be submitted at the following address: by email to bids.lr@undp.org (Please include procurement notice number in the subject area) no later than 12:00 Noon (GMT), Friday, 20 January 2017. Any request for clarification must be sent by standard electronic communication to the address or e-mail indicated above. The Energy & Environment Project will respond by standard electronic mail and will send written copies of the response, including an explanation of the query without identifying the source of inquiry, to all consultants.

1. Background

In accordance with UNDP and GEF M&E policies and procedures, all full and medium-sized UNDP support GEF financed projects are required to undergo a terminal evaluation upon completion of implementation. These terms of reference (TOR) sets out the expectations for a Terminal Evaluation (TE) of the *Projects titles* "Enhancing Resilience of Vulnerable Coastal Areas to Climate Change Risks in Liberia" (PIMS #3975).

The essentials of the project to be evaluated are as follows: *(fully complete the table below)*.

PROJECT SUMMARY TABLE

Project Title:				
GEF Project ID:	00074398		<i>at endorsement</i> <i>(Million US\$)</i>	<i>at completion</i> <i>(Million US\$)</i>
UNDP Project ID:		GEF financing:	USD2,900,000	USD2,900,000
Country:	Liberia	IA/EA own:	USD400,000	
Region:	West Africa	Government:		
Focal Area:	Climate Change	Other:		
FA Objectives, (OP/SP):		Total co-financing:	USD400,000	USD400,000
Executing Agency:	UNDP	Total Project Cost:	USD3,300,000	USD3,300,000
Other Partners involved:	Ministry of Agriculture, UNFAO	ProDoc Signature (date project began):		August 03,2010
		(Operational) Closing Date:	Proposed:	Actual:

2. Objectives & Scope

The project was designed to: The project “Enhancing Resilience of Vulnerable Coastal Areas to Climate Change Risks in Liberia” was developed in 2010,

The Goal of the project is to promote climate-resilient development in the coastal areas of Liberia.

The Objective of the project is to reduce vulnerability and build resilience of local communities and socio-economic sectors to the threats of climate change in Liberia’s coastal areas. This will notably be achieved in three counties: Grand Cape Mount, Montserrado and Grand Bassa.

In order to achieve this Objective, four Outcomes will be delivered:

- **Outcome 1** – National level capacity to plan and respond to climate change in coastal areas is strengthened.
- **Outcome 2** – Capacity in three coastal counties to plan and respond to climate change is strengthened.
- **Outcome 3** – At three sites, sustainable and affordable measures to protect coastal areas against climate change impacts are demonstrated.
- **Outcome 4** – Lessons learnt and best practices from Outcomes 1, 2 and 3 are disseminated to stakeholders and development partners.

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

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

3. EVALUATION APPROACH AND METHOD

An overall approach and method¹ for conducting project terminal evaluations of UNDP supported GEF financed projects has developed over time. The evaluator is expected to frame the evaluation effort using the criteria of **relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and impact**, as defined and explained in the UNDP Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-supported, GEF-financed Projects. A set of questions covering each of these criteria have been drafted and are included with this TOR (*fill in Annex C*) The evaluator is expected to amend, complete and submit this matrix as part of an evaluation inception report, and shall include it as an annex to the final report.

The evaluation must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The evaluator is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with government counterparts, in particular the GEF operational focal point, UNDP Country Office, project team, UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based in the region and key stakeholders. The evaluator is expected to conduct a field mission to Grand Cape Mount and Grand Bassa Counties, including the following project sites:

- Buchanan Pilot site
- Robert Sport

Interviews will be held with the following organizations and individuals at a minimum:

- Ministry of Lands, Mines and Energy
- Ministry of Public Works
- Environmental Protection Agency
- MIA Local offices in Grand Bassa and Grand Cape Mount counties

The evaluator will review all relevant sources of information, such as the project document, project reports – including Annual APR/PIR, project budget revisions, midterm review, progress reports, GEF focal area tracking tools, project files, national strategic and legal documents, and any other materials that the evaluator considers useful for this evidence-based assessment. A list of documents that the project team will provide to the evaluator for review is included in Annex B of this Terms of Reference.

EVALUATION CRITERIA & RATINGS

An assessment of project performance will be carried out, based against expectations set out in the Project Logical Framework/Results Framework (see Annex A), which provides performance and impact indicators for project implementation along with their corresponding means of verification. The evaluation will at a minimum cover the criteria of: **relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact**. Ratings must be provided on the following performance criteria. The completed table must be included in the evaluation executive summary. The obligatory rating scales are included in Annex D.

¹ For additional information on methods, see the Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results, Chapter 7, pg. 163

Evaluation Ratings:			
1. Monitoring and Evaluation	<i>rating</i>	2. IA & EA Execution	<i>rating</i>
M&E design at entry		Quality of UNDP Implementation – Implementing Agency (IA)	
M&E Plan Implementation		Quality of Execution - Executing Agency (EA)	
Overall quality of M&E		Overall quality of Implementation / Execution	
3. Assessment of Outcomes	<i>rating</i>	4. Sustainability	<i>rating</i>
Relevance		Financial resources	
Effectiveness		Socio-political	
Efficiency		Institutional framework and governance	
Overall Project Outcome Rating		Environmental	
		Overall likelihood of sustainability	

PROJECT FINANCE / COFINANCE

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

Co-financing (type/source)	UNDP own financing (mill. US\$)		Government (mill. US\$)		Partner Agency (mill. US\$)		Total (mill. US\$)	
	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual
Grants								
Loans/Concessions								
• In-kind support								
• Other								
Totals								

MAINSTREAMING

UNDP supported GEF financed projects are key components in UNDP country programming, as well as regional and global programmes. The evaluation will assess the extent to which the project was successfully mainstreamed with other UNDP priorities, including poverty alleviation, improved governance, the prevention and recovery from natural disasters, and gender.

IMPACT

The evaluators will assess the extent to which the project is achieving impacts or progressing towards the achievement of impacts. Key findings that should be brought out in the evaluations include whether the project has demonstrated: a) verifiable improvements in ecological status, b) verifiable reductions in stress on ecological systems, and/or c) demonstrated progress towards these impact achievements.²

CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS & LESSONS

The evaluation report must include a chapter providing a set of **conclusions, recommendations** and **lessons**.

IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS

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

4. EVALUATION TIMEFRAME

The total duration of the evaluation will be 23 days over a time period of 4 weeks (*recommended: 10-12*) according to the following plan:

Activity	Timing	Completion Date
Preparation	2 days	<i>date</i>
Evaluation Mission	9 days	<i>date</i>
Draft Evaluation Report	10 days	<i>date</i>
Final Report	2 days	(<i>Note: accommodate approx. 3 week time delay for circulation and review of the draft report</i>) <i>date</i>

5. EVALUATION DELIVERABLES

The evaluation team is expected to deliver the following:

Deliverable	Content	Timing	Responsibilities
Inception Report	Evaluator provides clarifications on timing and method	No later than 2 weeks before the evaluation mission:	Evaluator submits to UNDP CO
Presentation	Initial Findings	End of evaluation mission:	To project management, UNDP

² A useful tool for gauging progress to impact is the Review of Outcomes to Impacts (ROtI) method developed by the GEF Evaluation Office: [ROtI Handbook 2009](#)

			CO
Draft Final Report	Full report, (per annexed template) with annexes	Within 3 weeks of the evaluation mission:	Sent to CO, reviewed by RTA, PCU, GEF OFPs
Final Report*	Revised report	Within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft:	Sent to CO for uploading to UNDP ERC.

*When submitting the final evaluation report, the evaluator is required also to provide an 'audit trail', detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final evaluation report. See [Annex H](#) for an audit trail template.

6. TEAM COMPOSITION

The evaluation team will be composed of 1-international and 1-national. The consultants shall have prior experience in evaluating similar projects. Experience with GEF financed projects is an advantage. The international consultant will be the team leader and will be responsible for finalizing the report. The evaluators selected should not have participated in the project preparation and/or implementation and should not have conflict of interest with project related activities.

7. QUALIFICATIONS

VI. Required Skills and Qualifications	
Education:	Master in natural sciences; social sciences with a specialization in environment, biodiversity, climate change or any other closely related field
Experience:	<p>TEAM LEADER</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At least 10 years' experience with GEF related project evaluation • Experience in UN/international organizations project monitoring and evaluation, preferably UNDP-GEF experience, is an advantage • Demonstrated experience in Mid-term and terminal evaluations <p>TEAM MEMBER</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minimum 10 years of relevant professional experience; • Previous experience with results-based monitoring and evaluation methodologies;

	<p>Competencies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Knowledge of and/or experience with UNDP and/or GEF; • Technical knowledge in the targeted focal area of Climate change and impacts on agriculture sector development. • <i>Additional skills based on project particulars:</i> • Proven ability to work with governments and local communities in an agricultural settings
Language Requirements:	Fluency in written and spoken of English

8. EVALUATOR ETHICS

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

9. PAYMENT MODALITIES AND SPECIFICATIONS

%	Milestone
10%	At submission and approval of inception report
40%	Following submission and approval of the 1ST draft terminal evaluation report
50%	Following submission and approval (UNDP-CO and UNDP RTA) of the final terminal evaluation report

10. APPLICATION PROCESS

Applicants are requested to apply online (indicate the site, such as <http://jobs.undp.org>, etc.) by (date). Individual consultants are invited to submit applications together with their CV for these positions. The application should contain a current and complete C.V. in English (Spanish in LAC, French in Francophone Africa, etc.) with indication of the e-mail and phone contact. Shortlisted candidates will be requested to submit a price offer indicating the total cost of the assignment (including daily fee, per diem and travel costs).

UNDP applies a fair and transparent selection process that will take into account the competencies/skills of the applicants as well as their financial proposals. Qualified women and members of social minorities are encouraged to apply.

ANNEX A: PROJECT LOGICAL FRAMEWORK

This is included in the project document to be reviewed by consultant.

ANNEX B: LIST OF DOCUMENTS TO BE REVIEWED BY THE EVALUATORS

GEF Project Information Form (PIF), Project Document, and Log Frame Analysis (LFA)

Project Implementation Plan

Implementing/Executing partner arrangements

List and contact details for project staff, key project stakeholders, including Project Boards, and other partners to be consulted

Project sites, highlighting suggested visits

Mid Term Review (MTR) Report

Annual Project Implementation (APR/PIR) Reports

Project budget and financial data

Project Tracking Tool, at baseline, at mid-term, and at terminal points

UNDP Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF)

UNDP Country Programme Document (CPD)

UNDP Country Programme Action Plan (CPAP)

GEF focal area strategic program objectives

ANNEX C: EVALUATION QUESTIONS

(Note: This is a generic list, to be further detailed with more specific questions by CO and UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based on the particulars of the project. Refer to Annex 4 of the TE Guidance for a completed, sample evaluation criteria matrix)

This Evaluation Criteria Matrix must be fully completed/amended by the consultant and included in the TE inception report and as an Annex to the TE report.

Evaluative Criteria Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
Relevance: How does the project relate to the main objectives of the GEF focal area, and to the environment and development priorities at the local, regional and national levels?			
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved?			
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards?			
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, social-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?			
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward, reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status?			

•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•

ANNEX D: RATING SCALES

<i>Ratings for Effectiveness, Efficiency, Overall Project Outcome Rating, M&E, IA & EA Execution</i>	<i>Sustainability ratings:</i>	<i>Relevance ratings</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 6. Highly Satisfactory (HS): no shortcomings 5. Satisfactory (S): minor shortcomings 4. Moderately Satisfactory (MS): moderate shortcomings 3. Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): significant shortcomings 2. Unsatisfactory (U): major shortcomings 1. Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): severe shortcomings 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 4. Likely (L): negligible risks to sustainability 3. Moderately Likely (ML): moderate risks 2. Moderately Unlikely (MU): significant risks 1. Unlikely (U): severe risks 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Relevant (R) 1. Not relevant (NR)
<p><i>Additional ratings where relevant:</i> Not Applicable (N/A) Unable to Assess (U/A)</p>		

ANNEX E: EVALUATION CONSULTANT CODE OF CONDUCT AND AGREEMENT FORM

Evaluators:

1. Must present information that is complete and fair in its assessment of strengths and weaknesses so that decisions or actions taken are well founded.
2. Must disclose the full set of evaluation findings along with information on their limitations and have this accessible to all affected by the evaluation with expressed legal rights to receive results.
3. Should protect the anonymity and confidentiality of individual informants. They should provide maximum notice, minimize demands on time, and respect people's right not to engage. Evaluators must respect people's right to provide information in confidence, and must ensure that sensitive information cannot be traced to its source. Evaluators are not expected to evaluate individuals, and must balance an evaluation of management functions with this general principle.
4. Sometimes uncover evidence of wrongdoing while conducting evaluations. Such cases must be reported discreetly to the appropriate investigative body. Evaluators should consult with other relevant oversight entities when there is any doubt about if and how issues should be reported.
5. Should be sensitive to beliefs, manners and customs and act with integrity and honesty in their relations with all stakeholders. In line with the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights, evaluators must be sensitive to and address issues of discrimination and gender equality. They should avoid offending the dignity and self-respect of those persons with whom they come in contact in the course of the evaluation. Knowing that evaluation might negatively affect the interests of some stakeholders, evaluators should conduct the evaluation and communicate its purpose and results in a way that clearly respects the stakeholders' dignity and self-worth.
6. Are responsible for their performance and their product(s). They are responsible for the clear, accurate and fair written and/or oral presentation of study imitations, findings and recommendations.
7. Should reflect sound accounting procedures and be prudent in using the resources of the evaluation.

Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form³

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*

³www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct

Signature: _____

ANNEX F: EVALUATION REPORT OUTLINE⁴

- i.** Opening page:
 - Title of UNDP supported GEF financed project
 - UNDP and GEF project ID#s
 - Evaluation time frame and date of evaluation report
 - Region and countries included in the project
 - GEF Operational Program/Strategic Program
 - Implementing Partner and other project partners
 - Evaluation team members
 - Acknowledgements
- ii.** Executive Summary
 - Project Summary Table
 - Project Description (brief)
 - Evaluation Rating Table
 - Summary of conclusions, recommendations and lessons
- iii.** Acronyms and Abbreviations
(See: UNDP Editorial Manual⁵)
- 1.** Introduction
 - Purpose of the evaluation
 - Scope & Methodology
 - Structure of the evaluation report
- 2.** Project description and development context
 - Project start and duration
 - Problems that the project sought to address
 - Immediate and development objectives of the project
 - Baseline Indicators established
 - Main stakeholders
 - Expected Results
- 3.** Findings
(In addition to a descriptive assessment, all criteria marked with (*) must be rated⁶)
- 3.1** Project Design / Formulation
 - Analysis of LFA/Results Framework (Project logic /strategy; Indicators)
 - Assumptions and Risks
 - Lessons from other relevant projects (e.g., same focal area) incorporated into project design
 - Planned stakeholder participation
 - Replication approach
 - UNDP comparative advantage
 - Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector
 - Management arrangements
- 3.2** Project Implementation
 - Adaptive management (changes to the project design and project outputs during implementation)

⁴The Report length should not exceed 40 pages in total (not including annexes).

⁵ UNDP Style Manual, Office of Communications, Partnerships Bureau, updated November 2008

⁶ See Annex D for rating scales.

- Partnership arrangements (with relevant stakeholders involved in the country/region)
- Feedback from M&E activities used for adaptive management
- Project Finance
- Monitoring and evaluation: design at entry (*), implementation (*), and overall assessment (*)
- Implementing Agency (UNDP) execution (*) and Executing Agency execution (*), overall project implementation/ execution (*), coordination, and operational issues

3.3 Project Results

- Overall results (attainment of objectives) (*)
- Relevance (*)
- Effectiveness (*)
- Efficiency (*)
- Country ownership
- Mainstreaming
- Sustainability: financial resources (*), socio-economic (*), institutional framework and governance (*), environmental (*), and overall likelihood (*)
- Impact

4. Conclusions, Recommendations & Lessons

- Corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project
- Actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the project
- Proposals for future directions underlining main objectives
- Best and worst practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance and success

5. Annexes

- ToR
- Itinerary
- List of persons interviewed
- Summary of field visits
- List of documents reviewed
- Evaluation Question Matrix
- Questionnaire used and summary of results
- Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form
- Report Clearance Form
- *Annexed in a separate file:* TE audit trail
- *Annexed in a separate file:* Terminal GEF Tracking Tool, if applicable

ANNEX G: EVALUATION REPORT CLEARANCE FORM

(to be completed by CO and UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based in the region and included in the final Document)

Evaluation Report Reviewed and Cleared by	
UNDP Country Office	
Name: _____	
Signature: _____	Date: _____
UNDP GEF RTA	
Name: _____	
Signature: _____	Date: _____

ANNEX H: TE REPORT AUDIT TRAIL

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

To the comments received on (*date*) from the Terminal Evaluation of (*project name*) (UNDP *PIMS #*)

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

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

UNDP is committed to achieving workforce diversity in terms of gender, nationality and culture. Individuals from minority groups, indigenous groups and persons with disabilities are equally encouraged to apply. All applications will be treated with the strictest confidence.

11. Documents to be included when submitting the proposals

Interested individual consultants must submit the following documents/information to demonstrate their qualifications:

1. Proposal:
Explaining why they are the most suitable for the work (1 page)
2. Financial proposal
3. Personal CV (P11) including past experience in similar projects and at least 3 references

6. Financial Proposal

The financial proposal shall specify a daily fee. Payments will be made to the Individual Consultant based on specific and measurable deliverables as specified in the TOR upon completion of all deliverables. Financial Proposal should be password protected.

<u>Description</u>	<u>Unit</u>	<u>Quantity</u>	<u>Unit Price</u>	<u>Total price</u>
Consultancy/professional fee:	days	23		

Proposals should be submitted at the following address: by email to bids.lr@undp.org (Please include procurement notice number in the subject area) no later than 12:00 Noon (GMT), **Friday, 20 February 2017**.

7. Evaluation

Individual consultants will be evaluated based on the following methodologies:

Cumulative analysis

Award of the contract will be made to the individual consultant whose offer has been evaluated and determined as:

- a) responsive/compliant/acceptable, and*
- b) Having received the highest score out of a pre-determined set of weighted technical and financial*

** Technical Criteria; [70 percent]*

** Financial Criteria; [30 percent]*

Only candidates obtaining a minimum of 70% of the maximum points would be considered for the financial evaluation

Criteria	Weight	Max. Point
<u>Technical</u>		
<i>Criteria A:</i> Technical skills, given by qualifications and training record;	<i>14</i>	<i>20</i>
<i>Criteria B:</i> Overall experience in the provision with the services given above;	<i>35</i>	<i>50</i>
<i>Criteria C:</i> Adequacy of competencies & skills responding to the Terms of Reference , (TOR) ;	<i>21</i>	<i>30</i>
<u>Financial</u>	<i>30 points x price of the lowest price proposed / price of proposal</i>	<i>30 points</i>

ANNEXES

ANNEX 1- TERMS OF REFERENCES (TOR)

ANNEX 2- INDIVIDUAL CONSULTANT GENERAL TERMS AND CONDITIONS

ANNEX 3 – P11 FORM