TERMS OF REFERENCE
UNDP-GEF Mid-Term Review Consultant (International)
Sustainable Management of Highly Migratory Fishstocks in the West and Central Pacific

1. INTRODUCTION
This is the Terms of Reference (ToR) for the UNDP-GEF Midterm Review (MTR) of the full-sized project titled Sustainable Management of Highly Migratory Fishstocks in the West and Central Pacific, which is to be undertaken in January 2017. The project started on the Project Document signature date and is in its third year of implementation. In line with the UNDP-GEF Guidance on MTRs, this MTR process was initiated before the submission of the second Project Implementation Report (PIR). This ToR sets out the expectations for this MTR. The MTR process must follow the guidance outlined in the document Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects.

2. PROJECT BACKGROUND INFORMATION
The Sustainable Management of Highly Migratory Fish Stocks in the West and Central Pacific Project (WPEA-SM) was designed to build on the West Pacific East Asia Oceanic Fisheries Management Project (WPEA), a UNDP-GEF medium-size project, aimed at building capacity in Indonesia, the Philippines and Vietnam to engage in regional initiatives to conserve and manage fisheries for highly migratory fish stocks. It was successfully implemented by the WCPFC and field activities were completed at the end of 2012. Studies have shown that the sustainable harvest of shared tuna stocks in the East Asian Seas (EAS) faces a number of threats rooted in the increased demand for fish from a rapidly growing population and increasing exports, which have substantially increased fishing pressure on the marine fishery resources in the past two decades, both within the sub-region and the wider Western and Central Pacific Ocean (WCPO). Tuna fisheries are also threatened by Illegal, Unreported and Unregulated fishing (IUU), compounded by ineffective surveillance and monitoring, incomplete reporting to the Western and Central Pacific Fisheries Commission, and gaps in the regulatory framework.

The proposed Project will remove the main barriers to sustainable fisheries management of highly migratory tuna species in the East Asian Seas, primarily Indonesia, Philippines and Vietnam by strengthening national capacities and regional cooperation to implement fishery sector reforms that will sustain and conserve the highly migratory fish stocks in the West Pacific Ocean and East Asian Large Marine Ecosystems (LME) whilst also considering climatic variability and change.

The Project intends to strengthen national capacities and regional cooperation to implement fishery sector reforms that will sustain and conserve the highly migratory fish stocks in the West Pacific Ocean and East Asia LMEs while considering climatic variability and change. It will:

• Build capacity of Philippines, Indonesia and Vietnam to mainstream climate change impacts into their national fisheries institutions and policies;
• Strengthen regional collaborative mechanisms for monitoring and assessment of highly migratory fish stocks;
• Use an ecosystems approach to fisheries management of shared target and non-target oceanic stocks;
• Strengthen national and regional monitoring, regulation and control;
• Contribute to the implementation of the SDS-SEA; and
• Link its activities to the work of the WCPFC Commission. The WCPFC will establish a Consultative Forum to coordinate monitoring of highly migratory stocks across POWLME and SEA LMEs.
Project Components:

Component 1: REGIONAL GOVERNANCE FOR BUILDING REGIONAL AND NATIONAL ADAPTIVE CAPACITY OF INDONESIA, PHILIPPINES AND VIETNAM IN THE MANAGEMENT OF HIGHLY MIGRATORY FISH STOCKS

1. Improved regional mechanisms for monitoring and assessment of highly migratory fish stocks and illegal, unreported and unregulated (IUU) fishing in the POWP LME and EAS.
2. Enhanced capacity of technical staff, policy and decision makers in Indonesia, Philippines and Vietnam to integrate climate change impacts on highly migratory stocks into management regimes.
3. Climate change concerns mainstreamed into national fishery sector policy in Indonesia, Philippines and Vietnam

Outputs:
- Joint WCPFC/PEMSEA Consultative Forum established for effective monitoring of highly migratory stocks and marine ecosystems across the POWP LME and EAS LMEs
- General guidelines on adaptive management and monitoring of highly migratory stocks to address climate change
- Sector policy instruments developed and management plans reviewed, and climate change adaptive management approach incorporated in sectoral policies and plans

Component 2: IMPLEMENTATION OF POLICY, INSTITUTIONAL AND FISHERY MANAGEMENT REFORM

1. Enhanced compliance of existing legal instruments at national, regional and international levels;
2. Adoption of market-based approaches to sustainable harvest of tunas;
3. Reduced uncertainty in stock assessment of POWP LME and EAS LMEs highly migratory fish stocks, and improved understanding of associated ecosystems and their biodiversity;
4. Ecosystem Approach to Fisheries Management (EAFM) guiding sustainable harvest of the oceanic tuna stocks and reduced by-catch of sea turtles, sharks and seabirds

Outputs:
- WCPFC Convention and relevant regional instruments and agreements implemented; fishery sector national reforms implemented in Indonesia, Philippines and Vietnam
- Tuna fishery supply chains in the EAS analyzed
- Criteria for monitoring programmes and stock assessment for highly migratory fish stocks and associated ecosystems developed
- Ecosystem Approach to Fisheries Management (EAFM) and associated tuna management plans finalized and implemented in Indonesia, Philippines and Vietnam

3. OBJECTIVES OF THE MTR

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, its risks to sustainability.

4. MTR APPROACH & METHODOLOGY

The MTR must provide evidence based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The MTR Consultant will review all relevant sources of information including documents prepared during the preparation phase (i.e. PIF, UNDP Initiation Plan, UNDP Environmental & Social Safeguard Policy, the Project Document, project reports including Annual Project Review/PIRs, project budget revisions, lesson learned reports, national strategic and legal documents, and any other materials that the consultant considers useful for this evidence-based review).
The MTR Consultant is expected to follow a collaborative and participatory approach\(^1\) ensuring close engagement with government counterparts, in particular the, UNDP Country Office, the UNDP Regional Technical Advisor for International Waters, the focal agencies of the three participating countries, and the WCPFC.

Engagement of stakeholders is vital to a successful MTR.\(^2\) Stakeholder involvement should include interviews with stakeholders who have project responsibilities, including but not limited to; executing agencies, senior officials’ component leaders, key experts and consultants in the subject area, Project Board, project stakeholders, academia, local government and CSOs, etc. Additionally, the MTR Consultant is expected to conduct a field mission to all three countries and selected project sites. Interviews will be held with the government focal agencies per country and as well as other stakeholders.

The final MTR report should describe the full MTR approach taken and the rationale for the approach making explicit the underlying assumptions, challenges, strengths and weaknesses about the methods and approach of the review.

5. DETAILED SCOPE OF THE MTR

The MTR Consultant will assess the following four categories of project progress. See the *Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects* for extended descriptions.

i. Project Strategy

Project design:
- Review the problem addressed by the project and the underlying assumptions. Review the effect of any incorrect assumptions or changes to the context to achieving the project results as outlined in the Project Document.
- Review the relevance of the project strategy and assess whether it provides the most effective route towards expected/intended results. Were lessons from other relevant projects properly incorporated into the project design?
- Review how the project addresses country priorities. Review country ownership. Was the project concept in line with the national sector development priorities and plans of the country (or of participating countries in the case of multi-country projects)?
- Review decision-making processes: were perspectives of those who would be affected by project decisions, those who could affect the outcomes, and those who could contribute information or other resources to the process, taken into account during project design processes?
- Review the extent to which relevant gender issues were raised in the project design. See Annex 9 of *Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects* for further guidelines.
- If there are major areas of concern, recommend areas for improvement.

Results Framework/Logframe:
- Undertake a critical analysis of the project’s logframe indicators and targets, assess how “SMART” the midterm and end-of-project targets are (Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Relevant, Time-bound), and suggest specific amendments/revisions to the targets and indicators as necessary.
- Are the project’s objectives and outcomes or components clear, practical, and feasible within its time frame?

---

\(^1\) For ideas on innovative and participatory Monitoring and Evaluation strategies and techniques, see [UNDP Discussion Paper: Innovations in Monitoring & Evaluating Results](https://undp.org/content/undp/en/deliver-results/monitoring-evaluating.html), 05 Nov 2013.

\(^2\) For more stakeholder engagement in the M&E process, see the [UNDP Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results](https://undp.org/content/undp/en/deliver-results.html), Chapter 3, pg. 93.
Examine if progress so far has led to, or could in the future catalyse beneficial development effects (i.e. income generation, gender equality and women’s empowerment, improved governance etc...) that should be included in the project results framework and monitored on an annual basis.

Ensure broader development and gender aspects of the project are being monitored effectively. Develop and recommend SMART ‘development’ indicators, including sex-disaggregated indicators and indicators that capture development benefits.

ii. Progress Towards Results

Progress Towards Outcomes Analysis:

- Review the logframe indicators against progress made towards the end-of-project targets using the Progress Towards Results Matrix and following the Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects; colour code progress in a “traffic light system” based on the level of progress achieved; assign a rating on progress for each outcome; make recommendations from the areas marked as “Not on target to be achieved” (red).

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Strategy</th>
<th>Indicator³</th>
<th>Baseline Level⁴</th>
<th>Level in 1st PIR (self-reported)</th>
<th>Midterm Target⁵</th>
<th>End-of-project Target</th>
<th>Midterm Level &amp; Assessment⁶</th>
<th>Achievement Rating⁷</th>
<th>Justification for Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Objective:</td>
<td>Indicator (if applicable):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 1:</td>
<td>Indicator 1:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indicator 2:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 2:</td>
<td>Indicator 3:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indicator 4:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Etc.</td>
<td>Etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Indicator Assessment Key

Green= Achieved  Yellow= On target to be achieved  Red= Not on target to be achieved

In addition to the progress towards outcomes analysis:

- Compare and analyse the GEF Tracking Tool at the Baseline with the one completed right before the Midterm Review.
- Identify remaining barriers to achieving the project objective in the remainder of the project.
- By reviewing the aspects of the project that have already been successful, identify ways in which the project can further expand these benefits.

iii. Project Implementation and Adaptive Management

Management Arrangements:

³ Populate with data from the Logframe and scorecards
⁴ Populate with data from the Project Document
⁵ If available
⁶ Colour code this column only
⁷ Use the 6 point Progress Towards Results Rating Scale: HS, S, MS, MU, U, HU
• Review overall effectiveness of project management as outlined in the Project Document. Have changes been made and are they effective? Are responsibilities and reporting lines clear? Is decision-making transparent and undertaken in a timely manner? Recommend areas for improvement.
• Review the quality of execution of the Executing Agency/Implementing Partner(s) and recommend areas for improvement.
• Review the quality of support provided by the GEF Partner Agency (UNDP) and recommend areas for improvement.

Work Planning:
• Review any delays in project start-up and implementation, identify the causes and examine if they have been resolved.
• Are work-planning processes results-based? If not, suggest ways to re-orientate work planning to focus on results?
• Examine the use of the project’s results framework/logframe as a management tool and review any changes made to it since project start.

Finance and co-finance:
• Consider the financial management of the project, with specific reference to the cost-effectiveness of interventions.
• Review the changes to fund allocations as a result of budget revisions and assess the appropriateness and relevance of such revisions.
• Does the project have the appropriate financial controls, including reporting and planning, that allow management to make informed decisions regarding the budget and allow for timely flow of funds?
• Informed by the co-financing monitoring table to be filled out, provide commentary on co-financing: is co-financing being used strategically to help the objectives of the project? Is the Project Implementing Partner meeting with all co-financing partners regularly in order to align financing priorities and annual work plans?

Project-level Monitoring and Evaluation Systems:
• Review the monitoring tools currently being used: Do they provide the necessary information? Do they involve key partners? Are they aligned or mainstreamed with national systems? Do they use existing information? Are they efficient? Are they cost-effective? Are additional tools required? How could they be made more participatory and inclusive?
• Examine the financial management of the project monitoring and evaluation budget. Are sufficient resources being allocated to monitoring and evaluation? Are these resources being allocated effectively?

Stakeholder Engagement:
• Project management: Has the project developed and leveraged the necessary and appropriate partnerships with direct and tangential stakeholders?
• Participation and country-driven processes: Do local and national government stakeholders support the objectives of the project? Do they continue to have an active role in project decision-making that supports efficient and effective project implementation?
• Participation and public awareness: To what extent has stakeholder involvement and public awareness contributed to the progress towards achievement of project objectives?

Reporting:
• Assess how adaptive management changes have been reported by the project management and shared with the Project Board.
• Assess how well the Project Implementing Partner and country-partners undertake and fulfil GEF reporting requirements (i.e. how have they addressed poorly-rated PIRs, if applicable?)
• Assess how lessons derived from the adaptive management process have been documented, shared with key partners and internalized by partners.

Communications:
• Review internal project communication with stakeholders: Is communication regular and effective? Are there key stakeholders left out of communication? Are there feedback mechanisms when communication is received? Does this communication with stakeholders contribute to their awareness of project outcomes and activities and investment in the sustainability of project results?
• Review external project communication: Are proper means of communication established or being established to express the project progress and intended impact to the public (is there a web presence, for example? Or did the project implement appropriate outreach and public awareness campaigns?)
• For reporting purposes, write one half-page paragraph that summarizes the project’s progress towards results in terms of contribution to sustainable development benefits, as well as global environmental benefits.

iv. Sustainability

• Validate whether the risks identified in the Project Document, Annual Project Review/PIRs and the ATLAS Risk Management Module are the most important and whether the risk ratings applied are appropriate and up to date. If not, explain why.
• In addition, assess the following risks to sustainability:

Financial risks to sustainability:
• What is the likelihood of financial and economic resources not being available once the GEF assistance ends (consider potential resources can be from multiple sources, such as the public and private sectors, income generating activities, and other funding that will be adequate financial resources for sustaining project’s outcomes)?

Socio-economic risks to sustainability:
• Are there any social or political risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project outcomes? What is the risk that the level of stakeholder ownership (including ownership by governments and other key stakeholders) will be insufficient to allow for the project outcomes/benefits to be sustained? Do the various key stakeholders see that it is in their interest that the project benefits continue to flow? Is there sufficient public / stakeholder awareness in support of the long term objectives of the project? Are lessons learned being documented by the Project Implementing Partner on a continual basis and shared/ transferred to appropriate parties who could learn from the project and potentially replicate and/or scale it in the future?

Institutional Framework and Governance risks to sustainability:
• Do the legal frameworks, policies, governance structures and processes pose risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project benefits? While assessing this parameter, also consider if the required systems/mechanisms for accountability, transparency, and technical knowledge transfer are in place.

Environmental risks to sustainability:
• Are there any environmental risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project outcomes?
Conclusions & Recommendations

The MTR Consultant will include a section of the report setting out the MTR’s evidence-based conclusions, in light of the findings.\(^8\)

Recommendations should be succinct suggestions for critical intervention that are specific, measurable, achievable, and relevant. A recommendation table should be put in the report’s executive summary. See the Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects for guidance on a recommendation table.

The MTR Consultant should make no more than 10 recommendations total.

Ratings

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

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

6. TIMEFRAME

\(^8\) Alternatively, MTR conclusions may be integrated into the body of the report.
The total duration of the MTR will be approximately 10 weeks starting January 2017, and shall not exceed four (4) months from when the consultant(s) are hired. The tentative MTR timeframe is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIMEFRAME</th>
<th>ACTIVITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>December 2016</td>
<td>Application closes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 January 2017</td>
<td>Select MTR Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within 1 week after signing</td>
<td>Prep the MTR Consultant (handover of Project Documents)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 weeks after contract signing</td>
<td>Document review and preparing MTR Inception Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Finalization and Validation of MTR Inception Report- latest start of MTR mission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 days (3 weeks)</td>
<td>MTR mission: stakeholder meetings, interviews, field visits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 day</td>
<td>Mission wrap-up meeting &amp; presentation of initial findings- earliest end of MTR mission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 days</td>
<td>Preparing draft report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 days</td>
<td>Incorporating audit trail from feedback on draft report/Finalization of MTR report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 days</td>
<td>Preparation &amp; Issue of Management Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 day</td>
<td>Presentation to the Project Steering Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 March 2017</td>
<td>Expected date of full MTR completion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Options for site visits should be provided in the Inception Report.

7. MIDTERM REVIEW DELIVERABLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Deliverable</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Timing</th>
<th>Responsibilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>MTR Inception Report</td>
<td>MTR Consultant clarifies objectives and methods of Midterm Review</td>
<td>No later than 2 weeks before the MTR mission</td>
<td>MTR Consultant submits to the Commissioning Unit and project management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Presentation</td>
<td>Initial Findings</td>
<td>End of MTR mission</td>
<td>MTR Consultant presents to project management and the Commissioning Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Draft Final Report</td>
<td>Full report (using guidelines on content outlined in Annex B) with annexes</td>
<td>Within 3 weeks of the MTR mission</td>
<td>Sent to the Commissioning Unit, reviewed by RTA, Project Coordinating Unit, GEF OFP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Final Report*</td>
<td>Revised report with audit trail detailing how all</td>
<td>Within 1 week of receiving UNDP</td>
<td>Sent to the Commissioning Unit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
received comments have  
(and have not) been  
addressed in the final MTR  
report  

comments on draft  

*The final MTR report must be in English. If applicable, the Commissioning Unit may choose to arrange for a translation of the report into a language more widely shared by national stakeholders.

8. MTR ARRANGEMENTS

The principal responsibility for managing this MTR resides with the Commissioning Unit. The Commissioning Unit for this project’s MTR is UNDP Philippines. The commissioning unit will contract the consultant – after review of the selected candidate by UNDP CO together with the WCPFC - and ensure the timely provision of per diems and travel arrangements to all countries to be visited for the MTR Consultant. UNDP CO will be responsible for liaising with the MTR Consultant to provide all relevant documents, set up stakeholder interviews, and arrange field visits. The MTR Consultant will meet virtually with the UNDP CO and UNDP RTA to discuss the evaluation’s scope and objectives, as well as to debrief the UNDP on the evaluation’s findings.

9. QUALIFICATIONS

The consultant cannot have participated in the project preparation, formulation, and/or implementation (including the writing of the Project Document) and should not have a conflict of interest with project’s related activities. The selection of consultant will be aimed at maximizing the overall qualities in the following areas:

- Experience applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios (5%);
- Competence in adaptive management, as applied to sustainable fisheries (5%)
- Previous Experience working with the GEF or GEF-evaluations (15%);
- Experience working in the East Asian Region, particularly Indonesia, Philippines and Vietnam (15%)
- Work experience in the field of sustainable fisheries management for at least 10 years (20%);
- Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender; experience in gender sensitive evaluation and analysis (10%).
- Excellent communication analytical skills (10%);
- Project evaluation/review experiences within United Nations system will be considered an asset (10%);
- A Master’s degree in environmental management, fisheries management, community development, or other closely related field (10%).

The International Consultant, will primarily cover the tasks, but not limited to the following:

1. Prepare the MTR Inception Report including a detailed plan of the mission with an interview schedule, evaluation questions and provide it to the UNDP and CPMU no later than 2 weeks before the MTR mission
2. Ensure the conduct of evaluation activities as agreed on with WCPFC and UNDP; (including visits to Vietnam, Indonesia and Philippines)
3. Consolidate and analyze data and information gathered during the evaluation;
4. Finalize the MTE Report;
In consultation with the Consultant and as requested, the UNDP CO will make available all relevant documentation and provide contact information to key project partners and stakeholders, and facilitate contact where needed. The Consultant will request UNDP CO to assist in organizing any briefing de-briefing meetings including coordination of stakeholders’ input in the evaluation draft report.

10. PAYMENT MODALITIES AND SPECIFICATIONS

Consultants will be contracted by UNDP and remunerated according to the reviewed and accepted financial proposal. The contract will be output-based and payment issued only upon delivery of satisfactory outputs/milestones.

**Table 6. Payment Schedule**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>%</th>
<th>Milestone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20%</td>
<td>Following submission and acceptance of the MTR mission Inception Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40%</td>
<td>Following submission and approval of the 1ST draft MTR report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40%</td>
<td>Following submission and approval (UNDP CO and IW RTA) of the final MTR report</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. APPLICATION PROCESS

Applicants are requested to apply online (http://www.undp.org.ph.jobs). Individual consultants are invited to submit applications together with their CV for these positions.

The application should contain a current and complete C.V. in English with indication of the e-mail and phone contact. Shortlisted candidates will be requested to submit a price offer indicating the total cost of the assignment (lumpsum / daily fees only).

UNDP applies a fair and transparent selection process that will take into account the competencies/skills of the applicants as well as their financial proposals. Qualified women and members of social minorities are encouraged to apply.
TOR ANNEX A
LIST OF DOCUMENTS TO BE REVIEWED BY THE MTR Consultant

1. PIF
2. UNDP Initiation Plan
3. UNDP Project Document
4. UNDP Environmental and Social Screening results
5. Project Inception Report
6. All Project Implementation Reports (PIR’s)
7. Quarterly progress reports and work plans of the various implementation task teams
8. Audit reports
9. Finalized GEF focal area Tracking Tools at CEO endorsement and midterm (fill in specific TTs for this project’s focal area)
10. Oversight mission reports
11. All monitoring reports prepared by the project
12. Financial and Administration guidelines used by the Project
13. Project Document and CEO Endorsement –
15. Quarterly Reports
16. APRs/PIRs (2015)
17. Minutes of National Steering Committee meetings

ToR ANNEX B: Guidelines on Contents for the Midterm Review Report

i. Basic Report Information (for opening page or title page)
   • Title of UNDP supported GEF financed project
   • UNDP PIMS# and GEF project ID#
   • MTR time frame and date of MTR report
   • Region and countries included in the project
   • GEF Operational Focal Area/Strategic Program
   • Executing Agency/Implementing Partner and other project partners
   • MTR CO members
   • Acknowledgements

ii. Table of Contents

iii. Acronyms and Abbreviations
1. Executive Summary (3-5 pages)
   • Project Information Table
   • Project Description (brief)
   • Project Progress Summary (between 200-500 words)
   • MTR Ratings & Achievement Summary Table
   • Concise summary of conclusions
   • Recommendation Summary Table

2. Introduction (2-3 pages)
   • Purpose of the MTR and objectives
   • Scope & Methodology: principles of design and execution of the MTR, MTR approach and data

---

9 This list will be updated before MTE as more documents become available.
10 The Report length should not exceed 40 pages in total (not including annexes).
collection methods, limitations to the MTR
• Structure of the MTR report

3. Project Description and Background Context (3-5 pages)
• Development context: environmental, socio-economic, institutional, and policy factors relevant to the project objective and scope
• Problems that the project sought to address: threats and barriers targeted
• Project Description and Strategy: objective, outcomes and expected results, description of field sites (if any)
• Project Implementation Arrangements: short description of the Project Board, key implementing partner arrangements, etc.
• Project timing and milestones
• Main stakeholders: summary list

4. Findings (12-14 pages)
4.1 Project Strategy
• Project Design
• Results Framework/Logframe
4.2 Progress Towards Results
• Progress towards outcomes analysis
• Remaining barriers to achieving the project objective
4.3 Project Implementation and Adaptive Management
• Management Arrangements
• Work planning
• Finance and co-finance
• Project-level monitoring and evaluation systems
• Stakeholder engagement
• Reporting
• Communications
4.4 Sustainability
• Financial risks to sustainability
• Socio-economic to sustainability
• Institutional framework and governance risks to sustainability
• Environmental risks to sustainability

5. Conclusions and Recommendations (4-6 pages)
5.1 Conclusions
• Comprehensive and balanced statements (that are evidence-based and connected to the MTR’s findings) which highlight the strengths, weaknesses and results of the project
5.2 Recommendations
• Corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project
• Actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the project
• Proposals for future directions underlining main objectives

6. Annexes
• MTR ToR (excluding ToR annexes)
• MTR evaluative matrix (evaluation criteria with key questions, indicators, sources of data, and methodology)
• Example Questionnaire or Interview Guide used for data collection
• Ratings Scales
• MTR mission itinerary
• List of persons interviewed
• List of documents reviewed
• Co-financing table (if not previously included in the body of the report)
• Signed UNEG Code of Conduct form
- Signed MTR final report clearance form
- *Annexed in a separate file:* Audit trail from received comments on draft MTR report
- *Annexed in a separate file:* Relevant midterm tracking tools (*METT, FSC, Capacity scorecard, etc.*)

**ToR ANNEX B: Midterm Review Evaluative Matrix Template**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluative Questions</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>Methodology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Strategy: To what extent is the project strategy relevant to country priorities, country ownership, and the best route towards expected results?</td>
<td><em>(i.e. relationships established, level of coherence between project design and implementation approach, specific activities conducted, quality of risk mitigation strategies, etc.)</em></td>
<td><em>(i.e. project documents, national policies or strategies, websites, project staff, project partners, data collected throughout the MTR mission, etc.)</em></td>
<td><em>(i.e. document analysis, data analysis, interviews with project staff, interviews with stakeholders, etc.)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progress Towards Results: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved thus far?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Implementation and Adaptive Management: Has the project been implemented efficiently, cost-effectively, and been able to adapt to any changing conditions thus far? To what extent are project-level monitoring and evaluation systems, reporting, and project communications supporting the project’s implementation?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, socio-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TOR ANNEX C: MTR RATINGS

#### Ratings for Progress Towards Results: (one rating for each outcome and for the objective)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Highly Satisfactory (HS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Satisfactory (S)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Moderately Satisfactory (MS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Moderately Unsatisfactory (HU)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory (U)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Ratings for Project Implementation & Adaptive Management: (one overall rating)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Highly Satisfactory (HS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Satisfactory (S)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Moderately Satisfactory (MS)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|        | Moderately | Implementation of some of the seven components is not leading to efficient
**Ratings for Sustainability: (one overall rating)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Likely (L)</th>
<th>Moderately Likely (ML)</th>
<th>Moderately Unlikely (MU)</th>
<th>Unlikely (U)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Negligible risks to sustainability, with key outcomes on track to be achieved by the project’s closure and expected to continue into the foreseeable future</td>
<td>Moderate risks, but expectations that at least some outcomes will be sustained due to the progress towards results on outcomes at the Midterm Review</td>
<td>Significant risk that key outcomes will not carry on after project closure, although some outputs and activities should carry on</td>
<td>Severe risks that project outcomes as well as key outputs will not be sustained</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ToR ANNEX D: MTR Report Clearance Form**
*(to be completed by the Commissioning)*

Midterm Review Report Reviewed and Cleared By:

**Commissioning Unit**

Name: _________________________________

Signature: _________________________________ Date: _________________________________

**UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Advisor**

Name: _________________________________

Signature: _________________________________ Date: _________________________________
### ANNEX F: EVALUATION CONSULTANT CODE OF CONDUCT AGREEMENT FORM

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

---

**Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form**

**Agreement to abide by the Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN System**

**Name of Consultant:** ____________________________________________________

**Name of Consultancy Organization** (where relevant): ________________________

I confirm that I have received and understood and will abide by the United Nations Code of Conduct for Evaluation.

Signed at *(place)* on *(date)*

Signature: ______________________________
TOR ANNEX G
EVALUATION REPORT OUTLINE

Opening Page
• Title of UNDP supported GEF financed project
• UNDP and GEF project ID#s.
• Evaluation time frame and date of evaluation report
• Region and countries included in the project
• GEF Operational Program/Strategic Program
• Implementing Partner and other project partners
• MTR Consultant
• Acknowledgements

Executive Summary
• Project Summary Table
• Project Description (brief)
• Evaluation Rating Table
• Summary of conclusions, recommendations and lessons

Acronyms and Abbreviations
(See: UNDP Editorial Manual)

1. Introduction
• Purpose of the evaluation
• Scope & Methodology
• Structure of the evaluation report

2. Project description and development context
• Project start and duration
• Problems that the project sought to address
• Immediate and development objectives of the project
• Baseline Indicators established
• Main stakeholders
• Expected Results

3. Findings
(In addition to a descriptive assessment, all criteria marked with (*) must be rated)

---

12 The Report length should not exceed 40 pages in total (not including annexes).
13 UNDP Style Manual, Office of Communications, Partnerships Bureau, updated November 2008
3.1 Project Design / Formulation
- Analysis of LFA/Results Framework (Project logic /strategy; Indicators)
- Assumptions and Risks
- Lessons from other relevant projects (e.g., same focal area) incorporated into project design
- Planned stakeholder participation
- Replication approach
- UNDP comparative advantage
- Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector
- Management arrangements

3.2 Project Implementation
- Adaptive management (changes to the project design and project outputs during implementation)
- Partnership arrangements (with relevant stakeholders involved in the country/region)
- Feedback from M&E activities used for adaptive management
- Project Finance
- Monitoring and evaluation: design at entry and implementation (*)
- UNDP and Implementing Partner implementation / execution (*) coordination, and operational issues

3.3 Project Results
- Overall results (attainment of objectives) (*)
- Relevance(*)
- Effectiveness & Efficiency (*)
- Country ownership
- Mainstreaming
- Sustainability (*)
- Impact

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

5. Annexes
- ToR
- Itinerary
- List of persons interviewed
- Summary of field visits

- List of documents reviewed
- Evaluation Question Matrix
- Questionnaire used and summary of results
- Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form
ANNEX H: EVALUATION REPORT CLEARANCE FORM
(to be completed by CO and UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based in the region and included in the final document)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Report Reviewed and Cleared by</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UNDP County Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name:___________________________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signature:______________________ Date:______________________________</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNDP GEF RTA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signature:______________________ Date:______________________________</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex I

CO-FINANCING TABLE FOR UNDP
SUPPORTED GEF FINANCED PROJECTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Co Financing Types/Sources</th>
<th>IA Own Financing (Million US $)</th>
<th>Government (Million US $)</th>
<th>Other Sources(^{15}) (Million US $)</th>
<th>Total Financing (Million US $)</th>
<th>Total Disbursement (Million US $)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proposed</td>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>Proposed</td>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>Proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Kind</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non grant instruments(^{16})</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Types</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{15}\) Other Sources refer to contributions mobilized for the project from other multilateral agencies, bilateral development cooperation agencies, NGOs, the private sector, etc. Specify each and explain “Other sources” of co-financing when possible.

\(^{16}\) Describe “Non-grant instruments” (such as guarantees, contingent grants, etc.)