



TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR THE FINAL EVALUATION

“Building adaptive capacity and resilience to climate change in the water sector in Cape Verde”

INTERNATIONAL CONSULTANT

1. INTRODUCTION

In accordance with the UNDP and GEF M&E policies and procedures, a final evaluation of the full-size project “Building adaptive capacity and resilience to climate change in the water sector in Cape Verde” is required. This project, implemented through the National Institute for Water Resource Management (INGRH) is to be completed by 31st March 2014. Final Evaluation report is to be completed by May 2014. The project started on the, 2009 and is in its final year of implementation. This Terms of Reference (TOR) sets out the expectations for this terminal evaluation.

The essentials of the project to be reviewed are as follows:

Project title:	Building adaptive capacity and resilience to climate change in the water sector in Cape Verde		
UNDP Project ID:	PIMS 4091	Project financing	<i>at endorsement (Million US\$)</i>
ATLAS Project ID:	00072399	GEF financing:	\$3,000,000 USD
Country:	Cape Verde	IA/EA own:	\$200,000 USD
Region:	West Africa	Government:	\$ 9,211,299 USD
Focal Area:	Climate Change Adaptation	Other:	\$ 54,487,736 USD
GEF Focal Area Strategic Program		Total co-financing:	\$ 63,699,035 USD
Executing Agency:	National Institute for Water Resource Management (INGRH)	Total Project Cost in cash:	\$3,200,000 US
Other Partners involved:	ProDoc Signature (date project began):		15 October 2009
	Initial Planned closing date: June, 2013		Revised closing date: June 2014

2. Project background

The impacts of climate change on Cape Verde water resources, particularly on water availability, are predicted to adversely affect human health, agricultural production and food security in both rural and urban areas. Predicted climate change scenarios are likely to constrain long-term development through: (i) increased frequency and severity of drought; (ii) increased rainfall variability, including more frequent events of short and intense rains, causing flash-floods in several catchment areas; and (iii) progressive sea level rise and salt water intrusion in freshwater reservoirs closer to coastal areas. Consequently, a major challenge for Cape Verde is to mainstream climate change adaptation measures into integrated water resource management across different institutional, social and spatial frameworks. Technical capacity of both government and local communities to manage the emerging threats imposed by climate change is required. The likely impacts of climate change are still poorly understood and the need for adaptation not sufficiently incorporated into relevant frameworks

The objective of the project is to build adaptive capacity and increase the water sector's resilience to climate change. Financial resources from the Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF) had been used to address systemic, institutional and individual capacity gaps to manage water resources for human, agricultural and other uses in the face of a changing climate.

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

2. Project objectives and expected outputs

The project's goal is to ensure that water availability, supply and quality are maintained in the face of changed climatic conditions.

The project objective is to increase resilience and enhance key adaptive capacity to address the additional risks posed by climate change to the water sector in Cape Verde. In order to achieve the above objective, and based on a barrier analysis, the project's intervention has been organised in three components under which three 'outcomes' are expected from the project:

- *Outcome 1:* Climate change risks and adaptation measures integrated into key national policies, plans and programs for water resource management.
- *Outcome 2:* Small and medium scale climate change adaptation practices for water resource management are demonstrated and implemented in selected hydrographical basins.
- *Outcome 3:* Lessons learned and best practices from pilot activities, capacity development initiatives and policy changes are disseminated.

Outcome 1 will deal with the 'governance framework' for climate change adaptation. The fact that climate risk, vulnerability and adaptation measures are only superficially integrated (or mainstreamed) in policies, plans and programs is a symptom of incipient and limited capacity of key stakeholders at the



national level to plan in response to climate change. Outcome 2 will, in turn, show how pilot demonstration investment at the site level can make a difference in terms of improving resilience locally. Overall, the lessons learnt and experiences acquired under Outcomes 1 and 2 will be disseminated across Cape Verde and to other countries through actions foreseen under Outcome 3

3. Final Evaluation objectives

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

For GEF Secretariat, TE promotes accountability for achievement of GEF objectives through the assessment of results, effectiveness, processes, and performance of the partners involved in GEF activities.

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.

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

Consequently, the evaluation mission is also expected to make detailed recommendations on the work plan for the follow-up project (already approved to be financed by the Climate Fast Start CIDA Facility and on the inception phase).

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

The evaluation mission will also identify lessons learnt and best practices from the project which could be applied to future and other on-going projects. The international consultant for this review is expected to identify lessons learnt and best practices from other climate change adaptation project that could guide technical recommendations and improvements, specially targeting follow-up project endorsed by CIDA and the SGP interventions on the community base adaptation focal area.



4. Scope of the Terminal Evaluation

The scope of the Terminal Evaluation will cover all activities undertaken in the framework of the project. The evaluators will compare planned outputs of the project to actual outputs and assess the actual results to determine their contribution to the attainment of the project objectives.

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

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

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

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

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

The recommendations should be feasible and directed to the intended users of the evaluation about what actions to take and decisions to make. The recommendations should be specifically supported by

the evidence and linked to the findings and conclusions around key questions addressed by the evaluation.

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

The review team will assess the following three categories of project progress. For each category, the review team is required to rate overall progress using a six-point rating scale outlined in section 6 (Evaluation criteria & rating).

4.1. Project formulation:

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

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

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

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

4.2. Project Implementation

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

a. *M&E mechanisms*

- The logical framework used during implementation as a management and M&E tool;

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

b. Finance

- i. *Effectiveness of the financial planning*
- ii. *Cost-Effective factors*

c. Co-finance

The evaluation will assess the key financial aspects of the project, including the extent of co-financing

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

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

d. GEF implementing agency execution- UNDP

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

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



e. Implementing partner execution

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

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

f. Project M&E mechanisms

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

- An analysis of the M&E plan at project start up, considering whether baseline conditions, methodology and roles and responsibilities are well articulated. Is the M&E plan well conceived? Is it articulated sufficient to monitor results and track progress toward achieving objectives
- The quality of M&E plan implementation: Was the M&E plan sufficiently budgeted and funded during project preparation and implementation?
- The effectiveness of monitoring indicators from the project document for measuring progress and performance;
- Compliance with the progress and financial reporting requirements/ schedule, including quality and timeliness of reports;
- The value and effectiveness of the monitoring reports and evidence that these were discussed with stakeholders and project staff;
- The extent to which follow-up actions, and/ or adaptive management, were taken in response to monitoring reports (APR/PIRs);
- Check to see whether APR/PIR self-evaluation ratings were consistent with the MTR and TE findings. If not, were these discrepancies identified by the project steering committee and addressed?
- Terminal Evaluations for full size projects should also consider whether changes were made to project implementation as a result of the MTR recommendations.

g. Stakeholder interaction

h. Adaptive Management

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

- Why these changes were made and what was the approval process did the project undergo significant changes as a result of recommendations from the mid-term review?

- If the changes were extensive, did they materially change the expected project outcomes?
- Were the project changes articulated in writing and then considered and approved by the project steering committee?

4.3. Project Results

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

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

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

i. Country ownership,

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

Some relevant questions to assess ownership might be:

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

ii. Mainstreaming,

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

The section on mainstreaming should assess:

1. Whether it is possible to identify and define positive or negative effects of the project on local populations and policy frameworks;
2. If the project objectives conform to agreed priorities in the UNDP country programme document (CCPD) and UNDAF;

3. Whether there is evidence that the project outcomes have contributed to enhance resilience and better preparation to cope with natural disasters;
4. Whether gender issues had been taken into account in project design and implementation and in what way has the project.

iii. Sustainability

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

- *Financial risks:* Are there financial risks that may jeopardize the sustainability of project outcomes? What is the likelihood of financial and economic resources not being available once GEF grant assistance ends?
- *Socio-economic risks:* Are there social or political risks that may threaten the sustainability of project outcomes? What is the risk for instance that the level of stakeholder ownership (including ownership by governments and other key stakeholders) will be insufficient to allow for the project outcomes/benefits to be sustained? Do the various key stakeholders see that it is in their interest that project benefits continue to flow? Is there sufficient public/stakeholder awareness in support of the project's long-term objectives?
- *Institutional framework and governance risks:* Do the legal frameworks, policies, and governance structures and processes within which the project operates pose risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project benefits? Are requisite systems for accountability and transparency, and required technical know-how, in place?
- *Environmental risks:* Are there ongoing activities that may pose an environmental threat to the sustainability of project outcomes?



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

iv. Catalytic Role

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

v. Impact

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

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

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

5. Evaluation Approach and method

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

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

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

The mission will start with a desk review of project documentation and also take the following process:

- a. Desk review of project document, outputs, monitoring reports, such as Project Inception Report, Minutes of Project Board meetings and Technical Support and Advisory Team meetings, Project Implementation Review (PIR), Quarterly Progress Reports, Mid-Term Review Report, M&E framework, mission reports and other internal documents including financial reports and relevant correspondence;
- b. Review of specific products including datasets, management and action plans, publications, audiovisual materials, technical packages, consultancies reports and other materials and reports;
- c. Interviews with the Project Managers, technical specialist and other project staff
- d. Interview with Program Officers in charge of project oversight at UNDP CO;
- e. Interview with RTA (Regional Technical Advisor) responsible for this thematic and geographic area;
- f. Interview with GEF Operational Focal Point;
- g. Finance and Operation Manager at UNDP CO authorizing direct payments;
- h. Interview with project executing agency: INGRH president, finance Officer and Program Officer at executing partner;
- i. Field visits to conduct consultations and/or interviews with relevant stakeholders involved, including government's representatives, local communities, NGO's, private sector, donors, other UN agencies and organizations.
- j. Field visit to interview project beneficiaries (community associations, local officials, farmers, water boards, etc.)

6. Evaluation criteria & rating

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

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

The following rating system is to be applied:

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

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

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



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

7. Evaluation team

Two consultants with the following qualifications shall be engaged to undertake the evaluation working concurrently according to the planned schedule. The international consultant, who will have in depth understanding of UNDP and GEF projects including evaluation experience, will be designated as the team leader and will have the overall responsibility of organizing and completing the review, and submitting the final report. The national consultant will provide supportive roles both in terms of professional back up, and conduct of local meetings. National Consultant recruitment process will be conducted separately by UNDP Country Office.

The collection of documents is to be done by National Consultant prior to commencing the work. The International Consultant has the overall responsibility for completing the desk review prior to the country mission to Cape Verde, and for submitting the final report following the country mission. The consultants will sign an agreement with UNDP Cape Verde and will be bound by its terms and conditions set in the agreement.

Qualifications of Team Leader (International consultant)

1. International consultant with advanced academic degree (MSc or PhD) and professional background in fields related to Climate Change Adaptation, Agriculture and Integrated Water Resource Management. A minimum of 5 years of relevant experience is required;
2. Substantive experience in reviewing and evaluating similar projects, preferably those involving UNDP/GEF or other United Nations development agencies or major donors;



3. Excellent English writing and communication skills. Portuguese, French or Spanish reading and communication skills. The consultant must bring his/her own computing equipment;
4. Demonstrate ability to assess complex situations, succinctly distils critical issues, and draw forward-looking conclusions and recommendations;
5. Highly knowledgeable of participatory monitoring and evaluation processes, and experience in evaluation of technical assistance projects with major donor agencies;
6. Ability and experience to lead multi disciplinary and national teams, and deliver quality reports within the given time;
7. Familiarity with the challenges developing countries face in adapting to climate change;
8. Familiarity with Cape Verde or similar SIDS (Small Islands Developing States) countries;
9. Excellent in human relations, coordination, planning and team work, and
10. Excellent feedback-giving skills and culture sensitiveness

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


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

8. EVALUATOR ETHICS

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

9. Proposed schedule

The review will start in March 2014 and it requires a **minimum of 10 working days country mission in Cape Verde** (Santiago and S. Antão island) as well as a desk review (prior to the country mission) and drafting and finalization of the report (following the country mission). The consultant will be paid on lump sum basis including international and local travel, fees and living allowance. The draft Final Report should be submitted to UNDP and UNDP/GEF-LDCF for circulation to relevant agencies/national



counterpart within three weeks after the completion of the review mission to Cape Verde. The consultants will finalize the report within two week upon receiving comments and feedback from stakeholders compiled by UNDP and UNDP/GEF-LDCF.

10. Deliverables

The review team will produce the following deliverables to UNDP, INGRH, GEF Operational and Political Focal Points, UNDP/GEF-LDCF and the Project Board (Steering and Technical Committee):

Deliverable	Content	Timing	Responsibilities	Payment Schedule
Contract signing				10%
Inception Report (including an evaluation matrix)*	Review team clarifies timing and method of review	No later than 1 weeks before the review mission	Review team submits to UNDP Country Office	15% Upon satisfactory approval
Presentation of initial findings	Initial Findings: discussed in a wrap-up discussion with project team and CO; and presented on a stakeholder workshop.	End of review mission	To project management and UNDP Country Office; and key stakeholders	
Draft Final Report + Executive summary	Full report covering all items detailed on section 4 "Scope of the MTR" with detailed attention to lessons learnt and recommendations and with annexes minimally including (List of Persons interviewed, summary of field visits, list of documents reviewed, questionnaire and summary of results, co-financing matrix and leveraged resources, etc.)	Within 3 weeks of the review mission	Sent to UNDP CO, reviewed by RTA, PCU, INGRH, GEF Operational and Political Focal Point	40% Upon satisfactory approval
Final Report & Evaluation Matrix	Revised report with audit trail detailing how all received comment have (and have not) been addressed in the final review report).	Within 2 week of receiving UNDP, executing agency (INGRH) and GEF OFP comments on draft	Sent to UNDP CO	35% Upon satisfactory approval

*According to GEF/UNDP TE Policies and guidelines, an inception report should detail the evaluators understanding of the project being evaluated and why, showing how each evaluation question will be answered by way of: proposed methods, proposed sources of data and data collection procedures. The inception report should include a proposed schedule of tasks, activities and deliverables, designating a team member with the lead responsibility for each task or product. The Inception Report will be shared with the GEF operational focal point (OFP) and other key stakeholders, to ensure a common understanding of the mission plan, methodology and timing.

The final report together with the annexes shall be written in English and Portuguese and shall be presented in electronic form in MS Word format to facilitate comments and PDF format.



11. IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS

The principal responsibility for managing this review resides with the UNDP Country Office (UNDP CO) in Praia, Cape Verde. The UNDP CO will contract the consultants and ensure the timely provision of schedule payments. The Head of Environment, Energy and Disaster Prevention at the Joint Office of UNDP/UNFPA/UNICEF (Antonio Querido) will be the supervisor of this consultancy.

The NAPA Follow up project team will be responsible for liaising with the review team to set up stakeholder interviews, arrange field visits with missions. The project coordination unit (PCU) will assist the evaluation team with local travel arrangements and scheduling. The PCU is responsible as well for providing logistics for debriefing session.

12. APPLICATION PROCESS

All applications including P11 form, CV, and technical and financial proposals should be submitted to the email address, procurement.cv@cv.jo.un.org indicating the following reference “International Consultant for **Terminal Evaluation - Building adaptive capacity and resilience to climate change in the water sector in Cape Verde**” by 12th March 2014 COB. Incomplete applications will be excluded from further consideration.


Recommended Presentation of Proposal:

- Cover letter and Professional Resume CV and P11;
- Technical proposal, including the proposed evaluation methodology and work plan;
- Financial proposal, including proposed fee for a maximum of 30 working days and all other travel related costs (such as flights tickets¹, living allowance, etc).
- Sample of executive summary of a terminal evaluation or any other type of evaluation report led by the applicant

Criteria for Evaluation of Proposal: The selection will be made based on the educational background (10%), experience on similar assignments (25%) and the quality of the technical proposal (35%). The financial proposal will weigh as 30% of the total scoring

Terms of reference approved by:

António Querido



(Head of Environment, Energy and Disaster Prevention at the Joint Office of UNDP/UNFPA/UNICEF)

Praia, 25th February 2014

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

