

## REQUEST FOR TENDERS

RFT: 2025/026  
File: AP\_2/44  
Date: 24 April 2025  
To: Interested Service Providers  
From: Loraini Sivo, Project Manager PEBACC+

**Subject:** Request for Tender - Mid Term Review of the Pacific Ecosystem Based Adaptation to Climate Change Project (PEBACC+)

### 1. Background

- 1.1. The Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environment Programme (SPREP) is an intergovernmental organisation charged with promoting cooperation among Pacific islands countries and territories to protect and improve their environment and ensure sustainable development.
- 1.2. SPREP approaches the environmental challenges faced by the Pacific guided by four simple Values. These values guide all aspects of our work:
  - We value the Environment
  - We value our People
  - We value high quality and targeted Service Delivery
  - We value Integrity
- 1.3. For more information, see: [www.sprep.org](http://www.sprep.org).

### 2. Specifications: statement of requirement

- 2.1. SPREP wishes to call for tenders from qualified experienced personnel to conduct the Midterm Review (MTR) of the project titled Pacific Ecosystem Based Adaptation to Climate Change (PEBACC+) implemented through the Secretariat of the Pacific Ecosystem Based Adaptation Project.

The MTR will assess progress towards the achievement of the project objectives and outcomes as specified in the Project Document and assess early signs of project success or failure with the goal of identifying the necessary changes to be made in order to set the project on-track to achieve its intended results. The MTR will also review the project's strategy and its risks to sustainability ensuring that the project not only achieves short-term results but also contributes to lasting benefits for the target community. By analysing performance indicators and milestones, the review will provide an evidence-based understanding of implementation success and areas needing improvement.

- 2.2. The Terms of Reference of the consultancy are set out in Annex A.
- 2.3. The successful consultant must supply the services to the extent applicable, in compliance with SPREP's Values and Code of Conduct: <https://library.sprep.org/sites/default/files/sprep-organisational-values-code-of-conduct.pdf>. Including SPREP's policy on Child Protection, Environmental Social Safeguards, Fraud Prevention & Whistleblower Protection and Gender and Social Inclusion.

2.4. SPREP Standard Contract Terms and Conditions are non-negotiable.

### 3. Conditions: information for applicants

- 3.1. To be considered for this tender, interested consultants must meet the following conditions:
- i. Submit a detailed Curriculum vitae detailing qualification and previous relevant experience as per the scope of work;
  - ii. Provide three referees relevant to this tender submission, including the most recent work completed;
  - iii. Complete the **tender application form** provided (Please note you are required to complete in full all areas requested in the Form, particularly the Statements to demonstrate you meet the selection criteria – DO NOT refer us to your CV. Failure to do this will mean your application will not be considered).  
Provide examples of past related work outputs  
For the Technical and Financial proposals, you may attach these separately.
  - v. Must meet local registration requirements where consultant is based
- 3.2 Tenderers must declare any areas that may constitute conflict of interest related to this tender and sign the **conflict-of-interest form** provided.
- 3.3 **Tenderer is deemed ineligible due to association with exclusion criteria, including bankruptcy**, insolvency or winding up procedures, breach of obligations relating to the payment of taxes or social security contributions, fraudulent or negligent practice, violation of intellectual property rights, under a judgment by the court, grave professional misconduct including misrepresentation, corruption, participation in a criminal organisation, money laundering or terrorist financing, child labour and other trafficking in human beings, deficiency in capability in complying main obligations, creating a shell company, and being a shell company.
- 3.4 Tenderer must sign a declaration of **honour form** together with their application, certifying that they do not fall into any of the exclusion situations cited in 3.3 above and where applicable, that they have taken adequate measures to remedy the situation.

### 4. Submission guidelines

- 4.1. Tender documentation should demonstrate that the interested consultant satisfies the conditions stated above and in the Terms of Reference and is capable of meeting the specifications and timeframes. Documentation must also include supporting examples to address the evaluation criteria.
- 4.2. Tender documentation should be submitted in English and outline the interested consultant's complete proposal:
- a) SPREP Tender Application form and conflict of interest form. (Please note you are required to complete in full all areas requested in the Form, particularly the Statements to demonstrate you meet the selection criteria – DO NOT refer us to your CV. Failure to do this will mean your application will not be considered). Provide examples of past related work outputs. For the Technical and Financial proposals, you may attach these separately.
  - b) Honour form
  - c) Curriculum Vitae of the proposed personnel to demonstrate that they have the requisite skills and experience to carry out this contract successfully.
  - d) Technical Proposal which contains the details to achieve the tasks outlined in the Terms of Reference.
  - e) Financial Proposal – Breakdown cost for the services to render as per deliverables outlined in Annex A. The cost must be inclusive of all the expenses foreseen.

- 4.3. Provide three referees relevant to this tender submission, including the most recent work completed.
- 4.4. Tenderers/bidders shall bear all costs associated with preparing and submitting a proposal, including cost relating to contract award; SPREP will, in no case, be responsible or liable for those costs, regardless of the conduct or outcome of the bidding process.
- 4.5. The tenderer/bidder might be requested to provide additional information relating to their submitted proposal, if the Tender Evaluation Committee requests further information for the purposes of tender evaluation. SPREP may shortlist one or more Tenderers and seek further information from them.
- 4.6. The submitted tender proposal must be for the entirety of the Terms of Reference and not divided into portions which a potential tenderer/bidder can provide services for.
- 4.7. The Proposal must remain valid for 90 days from date of submission.
- 4.8. Tenderers must insist on an acknowledgement of receipt of tender.

### 5. Tender Clarification

- 5.1. a. Any clarification questions from applicants must be submitted by email to [procurement@sprep.org](mailto:procurement@sprep.org) before 07 May 2025. A summary of all questions received complete with an associated response posted on the SPREP website [www.sprep.org/tender](http://www.sprep.org/tender) by 09 May 2025.
- b. The only point of contact for all matters relating to the RFT and the RFT process is the SPREP Procurement Officer.
- c. SPREP will determine what, if any, response should be given to a Tenderer question. SPREP will circulate Tenderer questions and SPREP's response to those questions to all other Tenderers using the SPREP Tenders page (<https://www.sprep.org/tenders>) without disclosing the source of the questions or revealing any confidential information of a Tenderer.
- d. Tenderers should identify in their question what, if any, information in the question the Tenderer considers is confidential.
- e. If a Tenderer believes they have found a discrepancy, error, ambiguity, inconsistency or omission in this RFT or any other information given or made available by SPREP, the Tenderer should promptly notify the Procurement Officer setting out the error in sufficient detail so that SPREP may take the corrective action, if any, it considers appropriate.

### 6. Evaluation criteria

- 6.1. SPREP will select a preferred contractor on the basis of SPREP's evaluation of the extent to which the documentation demonstrates that the tenderer offers the best value for money, and that the tender satisfies the following criteria:
- 6.2. A proposal will be rejected if it fails to achieve 70% or more in the technical criteria and its accompanying financial proposal shall not be evaluated.

#### I. Technical Score – 80%

Criteria	Details	Weighting
Qualifications and Experience	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Master's degree in environmental science, environmental education, conservation biology, or a related field.</li> <li>ii. Substantial knowledge and professional experience in project, program, or public policy evaluation</li> </ul>	20

	(financed by Agence française de développement (AFD) or other international development donors with similar standards, European Union (EU), World Bank (WB), Global Environment Facility (GEF), etc, assorted with result-based management evaluation methodologies.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>iii. Technical and sector-specific knowledge and expertise (at least 10 years) in the following areas: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Specialised expertise in climate change adaptation, nature-based solutions, biodiversity conservation</li> <li>b. Significant knowledge and deep understanding of SPREP or other Regional Organisations in the Pacific is an asset</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	20
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>iv. Prior experience working in the Pacific Islands (Fiji, Vanuatu, Solomon Islands, New Caledonia, Wallis and Futuna) and main stakeholders in the region, including national and local administrations.</li> <li>v. Proven track record in development cooperation.</li> <li>vi. Appreciable experience in leading participatory reflections and discussions.</li> <li>vii. Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender and experience in gender sensitive evaluation and analysis.</li> </ul>	30
Technical Proposal	viii. Technical Proposal in undertaking the activities as per deliverable	10

## II. Financial Score – 20%

The following formula shall be used to calculate the financial score for ONLY the proposals which score 70% or more in the technical criteria:

$$\text{Financial Score} = a \times \frac{b}{c}$$

Where:

a = maximum number of points allocated for the Financial Score

b = Lowest bid amount

c = Total bidding amount of the proposal

## 7. Variation or Termination of the Request for Tender

- 7.1 a. SPREP may amend, suspend or terminate the RFT process at any time.
- b. In the event that SPREP amends the RFT or the conditions of tender, it will inform potential Tenderers using the SPREP Tenders page (<https://www.sprep.org/tenders>).
- c. Tenderers are responsible to regularly check the SPREP website Tenders page for any updates and downloading the relevant RFT documentation and addendum for the RFT if it is interested in providing a Tender Response.
- d. If SPREP determines that none of the Tenders submitted represents value for money, that it is otherwise in the public interest or SPREP's interest to do so, SPREP may terminate this RFT process at any time. In such cases SPREP will cancel the tender, issue a cancellation notice and inform unsuccessful bidders accordingly.

## 8. Deadline

- 8.1. **The due date for submission of the tender is: 16 May 2025 midnight (Apia, Samoa local time).**
- 8.2. Late submissions will be returned unopened to the sender.
- 8.3. Please send all tenders clearly marked: "RFT 2025/026 - Mid Term Review of the Pacific Ecosystem Based Adaptation to Climate Change Project (PEBACC+)"

Mail: SPREP

Attention: Procurement Officer  
PO Box 240  
Apia, SAMOA

Email: [tenders@sprep.org](mailto:tenders@sprep.org) (MOST PREFERRED OPTION)

Fax: 685 20231

Person: Submit by hand in the tenders' box at SPREP reception,  
Vailima, Samoa.

Note: Submissions made to the incorrect portal will not be considered by SPREP. If SPREP is made aware of the error in submission prior to the deadline, the applicant will be advised to resubmit their application to the correct portal. However, if SPREP is not made aware of the error in submission until after the deadline, then the application is considered late and will be returned unopened to the sender.

SPREP reserves the right to reject any or all tenders and the lowest or any tender will not necessarily be accepted.

SPREP reserves the right to enter into negotiation with respect to one or more proposals prior to the award of a contract, split an award/awards and to consider localised award/awards between any proposers in any combination, as it may deem appropriate without prior written acceptance of the proposers.

**A binding contract is in effect, once signed by both SPREP and the successful tenderer. Any contractual discussion/work carried out/goods supplied prior to a contract being signed does not constitute a binding contract.**

**For any complaints regarding the Secretariat's tenders please refer to the Complaints section on the SPREP website <http://www.sprep.org/accountability/complaints>**

## **ANNEX A**

### **Terms of Reference**

#### Mid Term Review of the Pacific Ecosystem Based Adaptation to Climate Change Project (PE-BACC+) Consultancy

### **INTRODUCTION**

This is the Terms of Reference (ToR) for -the Midterm Review (MTR) of the project titled Pacific Ecosystem Based Adaptation to Climate Change (PEBACC+) implemented through the Secretariat of the Pacific Ecosystem Based Adaptation Project, which is to be undertaken in 2025. The project has been signed in March 2022 and started in May 2023. This ToR sets out the expectations for this MTR. The MTR process must follow the guidance outlined in the Terms of Reference

### **PROJECT BACKGROUND INFORMATION**

The PEBACC+ regional project is a collaborative effort aimed at promoting ecosystem-based adaptation (EbA) and climate resilience across the Pacific region. With a focus on biodiversity conservation, sustainable land management, and community empowerment, PEBACC+ plays a crucial role in addressing the climate change impacts faced by Pacific Island nations. Since 2015 SPREP has been designing and implementing EbA responses in Fiji, Vanuatu and the Solomon Islands through the €4.9 million PEBACC project funded by the German government International Climate Initiative. This project ended in July 2020 and had a number of significant achievements for the three countries proving the value of the EbA approach and the methodologies employed that were well received by national government and communities and the investment to support national climate change adaptation policy. In order to maintain the momentum of these achievements, SPREP saw the importance of extending the work of PEBACC both within the current countries and extend the work to the French Territories.

The project holds significant importance in the context of climate change adaptation and sustainable development in the Pacific region. By emphasizing ecosystem-based approaches, PEBACC+ offers innovative solutions to enhance resilience, conserve biodiversity, and improve livelihoods in the face of climate variability and extreme weather events. Moreover, its collaborative and participatory approach fosters regional cooperation, knowledge sharing, and capacity building, strengthening the resilience of Pacific communities and ecosystems.

Through the funding of the “Kiwa Initiative – Nature-based Solutions (NbS) for climate resilience” ([www.kiwainitiative.org](http://www.kiwainitiative.org)), SPREP was able to secure €4M through the Agence française de développement (AFD) and €1,8M by the French Facility for Global Environment (FFEM) to implement a PEBACC+ (2nd phase) to reduce vulnerability of people and ecosystems to climate change by investing in ecosystem-based adaptation action that extends and builds on the solid foundation established by Pacific Ecosystem Based adaptation to Climate Change (PEBACC) project in Fiji, Vanuatu and Solomon Islands, support New Caledonia and Wallis and Futuna with EbA methodology training and facilitate lessons learnt

and experience-sharing throughout the region. The PEBACC+ project covers the following key sites – Vanuatu, Fiji, Solomon Islands, New Caledonia, Wallis and Futuna.

Together, these countries represent a significant portion of the Pacific region and face common challenges related to climate change, biodiversity loss, and sustainable development. By collaborating on the PEBACC+ project, they can leverage collective expertise, resources, and experiences to achieve shared goals and build a more resilient future for the Pacific.

The aim of the PEBACC+ project is to strengthen the resilience of ecosystems, economies and people in Fiji, Vanuatu, Solomon Islands, New Caledonia and Wallis and Futuna to the impacts of climate change. The specific objective of the PEBACC+ project is to develop, sustain and institutionalise the ecosystem-based approach to climate change adaptation in the target countries and territories through the following components and activities:

**Component 1:** Strengthen of stakeholders' experience in the practical implementation of EbA and NbS as a climate change adaptation strategy in Fiji, Vanuatu & Solomon Islands

**Activity 1.1.** Support EbA and NbS demonstration activities at historical PEBACC project sites to consolidate and expand the range of activities offered.

**Activity 1.2** Expand EbA and NbS demonstration sites to diversify adaptation options funded.

**Activity 1.3** Institutionalise and ensure the sustainability of EbA and NbS at national and sub-national levels.

**Component 2:** integration and support to the implementation of EbA and NbS approach as a strategy contributing to climate change adaptation in New Caledonia and Wallis and Futuna

**Activity 2.1** Raise awareness of the EbA and NbS approach among local institutions and communities (technical staff and decision-makers) and implement the ESRAM process, adapted to the context and according to the demand.

**Activity 2.2** Provide technical and financial support to EbA and NbS demonstration activities on identified pilot sites in New Caledonia and Wallis and Futuna.

**Activity 2.3** Integrate the EbA approach and NbS into territorial strategic guidance documents and ensure their sustainability.

**Component 3:** strengthening regional cooperation among Pacific Countries and Territories on ecosystem-based adaptation by promoting the sharing of experiences and lessons learned from projects to increase the resilience of people and ensure the sustainability of EbA implementation activities

**Activity 3.1.** Share learning and experiences of EbA and NbS approaches among countries and project stakeholders.

**Activity 3.2.** Promote the PEBACC concept across the Pacific region as an intervention logic to be expanded and replicated for climate change adaptation.

Through these components and activities, PEBACC+ aims to build capacity, raise awareness, and promote the integration of ecosystem-based approaches to climate change adaptation, ultimately contributing to enhanced resilience and sustainability in the Pacific region.

## MTR PURPOSE

The MTR will assess progress towards the achievement of the project objectives and outcomes as specified in the Project Document and assess early signs of project success or failure with the goal of identifying the necessary changes to be made in order to set the project on-track to achieve its intended results. The MTR will also review the project's strategy and its risks to sustainability ensuring that the project not only achieves short-term results but also contributes to lasting benefits for the target community. By analysing performance indicators and milestones, the review will provide an evidence-based understanding of implementation success and areas needing improvement.

The results of the MTR will be utilised by various stakeholders, primarily the project management team, who will leverage the findings to inform decision-making, resource allocation, and strategic adjustments, as well as SPREP broader management. The Kiwa Secretariat team will use the evaluation to assess accountability and transparency in project performance, influencing future funding decisions. Local communities where the PEBAACC+ project activities are being implemented will indirectly benefit through enhanced project strategies that better address their needs. Finally, in-country key government stakeholders may find the insights valuable for broader discussions and best practice development. Following the MTR, stakeholders will prioritise implementing recommendations, update monitoring frameworks, and engage in collaborative efforts to ensure the project remains on track to achieve its intended outcomes sustainably.

## MTR APPROACH & METHODOLOGY

The evaluation exercise is based on a three-stage approach:

- i. Structure the evaluation process;
- ii. Data collection and conduct of the evaluative analysis;
- iii. Present the conclusions of the evaluative analysis and recommendations.

Please note that in the case of the mid-term evaluation, a **specific focus is needed on the practical aspect of the recommendations** to be proposed by the consultant(s) so that they can be implemented before the end of the project implementation phase.

### **i. Structure the evaluation process**

During this preparatory phase, the consultant(s) shall:

- Gather and consult all information and documentation relevant to the project being evaluated (design, implementation, supervision) and necessary in order to provide an understanding of its context. The documents to be consulted will be made available (see Annex 2.); they will be provided by SPREP and AFD.
- Identify all project stakeholders and, through discussion with core members of the Project Management Unit (PMU) and AFD, determine a list of key stakeholders from the project team, partner organisations, government and key beneficiaries in each country as part of the scoping note;
- Conduct interviews with key stakeholders involved or who have been involved in the design, management and supervision of the project; Prepare **a concise but accurate description of the project (maximum 2 pages)** outlining project objectives, operating methods,

stakeholders, timelines, and contextual changes, while highlighting the main challenges. It should, in particular, retrace the history of the project in order to reconstruct its progress at its various stages, from the appraisal phase to the date of evaluation. It must be included in the evaluation report (as per the Evaluation Report Template in Annex 4). Reconstruct and assess **the logic behind the project intervention**<sup>1</sup> by examining i) the project's logical framework; ii) the evolution in the logical framework over the course of the project and iii) the alignment with the project's sustainable development opinion, which characterises the project's ambition;

- Produce an evaluation framework (i) based on the A Decade of Development Finance for Biodiversity (OECD) criteria (see annex 7) and the associated evaluation questions listed below for each key criteria ; (ii) highlighting the methodology and stages in the reasoning process that will make it possible to come up with answers to each evaluation question and (iii) specifying the information sources for documenting these criteria, hypotheses, or indicators (documents, interviews, focus groups, surveys...) in order to answer the evaluation questions.

The consultant shall provide a scoping note summarising the framework of the evaluation after the beginning of the assessment. **This preparatory phase is key, and the scoping note should be shared with SPREP and AFD, in order for the proposed evaluation framework and methodology to be validated.**

## ii. Data collection and conduct of the evaluative analysis

On the basis of the findings and the information available, the consultant will have to answer the evaluation questions below. Particular attention will be paid to **the evaluator's ability to mobilise various sources**, to triangulate them and to take a critical look at their reliability: documentary review, semi-directive interviews, focus groups (thematic discussion groups), existing data, ad hoc surveys, field observations and satellite data analysis (see Annex 6).

*Proposed list of evaluative questions (about 15 questions maximum)*

### Question 1

Review the relevance of the project strategy and modalities and assess whether it provides the most effective route towards expected /intended results.

- Sub question a: to what extent does the Ecosystem and Socio-economic Resilience Analysis and Mapping (ESRAM) meet the country/site needs, and is relevant to address challenges of enhancing the resilience of ecosystems, economies and communities to climate change?
- Sub question b: is project governance (incl. partnership modalities, such as Letter of Agreements (LoA) with governments) appropriate and efficient to implement activities on the ground in a 4-year project?

---

<sup>1</sup> The logic for the intervention is composed of all the activities implemented, resources mobilised, the adapted monitoring method (including indicators), the achievements, results and expected outcomes, as well as all hypotheses that explain how the activities have led to the outcomes in the context of the intervention. The reconstruction of the logic of the intervention must particularly allow the evaluator to: (i) clarify the objectives of the intervention and express them as a hierarchy of expected outcomes, and (ii) help to appreciate the internal coherence of the intervention. It should also help to identify the initial hypotheses (or assumptions, often implicit) that guided the project's design a priori, and to assess its validity a posteriori.

#### Question 2

Assess the project relevance in terms of technical partnerships (to implement EbA activities), capacities and adequacy to the contexts of intervention/implementation.

Has the project developed and leveraged the necessary and appropriate partnerships with direct and tangential stakeholders?

#### Question 3

How effective is the cooperation between African, Caribbean, Pacific (ACP) and Overseas Countries and Territories (OCTs) for? What do you recommend enhancing it?

#### Question 4

How far are the initial objectives addressed? Please provide a separate assessment for each PICT.

#### Question 5

Which activities should be given priority to, until the end of the project, to ensure maximum impact, feasibility and best use of remaining project funds?

#### Question 6

Review how the logframe has been monitored so far. Propose adjustments to better fit the project contribution to climate change adaptation, the partners capacities to monitor it in a cost efficient and inclusive way and provide elements for visibility of overall project outcomes.

#### Question 7

Review the overall effectiveness of project management (including monitoring, fund allocation, procurement, etc.)

- Sub question a: Review of the quality of execution of the project PMU.

Recommend areas for improvement in terms of coordination within PMU

- Sub question b: Review the quality of support provided by SPREP.

What are the key barriers and challenges as regards administrative and procurement aspects which affect the progress to date, and how to mitigate them?

Recommend specific adjustments for SPREP to ease the implementation of this project before the end of the implementation period.

#### Question 8

How have the strategic aspects of the project (such as work planning and finance management) been managed and anticipated? What adjustments do you propose?

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?

#### Question 9

Review the monitoring tools being used, including their cost efficiency, consistency with project objectives and results, as well as inclusiveness (to enhance sustainability). Review the existing resources and provide recommendations.

#### Question 10

Do local and national government stakeholders currently support the project objectives? Do they currently have an active role in the implementation of the project (including on NbS implementation on the ground)?

Question 11

What can the project do to enhance its gender benefits?

Sub questions: how does the project engage with women and girls? Is the project likely to have the same positive and /or negative effects on women and men, girls and boys?

Question 12

What are the current links to SPREP EbA strategy/framework and how the contribution of PE-BACC+ could be strengthened?

Question 13

Review project communication.

- Sub question a, with stakeholders: is communication regular and effective? Does it contribute to their awareness of project outcomes and activities, and their investment for the sustainability of the project results?

- Sub question b, external communication: are proper means of communication established to express the project progress and intended impact to the target public, including Kiwa donors?

Question 14

What are the contributions and (potential) impact of the proposed interventions to reduce communities' vulnerabilities to climate change?

Question 15

Analyse the leverage effect of PEBACC+ based on recent previous interventions and projects (incl. PEBACC, PACRES). Analyse PEBACC+ results in building/maintaining/strengthening stakeholders' capacities and elaborating exit strategies.

Question 16

FFEM added value to the project: provide an assessment of the specific contribution and added value of the FFEM funding and action compared to the other resources available to the project and the project's co-financers. In particular, a look will be taken at the way in which the project fits in with the principles of action of the FFEM. In particular, what is the project's innovative character and reproducibility with regard to the FFEM's criteria?

These evaluation questions refer to the **Development Assistance Committee (DAC) criteria** (*Relevance, Coherence, Effectiveness, Efficiency, Impact and Sustainability*). The **added value and visibility of the Kiwa Initiative** and FFEM in implemented activities will also be specifically examined and will constitute a seventh evaluation criterion (see Annex 7).

**Identification of evaluation questions by criteria**

Criteria	Relevance	Consistency/Coherence	Effectiveness	Efficiency	Impact	Sustainability	Added value of Kiwa initiative & FFEM
Questions							

							<b>and visi- bility</b>
Question 1	x		x				
Question 2	x		x		x		
Question 3		x	x				x
Question 4		x					
Question 5		x			x	x	
Question 6			x		x		x
Question 7		x	x	x			
Question 8				x			
Question 9				x	x	x	
Question 10					x	x	
Question 11					x	x	
Question 12						x	
Question 13						x	x
Question 14					x		x
Question 15	x		x			x	

Data collection is to be conducted from Fiji (Suva) where SPREP Project team is located.

**Field missions** to the project field sites in the different countries and territories are required; Fiji, Solomon Islands and Vanuatu should imperatively be visited.

Additionally, based on the findings, **provide recommendations as regards a possible no cost extension of the project:** its main features (whose activities/sites should be extended, whose should not), indicative duration, as well as necessary conditions (governance, organization, PMU composition etc) for the project to deliver and achieve results.

### **Rating of program performance**

In order to enhance the clarity of the positioning of the analysis, the consultant(s) shall assign a rating for each OECD criterion (A: highly satisfactory; B: satisfactory; C: unsatisfactory; D: highly unsatisfactory) based on its judgment and on the responses to the evaluative questions. and present the results in a comprehensive way. It is important to be able to "score" the results in order to identify the more and less impactful/efficient aspects of the project.

### **iii. Present the conclusions of the evaluative analysis and recommendations**

Following the data collection phase and drawing upon the analysis of the information and data gathered in the field, the consultant(s) will prepare the draft evaluation report and articulate the conclusions of the evaluation. Once the consultant(s) have conducted their analysis, then formulated their conclusions and judgments on the project on the basis of each evaluative question,

the consultant(s) shall provide in this section general conclusions in order to make an overall assessment of the intervention being evaluated.

The consultant(s) shall make a distinction between the specific conclusions, the validity of which is restricted to the project being evaluated, and the conclusions of more general relevance. These conclusions must be ranked by order of importance and classified by order of reliability. This exercise aims to bring out the messages of the evaluation that may be intended for AFD, SPREP and for all the stakeholders. The consultant must make sure to mention for whom the recommendations are intended.

The consultant will identify lessons and/or strategic and/or operational recommendations. The latter must be linked to the conclusions and grouped together and organized by order of priority. In their final report, the consultant(s) will identify and differentiate between strategic and/or operational lessons and recommendations. These lessons and recommendations may relate to the intervention itself, future cycles of the intervention, similar interventions in other contexts, general project cycle practices at AFD (regarding design, implementation, monitoring, etc.), or the operating methods of the contracting authority.

-“Lessons” denotes insights gained from the evaluation that extend beyond the project’s scope (with potential applicability in broader contexts) and do not necessarily mandate follow-up actions.

- “Recommendations” encompasses decisions to be made or measures to be applied in order to improve operational methods, governance systems, arrangements, etc., particularly for subsequent phases of the evaluated project; unlike “lessons,” their implementation may be overseen by AFD following the evaluation. Recommendations demand particular attention; they should be linked to the conclusions, grouped, and prioritized. Furthermore, they should be practical, thus: very limited in number, specific, directed explicitly to one or more mentioned actors (SPREP, project partners, other stakeholders...), and include a relevant time frame (short, medium, or long-term).

The MTR report must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful.

The MTR consultant or team of consultants will gather and review all relevant sources of information including documents such as the Project Document, project reports including semi and annual donor reports, project budget and revisions, activity workplans and reports and any other materials that the team considers useful for this evidence-based review.

The MTR team will review the baseline of the project logframe and progress made to date, hence an updated version will be provided by the Project Management Team for their assessment.

The MTR team is expected to follow a collaborative and participatory approach ensuring close engagement with the Project Team, government and non-government counterparts that the project worked with, the SPREP Office, direct beneficiaries, and other key stakeholders. Engagement of stakeholders is vital to a successful MTR. Stakeholder involvement should include interviews with stakeholders who have supported the project in any way, including but not limited to; key government officials, consultants, community members, project stakeholders, local government and Civil Society Organizations (CSOs), etc. Additionally, the MTR team is expected to reach out to coordinators in Vanuatu, Solomon Islands, New Caledonia, Walls and Futuna specific to where the project activities are being implemented.

The specific design and methodology for the MTR should emerge from consultations between the MTR team and the above-mentioned parties regarding what is appropriate and feasible for

meeting the MTR purpose and objectives and answering the evaluation questions, given limitations of budget, time and data. The MTR team must use gender-responsive methodologies and tools and ensure that gender equality and women's empowerment, as well as other cross-cutting issues incorporated into the MTR report.

The final methodological approach including interview schedule and data to be used in the MTR must be clearly outlined in the scoping note and be fully discussed and agreed between SPREP, stakeholders and the MTR team<sup>2</sup>.

## MIDTERM REVIEW DELIVERABLES

### i. Evaluation framework Scoping note

The **evaluation framework scoping note** shall be 10 to 15 pages long (excluding annexes). It shall include the description of the project as mentioned above (maximum 2 pages) and summarise the way in which the consultant(s) intend to structure the evaluation process (main issues, reasoning processes and indicators, information sources).

It will be accompanied by the **semi-structured questionnaires/interview guidelines** and will **summarise the evaluation exercise and main evaluative questions for the project stakeholders to be interviewed**.

Each of the prepared documents will be **shared with and validated by the evaluation steering committee** before the consultants can proceed with the subsequent phases of the evaluation exercise.

### ii. Draft final report (and power point)

A **draft final report, which should not exceed 30 pages** outside the appendices (see proposed plan and in more details in Annex 4) will be produced at the end of the consultant's work, as well as a **Power Point presentation format**.

Proposed plan for the draft final report

- Cover page: project overview, comprised of one paragraph summarising the project objectives, and one paragraph outlining the conclusions of the evaluation
- Rationale, objective, and methodology of the evaluation
- Initial approach and actual progress of the project
- Evaluation results (about 10 pages, structured according to the OECD-DAC criteria and evaluation questions).
- Lessons learned
- Recommendations

An unpublished annex document will complement the report. Refer to the provided report template in Annex 5 for guidance.

The final draft report will include the evaluation methodology, a detailed project narrative, reconstructed and updated logical framework, the project performance, conclusions, lessons and/or recommendations, and annexes to the report. It will be sent by SPREP to AFD. AFD will provide

---

<sup>2</sup> The TOR should retain enough flexibility for the MTR team to determine the best methods and tools for collecting and analysing data. For example, the TOR might suggest using questionnaires, and interviews, but the evaluation team should be able to revise the approach in consultation with the evaluation manager and key stakeholders. These changes in approach should be agreed and reflected clearly in MTR scoping note )

their comments and observations to the consultant within two to three weeks of receiving the draft report.

### iii. Final Report

The final report, incorporating these observations, should be available within two weeks after receiving comments. If these observations express differences of assessment not shared by the consultants, they may be annexed to the final report and commented on by the consultants. The report will be made available for public access on the AFD website. An unpublished annex document with more details will complement the report.

The report will be drawn up in accordance with the standard plan attached as Annex 4. The draft and final reports should be submitted in electronic format to the following e-mail addresses:

[lorainis@sprep.org](mailto:lorainis@sprep.org) , [guinganda@afd.fr](mailto:guinganda@afd.fr), [ahmim-richarda@afd.fr](mailto:ahmim-richarda@afd.fr) ; [kiwa\\_initiative@afd.fr](mailto:kiwa_initiative@afd.fr)

The evaluation report should not exceed 30 pages, excluding annexes. A good report must be synthetic. All additional useful material may be annexed.

## ORGANISATION AND SCHEDULE

The total duration of the MTR will be approximately 30 working days over a time period of 12 weeks and shall not exceed five months from when the consultants(s) are hired. The tentative MTR timeframe is as follows:

ACTIVITY	NUMBER OF WORKING DAYS	COMPLETION DATE
- Kick-off meeting (including AFD/Kiwa Secretariat):	1 day	May 2025
- Submission of the scoping note: (scoping note due no later than 2 weeks before the MTR mission)	4 days	19 May 2025
- MTR mission & data collection: desk review, stakeholder meetings, interviews (incl. AFD/Kiwa Secretariat)	15 days	7 June 2025
- Presentation of initial findings to SPREP/AFD (last day of the MTR mission)	1 days	10 <sup>th</sup> June 2025
- Submission of the draft report: (due within 3 weeks of the MTR mission)	5 days	10 July 2025
- Presentation of results to SREP team/key stakeholders and AFD	1 day	15 July 2025
- Submission of the final report: (due within 1 week of receiving Kiwa Sec comments on the draft)	2 days	30 July 2025
- (potentially) a presentation to Kiwa donors and Kiwa Steering Committee members	1 day	1 August 2025

An **evaluation steering committee** composed of representatives from SPREP, AFD/ Kiwa Secretariat will be established. The steering committee is tasked with: (i) ensuring the smooth progress of the evaluation, (ii) facilitating the retrieval of key documents and stakeholder-consultant communication, and (iii) reviewing, providing feedback on, and signing off on deliverables.

The evaluation process will require to invite the steering committee to the kick-off meeting and to present the results to them as well.

## TEAM COMPOSITION

A team of consultants are encouraged to apply with one being a team leader (with experience and exposure to projects and evaluations in other regions globally) working with individual consultants in-country. The team leader will be responsible for the overall design and writing of the MTR report.

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

The selection of consultants will be aimed at maximising the overall "team" qualities in the following areas:

- Substantial knowledge and professional experience in project, program, or public policy evaluation (financed by AFD or other international development donors with similar standards, European Union, World Bank, Global Environment Fund, etc), assorted with result-based management evaluation methodologies.
- Technical and sector-specific knowledge and expertise (at least 10 years) in the following areas:
  - Specialised expertise in climate change adaptation, nature-based solutions, biodiversity conservation
  - Significant knowledge and deep understanding of SPREP or other Regional Organisations in the Pacific is an asset
- Prior experience working in the Pacific Islands (Fiji, Vanuatu, Solomon Islands, New Caledonia, Wallis and Futuna) and main stakeholders in the region, including national and local administrations.
- Proven track record in development cooperation.
- Appreciable experience in leading participatory reflections and discussions.
- Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender and experience in gender sensitive evaluation and analysis.
- Critical Thinking and Problem Solving: capacity to think critically and identify underlying issues; skill in problem-solving, offering actionable recommendations based on evaluation findings

### Language

- Fluency in written and spoken English.
- French is also needed for reviewing the project implemented in 2 French territories (New Caledonia, and Wallis and Futuna)

## PAYMENT SCHEDULE

- 20% payment upon satisfactory delivery of the final scoping note
- 40% payment upon satisfactory delivery of the draft MTR report
- 40% payment upon satisfactory delivery of the final MTR report and approval by Kiwa Secretariat

Criteria for issuing the final payment of 40% :

- The final MTR report includes all requirements outlined in the MTR TOR and is in accordance with the MTR guidance.
- The final MTR report is clearly written, logically organised, and is specific for this project (i.e. text has not been cut & pasted from other MTR reports).
- The Audit Trail includes responses to and justification for each comment listed.

## Annexes

1. Annex 1 – Logical framework of the project being evaluated
2. Annex 2 – Indicative list of documents to be consulted
3. Annex 3 – Indicative list of organisations/ stakeholders to be met
4. Annex 4 – Template for the evaluation report
5. Annex 5 – Template for the annex to the evaluation report
6. Annex 6 – Information sources
7. Annex 7 – DAC criteria
8. Annex 8 – Addressing Environment & Social risk management and climate co-benefits

## Annex 1– Logical framework of PEBACC+ project (update October 2024)

PEBACC+ project logframe is collating baselines, targets and values from each 5 project countries (see related tabs)	Indicator	Base-line value (total 5 countries)	Targets (total 5 countries)	Total value as of 31 March 2023	Total value as of 31 March 2024	Total current value as of 30 Sept 2024 (5 countries)	Means of verification	Assumption	Kiwa Initiative indicators <i>When relevant, reference to indicators that monitor the overall Kiwa initiative</i>
<b>General objective:</b> To increase the resilience of ecosystems, economies and people in Fiji, Vanuatu, Solomon Islands, New Caledonia and Wallis and Futuna to the impact of climate change									
<p><b>SO 1 &amp;2:</b> The Ecosystem-based Adaptation (EbA) and Nature-based Solutions (NbS) approach as a strategy contributing to climate change adaptation is supported and implemented in the 5 project countries</p>	<p>1. Number and type of EbA activities implemented, and % of implementation</p> <p>2. # of beneficiaries from EbA actions implemented (disaggregated by activities, sex and age) [end of project:] % surveyed participants reporting an <b>increased</b> involvement into EbA activities</p> <p>3. % women and youth in community involved recognising an <b>increased</b> engagement/participation to decision-making processes and planning regarding EbA</p> <p>4. # of EbA implementation plans; - of which benefiting from a financial strategy / having identified secured sustainable funding modalities for the next years following project</p>	<p>20</p> <p>0</p> <p>0</p> <p>0</p>	<p># 22 type 8 % 70</p> <p>14,175</p> <p>W:&gt;40%; Y: &gt;40%</p> <p>10 (TBF)</p>	<p>0</p> <p>0</p> <p>0</p> <p>0</p>	<p>#16 type 7 10%</p> <p>308</p> <p>W:2.6%; Y-2%</p> <p>0</p>	<p>#6 type 2 - 19%</p> <p>40,639 (M:20,215; W:12,155; Y: 8,269)</p> <p>W:11%; Y-263%</p> <p>0</p>	<p>country and site reports; semi and annual project reports; [end of project survey to participants]</p> <p>questionnaire/survey to W and Y</p> <p>implementation plans and financial plans</p>	<p>Additional sources of funding or unexpected policy changes may affect % of implementation. Project activities can be embedded in larger regional initiatives (e.g. SPREP work on ESRAM, NbS capacity-building through Kiwa etc.) and depend on additional sources of funding</p>	<p>1. Number of people (women/men) directly benefiting from climate adaptation, resilience and biodiversity measures through Kiwa (direct beneficiaries)</p>

<p><b>SO3:</b> Regional cooperation among Pacific Countries and Territories on ecosystem-based adaptation is strengthened by promoting the sharing of experiences and lessons learned from projects to increase the resilience of people and ensure the sustainability of EbA implementation activities</p>	<p>5. # of project stakeholders involved in regional cooperation [end of project:] % of stakeholders reporting an <b>increased</b> engagement/cooperation</p>	<p>14 (50%)</p>	<p>22</p>	<p>0</p>	<p>4</p>	<p>0</p>	<p>event/trip reports; attendance sheet; online meeting registration/reports  [end of project survey to stakeholders]</p>		
<p>Result 1 Support EbA and NbS demonstration activities at the historical PEBACC project sites and expand to new sites, to consolidate and diversify funded adaptation options</p>	<p>1.1 area (ha) of degraded land reforested/ riverbed restored / coastal ecosystem/mangrove restored-rehabilitated</p> <p>1.2 area (ha) benefiting from new (i) marine or (ii) terrestrial sustainable management plans (disaggregated per site) % plan implementation per site</p> <p>1.3 # small/model farms in conversion or practising agroecology approaches</p>	<p>503</p> <p>0</p> <p>28</p>	<p>4120</p> <p>13 ha</p> <p>35</p>	<p>0</p> <p>0</p> <p>0</p>	<p>11,2</p> <p>0</p> <p>0</p>	<p>77,76</p> <p>0</p> <p>2</p>	<p>reforestation/ restoration plans and reports; country reports; maps</p> <p>management plans; country reports; maps</p> <p>country reports</p>	<p>Nurseries maintained during duration of intervention</p> <p>ESS specialist supports local/national work-plans/management plans</p>	<p>10. Areas (in ha) benefiting from biodiversity conservation or restoration actions by key areas i) terrestrial/freshwater and ii) marine [and specific focus on IAS]</p> <p>11. Areas (in ha) benefiting from sustainable resource and/or land and marine management projects/programs, by key areas i) terrestrial/freshwater and ii) marine</p> <p>K1#22: Number of small/family farms in conversion to agro-ecological systems</p>

	1.4 Hectares of land set up as sites for demonstration models to enhance agroecology practices and/or agro-forestry planting and/or mixed plantation  1.5 # of seedlings produced for reforestation [end of project] % survival of planted trees	20  27000	20 (TBF)  56000	0  0	0  5287	2  10 646	country reports; maps  country reports; site maintenance reports	nurseries maintained during duration of intervention	K1#23 :Areas (in ha) under conversion to agro-ecological systems
Result 2 : Build community capacities regarding NbS approaches and activities	2.1 # of community trainings related to NbS/sustainable resource management; - # people trained disaggregated by sex and age  2.2 # of women and youth supported to develop income-generating activities (disaggregated by Women and youth)	0  0	7- M:315; W:350; Y260 (TBF)  W:230; Y: 250	0  0	0  0	1: M20; W5; Y4  62; Y:19; W:43	Training reports; attendance sheet  country reports	Assuming consent from communities / interest and availability of beneficiaries to participate	
Result 3: Raise awareness of the EbA and NbS approach among local institutions (technical staff and decision-makers) and communities	3.1 # local or in-country multistakeholder workshops on climate change adaptation /NbS, and # of participants  3.2 # of women and young people engaged/consulted in the ESRAMs and other similar studies/plans (Master Plan, management plan)	17-322  49	3-300 (TBF)  600 (TBF)	0  0	2:1 - 20 (W-5; M-15); 2 - unknown  50: unknown	2;80  151; W-105; Y-46	Invasive Species ; NC ??? - event/workshop reports, attendance sheet  EsrAM report, meeting notes		
Result 4.1: Implement the Esram process as a tool to identify and implement EbA and NbS	4.1.1 # study (ESRAM) or feasibility study related to conservation or NbS approach conducted and used effectively during the project timeframe  4.1.2 # maps monitoring conservation or sustainably managed areas, and/or #	6  0	6  2	0  0	0  0	1  1	Esram reports, study reports; semi and annual project reports  maps; country reports	ESRAM to be conducted under the EREPA project, by end of 2023	K1 #12 Number of feasibility studies undertaken for regional organisations, national authorities or NGOs

	planning tools at territorial level % maps/tools effectively used								
Result 4.2: Institutionalise and sustain EbA and NbS at national and sub-national levels	4.2.1 # of ESRAM technical and methodological guides developed	0	1	0	0	0	Guidebook and Case Study Publication	Should be developed jointly with PCCC (bringing co-funding) based on previous ESRAMs	6. Number of national and regional policy frameworks/strategy documents that mention Nature-based Solutions for climate change adaptation and/or integrate climate change adaptation and biodiversity conservation as interlinked objectives 9. Number of public institutions funded (giving rise to financial on-granting) K1 #8 Number of (formal and informal) civil society partners involved in the Kiwa overall project
	4.2.2 # of revised or newly published strategy documents integrating EbA & NbS approaches at different scale (disag by regional/national/ subnational)	0	8	0	0	0	Strategy Documents published by authorities	Depending on territories political and planning calendar and other project results e.g. CLIPSSA	
	4.2.3 # public institutions supported and funded through Letters of Agreements	8	13	0	0	2	Partnership Agreements / LOA		
	4.2.4 # formal or informal civil society partners involved in the project	4	12	0	0	8	country and project reports		

Result 5: Promote the PEBACC and EbA/NbS concepts across the Pacific region as an intervention logic to be scaled up and replicated for climate change adaptation	5.1 # of communication products developed and disseminated (by type of media and target groups: decision-maker, practitioner, other)	10	28	0	26	70	publications		
	5.2 # of regional events where the EbA approach was promoted, and # participants (by type of organisation: authorities/CSOs/other, by sex and age)	9	14	0	5	4	event/workshop reports, attendance sheet	Interest and availability of participants	
	5.3 # of regional projects with an EbA component Pebacc+ linked to, or partnerships established and enabling scaling up	1	5	0	2	3	country and project reports	Availability of information from other projects	16. Number of regional events and workshops

## **Annex 2 – Indicative list of documents to be consulted**

*Establish the indicative list of key documents to be consulted, giving if possible, the title, the author (if applicable) and the date. Specify any missing documents.*

*It is advisable that the consultancy has access to all important documents that retrace the appraisal, formalisation and implementation monitoring of the project, in particular:*

- *identification note*
  - *Feasibility study*
  - *concept note/Project document*
  - *financing agreement together with any amendments*
  - *letters of agreement with the different partners*
  - *environmental and social management plan (ESMP) / Social and Environmental Screening Procedure (SESP).*
  - *project implementation manual*
  - *operator contracts, contracts of assistance to the contracting authority or contracts with the management contractor*
  - *Trip reports*
  - *Project deliverables*
  - *summary table extracted from disbursement software*
  - *all semi-annual and annual reports (technical and financial)*
- *Counterparty presentation documents (master agreement, status, activity report, financial statements, organisation chart, monitoring document, etc.) ;*

### **Annex 3 – Indicative list of organisations and stakeholders to be met**

- SPREP project team: Regional coordinator, in-country coordinators, finance manager, communication officer, XXX
- SPREP management team: XXX
- Project partners (receiving funds): XXX
- Members from communities who participates in the project: XXX
- National government in each of the country/territory: XX
- Local level governments: XXX
- Project partners (not receiving funds directly): XXX
- Consultants: XXX
- Members of the Regional and National Advisory Committees: XXX

## Annex 4 –Template for the evaluation report

### Project Evaluation

*Name of project(s) (without acronyms)*

Country:	Sector: <i>use the nomenclature of AFD's technical divisions</i>
----------	--

Evaluator:      Coordinator of the evaluation:

Validation date of evaluation report:

---

**Project number:**

**Contracting authority:**

**Amount:** *AFD financing and type – grant/loan*

**Disbursement rate:**

**Commitment date:**

**Completion date:** *operational completion date*

---

### Project objectives

Add the project fiche if available on [afd.fr](http://afd.fr)

### Conclusions of the evaluation

*This should not be an overall summary of the main observations of the evaluation. Consultants should highlight the key conclusions crosscutting the evaluation questions (distinguishing the essential from the important).*

### Rationale, objectives and methodology of the evaluation (0.5 p)

*For the methodology, answer the following questions in two sentences:*

- *Has this evaluation involved a specific methodology? If so, what is it?*
- *Have all the project stakeholders (AFD, contracting authority, civil society, companies, beneficiaries...) been able to express their views about the project via the evaluation comitology, or via on-site or online data collection tools? If not, what has prevented the consultation of some of these stakeholders? What methods have been used to collect*

*data from the various stakeholders (interviews, questionnaire survey, focus groups, observation, documentary sources?)*

- *What are the main limits and methodological biases of this exercise and did the consultants encounter any difficulties in conducting the evaluation?*
- *What gaps are there between the intended method and the method finally used?*

### **Initial project logic and actual implementation (5 p)**

*The intervention logic (objectives and means to achieve them): Indicate what the initially intended project objectives were and the path of change (i.e., the organisation of the changes and the intermediate results that should logically have enabled – or contributed to – the achievement of the objectives) and the assumptions underlying them. Indicate whether this intervention logic was comprehensive at the start of the project, or how it was completed or established during the evaluation. Also indicate whether this intervention logic was appropriate during the project implementation and in what way. Clearly indicate the planned objectives, targets and indicators.*

*Operating scheme and stakeholders: By “operating method”, we mean the preparation and organisation of the project. You should indicate the financial arrangements (financial product, fiduciary arrangements, co-financiers), as well as the operational arrangements. You should indicate the project stakeholders and their responsibilities (contracting authority, implementing agency/operator, any assistance to the contracting authority, etc.), as well as the coordination and governance mechanism (coordination bodies, decision-making procedures, etc.).*

*Project process and evolution of the context: In ½ page, highlight the main points that have had consequences for the project, including: the key dates of the project and AFD’s financing, the key events in the phases for the appraisal, implementation (indicate in particular how the implementation monitoring was conducted), and completion (or post-completion), the project’s progress since its start-up (main achievements), the main difficulties encountered, and the contextual elements that led to the project being modified.*

**Table 1: Project budget**

Section	Overall project amount		AFD contribution	
	Planned	Implemented	Planned	Implemented
Component 1				
Component 2				
...				

Optional note on the table: local currency, co-financiers, reasons for variances, etc.

### **Results of the evaluation (approx. 10 p)**

*This section should be organised following the structure indicated in the Terms of Reference, i.e.: according to the evaluation questions AND according to the DAC criteria used.*

## EQ 1 and Relevance, coherence

## EQ 2 and Effectiveness

**Table 2: Project output and results indicators (optional)**

Indicator	Target at the appraisal	Value after project

## EQ 3 and Efficiency

## EQ 4 and Impacts and sustainability

## EQ 5 and AFD Added value

### **FOCUS on...**

*This box is optional. It serves to complete or illustrate an evaluation question or highlight a particularly interesting result of the evaluation.*

### **Lessons**

*N.B.: The conclusions are presented on the first page.*

*The lessons (what may be useful in other contexts): this involves the observations made and lessons learned by the evaluator that go beyond the project context, as well as key messages, which do not necessarily need to be followed up with action. The evaluator may use their experience and expertise to look at the general application potential.*

### **Recommendations**

*The recommendations (what needs to be improved in this project/this type of project – how to do things differently): this involves proposals for improvements, decisions that need to be made or measures that need to be applied which are based on the conclusions of the evaluation, to*

*change operating methods, governance systems, mechanisms, etc. The recommendations should have a normative form, be clearly worded, and focus on identifiable and achievable actions (this actor should...). Where appropriate, it would be useful to make a distinction between the recommendations that are easy to implement in the short term and the more structural recommendations that should be considered over a longer period of time. There should be a very small number of recommendations.*

## Annex 5 –Template for the Annex to the evaluation report

### *KIWA PEBACC+ project evaluation*

<b>Contents</b>	
Additional information on the context and initial situation .....	29
<b>Project context (sectoral, social, political, economic and/or security) .....</b>	<b>29</b>
Project process .....	30
<b>Origin of the project .....</b>	<b>30</b>
<b>Intervention logic for the project (if specified) .....</b>	<b>30</b>
<b>Timeline and key events of the project implementation .....</b>	<b>30</b>
Analyses .....	30
<b>Analysis 1 underlying the conclusions of evaluation question 1 or of the relevance criterion .....</b>	<b>30</b>
<b>Analysis 2 underlying the conclusions of evaluation question 2 or of the effectiveness criterion .....</b>	<b>30</b>
Future prospects and risks for the project (optional) .....	31
More developed conclusions (optional).....	31
Details on the lessons and recommendations (optional).....	31
Appendix .....	31
<b>Documentation consulted.....</b>	<b>31</b>
<b>List of persons met.....</b>	<b>31</b>
<b>Evaluation frame of reference and detailed methodology (including limits).....</b>	<b>31</b>
<b>Qualitative/quantitative survey reports, focus group reports, etc. ....</b>	<b>31</b>

### **Additional information on the context and initial situation**

#### **Project context (sectoral, social, political, economic and/or security)**

*Indicate the situation at the start of the project and its progress, in the relevant country, region and sector (sectoral organisation, financing, strategy). You should only provide background information here which has affected the project, and which is useful for the evaluation analysis or the understanding of the project.*

*What is the central issue targeted by the project and how has it developed over the period?*

## **Project process**

*In this section, the following points **may** be specified if necessary, and if too sensitive to be included in the public evaluation report.*

### **Origin of the project**

### **Intervention logic for the project (if specified)**

*The intervention logic includes the explicit or implicit assumptions underlying the project strategy and the choices made during its design phase.*

### **Timeline and key events of the project implementation**

## **Analyses**

*This section is organised in accordance with what is indicated in the Terms of Reference and based on the outline of the main report using evaluation questions or DAC criteria.*

### **Analysis 1 underlying the conclusions of evaluation question 1 or of the relevance criterion**

### **Analysis 2 underlying the conclusions of evaluation question 2 or of the effectiveness criterion**

*Where relevant, specific analyses underlying the conclusions on gender, sustainable development, climate...*

### **FOCUS on...**

*This box is optional. It serves to complete or illustrate an analysis, or highlight a particularly interesting result of the evaluation.*

**Future prospects and risks for the project (optional)**

**More developed conclusions (optional)**

**Details on the lessons and recommendations (optional)**

**Appendix**

*Limit the appendix to essential information only.*

**Documentation consulted**

**List of persons met**

**Evaluation frame of reference and detailed methodology (including limits)**

**Qualitative/quantitative survey reports, focus group reports, etc.**

## Annex 6 – Information sources

- **Document review:** indicate the list of documents that have actually consulted and specify to which they are referred when they provide important elements in the argument.
- **Semi-directive interviews:** specify how the interlocutors were selected, how the interviews were conducted and whether any could not be met. Refer as much as possible to the original comments by quoting the interlocutor who mentioned them. It is possible not to mention the names of the interlocutors if they raise sensitive issues, but it is then necessary to provide indications on their status and function to allow the reader to reposition the subject.
- **Focus groups:** encouraged from a learning perspective, but to be used with discernment, in addition to other methods. Ensure that the manner in which the work was carried out (who was invited and how, how the exchanges were conducted) is well documented
- **Existing data:** many sources can be mobilised: household surveys, satellite data, etc.
- **Ad hoc surveys:** Use only if other data sources are not available. Specify the sampling method, pay attention to the design of the questionnaire, ensure quality control during agent training, supervision during collection and at the time of entry.
- **Field observations:** The way in which the sites visited are selected, the duration and conditions of observation must be briefly described. It is recommended to take the GPS points of the locations and present them on a map at the end of the mission. Taking pictures to illustrate the purpose is also recommended.

All the methods below must preserve the principle of informed consent (the interlocutor must be informed of the reason for which he or she is being questioned and explicitly express his or her agreement). Anonymity must also be preserved when dealing with sensitive subjects or when the environment raises security risks for partners and beneficiaries.

## Annex 7 – DAC criteria

### ➤ Relevance

The consultant shall first examine the consistency of the intervention with respect to the objectives and issues determined at the outset (relevance of the project at its origin). When appropriate, it will also assess the founding hypotheses that led to the construction of the intervention logic. He shall also assess how this consistency has evolved over time (evolution of the project over time).

In this framework, the consultant will systematically examine to what extent the project is consistent with:

- Kiwa initiative's objectives
- national guidelines (*define which as appropriate*);
- the definition, needs and expectations of the final beneficiaries (beneficiaries to be defined depending on the project). On this specific point, and particularly in order to judge the relevance at the origin of the project, the consultant may, for example, examine the efforts that were made at the time of the appraisal in order to define the final beneficiaries and take into account their points of view);
- the strategies and interventions of the other stakeholders (*to be defined as appropriate: NGOs, donors, local authorities...*).

### ➤ Coherence

The consultant will assess both the internal and external consistency of the project:

- **the internal coherence** of the project. This will involve reconstructing and judging the consistency of the various resources and tools mobilised to help achieve the objectives on the basis of the logic of the intervention;
- the capacity to integrate the situation and the respective interests of men and women at the time of the project design via preliminary analyses;
- **the external coherence** of the project (consistency with the interventions of the other actors: to be defined as appropriate—bilateral and/or multinational donors, public administrations, NGOs...).

### ➤ Effectiveness

The consultant shall first assess the achievement rate of the project (comparison between the expected outcomes and actual outcomes).

The consultant shall then assess the extent to which the project's objectives were fulfilled (particularly the specific objectives).

The consultant shall analyse the differences observed for both of these assessments and shall seek to analyse the project's contribution to the results achieved.

If necessary, the consultant may give an assessment of the project's ability to adapt to changing circumstances; this may lead a project to change the initial results and objectives (articulation with the relevance criterion).

*If the sustainable development opinion made recommendations*

[Within this framework, the consultant will analyse the implementation of the recommendations contained in the sustainable development opinion].

*For projects that include gender as the main or secondary objective (notes 1 and 2 of the OECD-DAC marker)*

[the results shall be systematically presented for men and women.].

*If aggregated indicators have been defined ex ante.*

[The consultant will pay particular attention to the analysis of the aggregated indicators]

➤ **Efficiency**

Efficiency examines the relationship between the resources implemented and their costs, on the one hand, and the funded outcomes achieved, on the other hand. This will involve assessing whether the resources of the project (funds, expertise, time, etc.) have been converted into results in an optimal manner.

The evaluation carried out by the consultant must make it possible to:

- assess whether the required resources were actually implemented, in a timely fashion and provide an optimal cost/efficiency ratio;

- analyse any observed delays or cost overruns.

*-In cases where this is feasible [measure the unit costs of the projects financed, as well as the per capita investment amounts for the project (i.e. the total amount of investments, or of a category of investment, compared to the number of beneficiaries concerned) and, if possible, to situate these costs and these amounts per capita compared to those observed in other projects.]*

*Depending on the case, it may be useful to specify in the ToR the levels of analysis that could be specifically examined, particularly concerning the procurement procedures, the financial management procedures, the institutional arrangement, the conditions precedent, etc.*

➤ **Impact**

Impact measures the benefits of the intervention on the relevant stakeholders and, particularly, the final beneficiaries. Here, the consultant will analyse the long-term effects (or the perspective of effects), both positive and negative, primary and secondary, that can be reasonably attributed either partly or entirely to the intervention under evaluation, whether directly or not (direct and indirect effects), or intentionally or not (expected and unexpected effects).

*This criterion is only relevant in cases where we have some hindsight after the completion of the activities. It is therefore not always relevant to include it in the evaluation process. The project's contribution to sustainable development objectives (economic development, poverty reduction, reduction of inequalities, including gender inequalities, biodiversity preservation and fight against climate change) as set out in the sustainable development opinion, can serve as a framework to evaluate the impact of the project.*

The consultant shall systematically evaluate the project's impact on gender equality and relationships. This will specifically involve evaluating the impacts of the distribution of responsibilities, access to and the control of resources, the workload of women...].

The evaluation will include an analysis of the results and impacts achieved in terms of mitigation and/or adaptation. *For mitigation projects including an ex-ante carbon footprint*, [the consultant will analyse (i) the relevance of the assumptions made ex-ante to establish the carbon balance and (ii) the feasibility of an ex-post carbon footprint. The consultant shall, if possible,

carry out the ex-post carbon footprint and comment on it or justify missing data for carrying out this assessment].

E&S risk control -

The assessment will include a component related to the E&S risk management approach implemented in the project. The consultant shall include in the assessment an analysis of the compliance of the project's E&S risk management approach with the AFD E&S procedural corpus (refer to "ope-R1066 - Environmental and Social Risk Management Approach for AFD-Funded Operations"). Beyond the compliance analysis, the consultant shall verify the extent to which the environmental and social risk management approach implemented has been relevant, effective, efficient and sustainable. The consultant will study the conditions under which this approach was implemented and the results obtained in terms of E&S risk control and the reduction of the project's negative E&S impacts. In particular, this evaluation will have to assess (i) whether the E&S risks and impacts have been properly assessed and anticipated through the various studies carried out ex-ante, (ii) whether the E&S operational documents (Environmental and Social Management Plan (ESMP), Resettlement Action Plan (RAP), Environmental and Social Action Plan (ESAP) or others) have identified appropriate E&S risk control measures, (iii) whether these measures have been effectively implemented and have achieved the objectives of E&S risk control and reduction of adverse E&S impacts, and (iv) whether the Owner has responded adequately to unanticipated E&S impacts and risks.]

*The Assessment Coordinator will ensure that the Consultant is provided with the operational documents for E&S risk management (ESMP, PAR, ESAP or others), the Environmental and Social Scorecard (ESSP) and, if available, the Environmental and Social Engagement Plan (ESEP) annexed to the Agreement. It may refer to document ope-U2038, which recalls the main principles of AFD's environmental and social risk management approach and proposes an indicative list of specific evaluation questions, by criterion, for assessing the E&S risk management approach.*

*If he/she wishes so, the evaluation coordinator may also request specific support from the Evaluation - ERS/EVA Division, more specifically oriented towards questions relating to the impact.*

### ➤ **Sustainability**

Sustainability is defined as being the continuation of benefits resulting from a development action after the intervention has reached completion. It is consequently assimilated to the likelihood of obtaining sustainable, long-term benefits.

The consultant will therefore examine here whether the fulfilment of the objectives that were set and the results already obtained, or in the process of being obtained, are of a sustainable nature, or even likely to be amplified over the long term, and, if so, under what conditions. In this framework, he will ensure he assesses the sustainability of the structures/institutions initiated or supported under the project, as well as the sustainability of the effects created by the Kiwa initiative-financed project.

The main aspects to be analyzed may be defined by the coordinator of the evaluation according to the project evaluated. It could particularly be useful to differentiate between the different levels of sustainability (institutional, technical, financial, environmental) that the analysis should cover.

### ➤ **Added value of Kiwa initiative's action**

*In this section, the consultant will assess Kiwa initiative's specific contribution and added value with respect to other interventions or ways of proceeding available to the contracting authority. It will be necessary here to make a critical judgment that shall highlight both the strengths and weaknesses of AFD's action. This analysis may focus on the different stages in the project cycle, the characteristics of the financial resources provided by Kiwa initiative, the cross-cutting issues (partnership and dialogue, capacity building, etc.) or on any other issue identified by the consultant.*

*This discussion on the "added value" brought by Kiwa initiative shall be clarified by the evaluation coordinator, particularly with respect to the specificities of the project, the sector concerned, the financial product and the nature of the support provided by Kiwa initiative. Depending on the case in point, this may involve:*

- *the nature of Kiwa initiative's influence on the strategies of local actors;*
- *the appraisal process*
- *the involvement of actors (and final beneficiaries)*
- *the partnership between the local actors and Kiwa initiative;*
- *the operating method and the implementation methods;*
- *the supervision mechanism;*
- *Kiwa initiative's eventual contribution to capacity-building;*
- *possible input from Kiwa initiative in the area of environmental and social risk control;*
- *Kiwa initiative's potential contribution to gender equality;*
- *the leverage or catalysing effect of Kiwa initiative funding on the behavior of other actors;*

*This list of criteria is not restrictive: partnership, participation, gender equity, capacity-building, conservation of natural resources, etc. may also be specific complementary themes for study depending on the nature of the interventions being evaluated.*

*Given the scope of decentralised evaluations and their design basis, as well as the technical limits that make it impossible to provide answers of a suitable quality to an excessive number of questions, **it is recommended to thoroughly check the potential usefulness of expected answers to questions on complementary themes** (and the feasibility of the additional workload that the consultant must take on to deal with such questions within the given timeframe), and to limit any such question to a small number.*