REPORTING FOR RESULTS-BASED REDD+ ACTIONS PROJECT

Mid-Term Review

Terms of Reference

Background

The overall goal of the Reporting for Results-based REDD+ Actions (RRR+) project is to contribute to the assessment of progress towards the ultimate objectives of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) and the Paris Agreement through improved greenhouse gas (GHG) inventory (GHGI) reporting. In particular, the project aims to develop and institutionalize the capacities of tropical forest countries to prepare and report to the UNFCCC and the Paris Agreement on anthropogenic GHG emissions and removals from the agriculture, forestry, and other land use sectors (AFOLU).

The RRR+ project is co-funded by the Norwegian Agency for Development (NORAD) and by the Coalition for Rainforest Nations (CfRN). The CfRN is the implementing entity in cooperation with KPMG. The first phase of the RRR+ project ran from 2016 and 2019 and set out to build capacity for measuring reductions in GHG emissions and enhancement of carbon stocks in agriculture, forest, and other land use in 21 tropical and subtropical forest countries. Currently, CfRN is implementing the second phase of the RRR+ project (2020-2023) covering a total of 13 rainforest nations that have and/or are still receiving support (Belize, Bolivia, Cameroon, Congo, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Democratic Republic of Congo, Fiji, Gabon, Ghana, Honduras, Mozambique, and Saint Lucia).

Today, despite all the limitations caused by the Covid-19 pandemic in 2020 and 2021, all targets identified in the results framework have been over-achieved and the project is very well on track and has delivered the capacity building for which it has been designed. The RRR+ project is supporting countries to prepare and refine the single National GHGI database, to develop the forest reference emission level/forest reference level (FREL/FRL), and to obtain REDD+ results, as appropriate. The RRR+ project is also assisting countries during the technical assessment of the FREL/FRL and the technical analysis of the REDD+ Technical Annex as part of the UNFCCC process, in full respect of all Paris Agreement decisions.

Coalition for Rainforest Nations

Purpose of the Mid-Term Review evaluation

The Mid-Term Review (MTR) is aimed at assessing how the different contexts in which the project is implemented affect its performance; whether the underlying assumptions and logic of the project hold at the country level; and whether external assumptions, needed to enable and sustain change, are valid. The MTR will consist of evaluation of the performance of the project, identification of good practices and challenges, and outlining of corrective actions for the next phase, if appropriate. Specifically, the MTR will:

- Provide for an independent assessment of:
    - The extent to which the RRR+ project is performing against its results framework[1];
    - The extent to which the project represents good value for money[2]; and
    - Limitations and challenges encountered and expected, and mitigation measures undertaken.
- Provide recommendations to enhance project implementation and maximize delivery of results.
- Provide recommendations for a potential project extension, including any appropriate modification or improvement for the next phase.

The MTR should not aim to explore or challenge the results framework itself, nor does it directly explore financing aspects of the project, although it does include assessment of value for money where this is possible/relevant.

Scope of work

The MTR will analyze all the countries in which the RRR+ project is being implemented. Ideally, to have a proper sense of counterfactuals (e.g., what would have happened if the project did not take place?), the evaluation would also include analysis of some control countries where the project is not being implemented.

The review will consist of desk research (or possible field visits, TBD) to participating countries, as well as online surveys and interviews with stakeholders who are involved in the RRR+ project. The MTR will have the following characteristics:

---

[1] Framework to be shared with selected vendor
[2] Value for Money (VfM) is the reflection of sound management principles, operational impact, and performance yield. Value for Money can be used as a management tool to determine whether a supported project has been able to obtain maximum impact with the resources provided.

Coalition for Rainforest Nations

Focus	• Assessment of progress against the project results framework; • Assessment of value for money (where possible); • Identification of good practices, limitations, and challenges; and • Emphasis on recommendations for the next phase of the project.
Timeframe	September 2022 – January 2023
Values & Emphasis	• Independent external assessment; • Diverse and multilingual expert personnel; • Participatory and collaborative approach; and • Exploration of opportunities to strengthen the RRR+ project as necessary to achieve results in cost-effective and innovative way.

Objectives and evaluation questions

The objective of the MTR is to assess the RRR+ project's relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, and contribution to the impacts and sustainability beyond the program period. The evaluation also aims to assess the project risk management. The objective for this evaluation has been expressed as a set of Key Evaluation Questions (KEQs) to be addressed and supported by the sub-questions, both of which can be found below:

Key evaluation question	Sub-question	Evaluation criteria
1. To what extent is the program addressing the beneficiaries' requirements, interests, and country needs?	1.1. Has the program responded to the priorities of rainforest nations as originally identified in the proposal? 1.2. Has the program been able to respond to significant changes in the rainforest nations' priorities? 1.3. What elements of the program design and governance supported or hindered efforts to be responsive to significant changes in the rainforest nations' priorities? 1.5. Has the program been working with the most strategic partners and counterparts (including stakeholders taking part in the development of, and not limited to, Biennial Update Reports, National Communications, GHG inventories, Forest reference emissions levels and REDD+ Technical Annexes such as relevant ministries, national agencies, forestry commissions, national REDD+ offices, etc.)? 1.6 To which degree lessons learned from phase 1[3] have been followed up and integrated in the program?	Relevance, Sustainability

---

[3] Lessons learned to be shared with selected vendor

2. Is the program complementary and well-coordinated with relevant interventions of other development partners and the private sector?	2.1. Has the program built upon or aligned with the activities and outputs of other development partners and initiatives working on the same theme? 2.2. How has the program ensured that the activities and outputs are known and taken forward by other development partners and initiatives working on the same theme in the same countries? 2.3. What elements of the program design and governance supported/ hindered effective coordination with other development partners and initiatives working on the same theme in the same countries? 2.4. Has CfRN effectively engaged with the private sector and have any resources been leveraged from the private sector?	Relevance, Coherence
3. Did the program achieve the outputs, outcomes, and impacts that were expected?	3.1. Have the program outputs been delivered, and outcomes been achieved as intended, or are they on track to be delivered? 3.2. Are the outcomes likely to lead to the subsequent impacts, either intended (as per the logframe) or unintended? 3.3. What is the quality of the program activities in view of reaching the program's objectives? 3.4. How is CfRN's ability to effectively monitor and report on the indicators and results defined in the results framework, and how has this information been used by the program to manage implementation?	Effectiveness, Impact
4. Are the results of the program likely to continue after the end of Norwegian support?	5.1. Have the measures to ensure sustainability of outcomes and transformational impact, as described in the original design[4], been appropriately implemented? 5.2. Have the measures to ensure sustainability of outcomes and transformational impact been effective (or likely to be effective)? 5.3. How could measures to ensure sustainability of outcomes and transformational impact have been enhanced? 5.4. What is the documented investment from the rainforest nations to ensure program activities are maintained once the Norwegian funding is phased out? 5.5. Are there any financial or other risks that may jeopardize the sustainability of program outputs? 5.6. How does CfRN document and use lessons learned from the program?	Impact, Sustainability

---

[4] The original design to be shared with selected vendor

Overall approach of the MTR

The MTR will be aligned with the Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation's (NORAD) Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) requirements and more broadly with the OECD's DAC Criteria for Evaluating Development Assistance: Relevance, Effectiveness, Efficiency, Impact and Sustainability. Gender-sensitive and South-South cooperation will be considered as important pillars of this project. Also, the complexity of the RRR+ project – namely the multi-country dimension, the timeframe, and the available budget – should be carefully considered.

Timeline and deliverables

Key Event	Timeline
Terms of Reference published	September 2022
Proposals due	27 September 2022
Vendor selection finalized	7 October 2022

In undertaking this MTR, the following deliverables and timeline are expected:

Deliverable	Timeline
Inception report (including methodology and approach)	0 + 4 weeks
Draft MTR	0 + 12 weeks
Final MTR	0 + 20 weeks

Eligibility requirements:

The MTR is expected to be conducted by a team with a diverse set of multi-disciplinary members, one of them being the designated team leader. Preference will be given to candidate teams with diverse members. Individual vendors are still welcome to submit. The team or individual will have the following competencies and/or experience:

- At least ten (10) years of experience in evaluating projects of a similar nature and scope.
- At least five (5) years of experience in conducting mid-term reviews or end of project evaluations for NORAD or other development bank funded projects.
- At least a master's degree in natural resource conservation and management or related fields such as: environmental economics, natural resources economics, environmental science, climate change, gender & development, or other relevant fields.
- The team leader will have at least five (5) years of expertise in areas related to GHG inventories, Paris Agreement and REDD+, as well as expertise and demonstrated experience in designing evaluation methodology and data collection tools and demonstrated experience in leading similar reviews/evaluations.
- The role of the team leader will be defining the approach and methodology; guiding and managing the review team; leading the mid-term review mission; drafting and revising, as required, the MTR reports; and debriefing and presenting the findings.
- Excellent English, French, and Spanish communication skills preferred.

Proposal requirements:

Technical service proposal information

Vendors are required to submit the following details in their technical proposal:

- Executive summary of proposal
- Vendor candidates' backgrounds, including CVs
- List of similar projects within the last five (5) years
- At least one (1) relevant example demonstrating the vendor's experience in conducting and managing evaluations of projects that involve international climate-based organizations and non-governmental organizations (NGOs), as well as in conducting evaluations of projects and programs related to GHG, emissions, agriculture, forestry, land use sectors, or climate

- Project methodology, including a description of how the vendor intends to undertake the delivery of tasks, providing justification of the approach
- Contact details of three (3) references, familiar with the vendor's experience

Cost proposal information

- Proposed rates and project costs are deemed to include all costs, insurances, taxes, fees, expenses, liabilities, obligations, risk, and other things necessary for the performance of the Terms of Reference
- Any charge not stated in the Proposal as being additional, will not be allowed
- All prices should be in US$

Proposal submittal information

- Proposals are due 27 September 2022 at 11:59PM Eastern Standard Time
- Proposals should follow technical and cost proposal guidelines above, as well as highlight eligibility requirements
- Format should be in PDF
- Proposals should be submitted to mtrsubmissions@cfrn.org