TERMS OF REFERENCE
UNDP-GEF Mid-Term Review Consultant (International)
Institutional, Legal and Governance consultant

Scaling up the Implementation of the Sustainable Development Strategy for the Seas of East Asia (SDS-SEA)

1. INTRODUCTION

This is the Terms of Reference (ToR) for the UNDP-GEF Midterm Review (MTR) of the full-sized project titled *Scaling up the Implementation of the Sustainable Development Strategy for the Seas of East Asia (SDS-SEA)*, which is to be undertaken in January 2018. 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 UNDP/GEF/PEMSEA Project on Scaling up the Implementation of the Sustainable Development Strategy for the Seas of East Asia (SDS-SEA) is a GEF project being implemented by UNDP and executed by PEMSEA. The countries bordering the EAS region - Cambodia, China, Indonesia, Japan, Lao PDR, Philippines, RO Korea, Singapore, Thailand, Timor Leste, and Vietnam - endorsed the Project. The Project commenced in 2014 and will end in December 2019.

The Project is the fourth phase of the UNDP-GEF projects under the Partnerships in Environmental Management for the Seas of East Asia (PEMSEA)[1]. The overall goal of the project is to reduce pollution and rebuild degraded marine resources through scaling up the implementation of the Sustainable Development Strategy for the Seas of East Asia (SDS-SEA) in Cambodia, PR China, Indonesia, Lao PDR, Philippines, Thailand, Timor Leste and Vietnam that share six large marine ecosystems (LMEs), and related catchment areas. The project covering 2014-2019 represents the "transformation phase" of a series of GEF support, culminating in the sustainability of PEMSEA as the regional coordinating mechanism for implementation of the SDS-SEA. It also makes a stronger linkage between sustainable development of river basins, coastal and marine areas and local, national and regional investment processes in a "blue economy".

The project objective is to catalyze actions and investments at the regional, national and local levels to rehabilitate and sustain coastal and marine ecosystem services and build a sustainable coastal and ocean-based economy in the East Asian region.

This objective will be achieved through the implementation of the following three interconnected Project components:

Component 1: PARTNERSHIPS IN COASTAL AND OCEAN GOVERNANCE ENABLING A SELF-SUSTAINING, COUNTRY-OWNED REGIONAL MECHANISM GOVERNING THE LMEs IN THE EAST ASIAN REGION

---

[1] Pilot phase project (1994-1999): "Marine Pollution Protection and Management of the East Asian Seas Region."; Second phase project (1999-2008): "Building Partnerships in Environmental Management for the Seas of East Asia". Third phase project (2008-2014): "Implementation of the SDS-SEA".

1. A self-sustaining, country-owned, regional mechanism governing and managing LMEs and coastal waters, rebuilding and sustaining ecosystems services and reducing the impacts of climate change on coastal populations in the East Asian Seas region.
2. National and local governments adopt and initiate ocean policy and institutional improvements
3. Innovative financing mechanisms in place for sustained operation of the country-owned regional coordinating mechanism

Outputs:
- Signed Agreements with Country and Non-Country Partners on voluntary financing
- Signed Partnership Agreements between PEMSEA with YSLME Commission, WCPF Commission and other regional governance mechanisms for collaborative planning, coordination and implementation among the respective SAPS, while addressing program sustainability and integration with broader regional cooperation frameworks
- The EAS program monitored, evaluated and reported to stakeholders via Regional State of Coasts and Oceans Report
- Improved national coastal and ocean policies and institutional arrangements for sustainable management of priority coastal and marine areas, surrounding watershed and blue economy development initiated in at least 6 participating countries
- National sector legislative agenda developed in at least 6 participating countries on ICM, CCA/DRR, integrated land and sea use zoning/marine spatial planning and other innovative regulatory and economic instruments
- SDS-SEA targets incorporated into national and local medium-term development and investment plans in at least 3 participating countries and 8 participating local governments, etc.
- Suite of products, services, funding mechanisms and partnership arrangements adopted and implemented in collaboration with Partners, Sponsoring Organizations, donors and private sector/business community

Component 2: HEALTHY AND RESILIENT MARINE AND COASTAL ECOSYSTEMS THROUGH CONSERVATION-FOCUSED ICM PROGRAMS THEREBY INCREASING AREAL EXTENT OF HEALTHY AND RESILIENT HABITATS
1. Increased areal extent of healthy, resilient habitats, including mangroves, coral reefs, sea grass and other coastal habitats
2. Improved management of overexploited and depleted fisheries, leading to recovery
3. Reduced discharge of pollutants from land-based activities and improved water use efficiency/conservation in priority river basins and coastal areas
4. Increased preparedness and capability of coastal communities to respond to natural and manmade hazards
5. Innovative economic and investment instruments generate funds to rehabilitate and sustain coastal and marine ecosystem services

Outputs:
- ICM program coverage extended to 25 percent (45,000 km) of the region's coastline, with scaled-up national and local ICM program implementation in 8 participating countries
- Increased proportion of coastal and watershed areas and LMEs have zoning schemes, MSPs, PAs/MPAs, EAFM, IRBCAM and other management processes in place and functioning effectively as part of ICM programs
- Measurable improvements in the areal extent, health and resiliency of habitats in coastal waters and watershed areas, including biodiversity hotspots and areas-at-risk to climate change
- Strengthened MPAs functioning effectively in priority coastal and marine biodiversity areas, demonstrating improved management effectiveness, sustainability and benefits
- Innovative fisheries management schemes (i.e., ICM/EAFM) developed and implemented using ecosystem-based approach to reduce overexploitation in selected threatened fishing grounds

- Reduced stress on coastal fisheries and improved household incomes, with implementation of alternative/ supplemental livelihood policies, capacities and incentive programs in coastal communities
- Reductions of pollutants (e.g., N; P; BOD) measured in priority river basins and coastal areas
- Innovative technologies and good practices in nutrient management and water use conservation demonstrated in priority coastal areas and river basins
- Adaptive management measures implemented in ICM sites to reduce impacts of climate change, improve oil spill preparedness, and strengthen maritime safety measures
- Port Safety Health and Environmental Management (PSHEM) Code adopted as an international standard for voluntary use in ports of participating countries
- Innovative economic and investment mechanisms (e.g., revolving funds, PPP, PES, carbon credits) tested and applied to help participating countries' national and local governments sustain and scale up ICM programs
- Corporations and the business community engaged as partners of local governments in ICM programs

Component 3: A KNOWLEDGE PLATFORM FOR BUILDING A SUSTAINABLE OCEAN-BASED BLUE ECONOMY
1. Regional knowledge sharing platform for ecosystem management established and enabling decision makers to translate policies and strategies into actions
2. Program contributed to global learning on scaling up investments in sustainable coastal and ocean management

Outputs:
- National and sub-national environmental monitoring programs for ICM sites, coastal seas and priority watersheds providing scientific and evidenced-based data on the effectiveness and impacts of management interventions and commitments
- State of the Oceans and Coasts Reports published and disseminated by participating countries
- Skills, knowledge and support services of national and sub-national governments enhanced through ICM Communities of Practice, including the PEMSEA Network for Local Governments (PNLG), Regional Task Force/National Task Force (RTF/NTF), etc.
- Evidence-based sound policy on ICM, climate change adaptation and disaster risk reduction (DRR) in priority areas supported by research results on ecosystem modelling, including total allowable nutrient loading, etc.
- One percent of IW budget allocated to the regional knowledge platform to contribute to IWLearn activities, including IWLearn project websites, experience notes and IW Conferences
- Knowledge and best practice in ICM facilitated by outreach to programs promoting sustainable coastal and ocean development in large marine ecosystems of South Asia, South Pacific, Latin America and Caribbean, etc.

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 and 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 Consultants are expected to follow a collaborative and participatory approach[2] 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 eight participating countries, and the PEMSEA Resource Facility.

Engagement of stakeholders is vital to a successful MTR.[3] 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 the 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 Consultants 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 and Regional (East Asian Seas) strategies. Review country ownership. Was the project concept in line with the national sector development priorities and plans of participating countries?
- 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.

---

[2] For ideas on innovative and participatory Monitoring and Evaluation strategies and techniques, see UNDP Discussion Paper: Innovations in Monitoring & Evaluating Results, 05 Nov 2013.

[3] For more stakeholder engagement in the M&E process, see the UNDP Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results, Chapter 3, pg. 93.

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?
- 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)

Project Strategy	Indicator[4]	Baseline Level[5]	Level in 1st PIR (self-reported)	Midterm Target[6]	End-of-project Target	Midterm Level & Assessment[7]	Achievement Rating[8]	Justification for Rating
Objective:	Indicator (if applicable):							
Outcome 1:	Indicator 1:							
	Indicator 2:							
Outcome 2:	Indicator 3:							
	Indicator 4:							
	Etc.							
Etc.								

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.

---

[4] Populate with data from the Logframe and scorecards
[5] Populate with data from the Project Document
[6] If available
[7] Colour code this column only
[8] Use the 6 point Progress Towards Results Rating Scale: HS, S, MS, MU, U, HU

- 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:
- 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 Consultants will include a section of the report setting out the MTR's evidence-based conclusions, in light of the findings.[9]

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 Consultants should make no more than 10 recommendations total.

Ratings

The MTR Consultants 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. MTR Ratings & Achievement Summary Table

Measure	MTR Rating	Achievement Description
Project Strategy	N/A	
Progress Towards Results	Objective Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale)	
	Outcome 1 Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale)	
	Outcome 2 Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale)	
	Outcome 3 Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale)	
	Etc.	

---

[9] Alternatively, MTR conclusions may be integrated into the body of the report.

Project Implementation & Adaptive Management	(rate 6 pt. scale)	
Sustainability	(rate 4 pt. scale)	

6. TIMEFRAME

The tentative MTR timeframe is as follows:

TIMEFRAME	ACTIVITY
November 2017	Application closes
December 2017	Select MTR Consultants
Within 1 week after contract signing	Prep the MTR Consultants (handover of Project Documents)
2 weeks after contract signing	Document review and preparing MTR Inception Report
Mid-January 2018	Finalization and Validation of MTR Inception Report- latest start of MTR mission
30 days	MTR mission: stakeholder meetings, interviews, field visits
1 day	Mission wrap-up meeting & presentation of initial findings- earliest end of MTR mission
15 days	Preparing draft report
5 days	Incorporating audit trail from feedback on draft report/Finalization of MTR report
5 days	Preparation & Issue of Management Response
1 day (June/July 2018)	Presentation to the Project Steering Committee
31 August 2018	Expected date of full MTR completion

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

7. MIDTERM REVIEW DELIVERABLES

#	Deliverable	Description	Timing	Responsibilities
1	**MTR Inception Report**	MTR Consultants clarify objectives and methods of Midterm Review	No later than 2 weeks before the MTR mission	MTR Consultants submit to the Commissioning Unit and project management
2	**Presentation**	Initial Findings	End of MTR mission	MTR Consultants present to project management and the Commissioning Unit
3	**Draft Final Report**	Full report (using guidelines on content outlined in	Within 3 weeks of the MTR mission	Sent to the Commissioning Unit,

9

		Annex B) with annexes		reviewed by RTA, Project Coordinating Unit, GEF OFP
4	**Final Report***	Revised report with audit trail detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final MTR report	Within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft	Sent to the Commissioning Unit

*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 consultants – after review of the selected candidate by UNDP CO - and ensure the timely provision of per diems and travel arrangements for the MTR Consultants (if necessary). UNDP CO will be responsible for liaising with the MTR Consultants to provide all relevant documents, set up stakeholder interviews, and arrange field visits.

9. QUALIFICATIONS

A team of specialists will be formed to conduct the MTR. It will consist of an Institutional, Legal and Governance consultant and a Coastal and Ocean Management consultant. The former will serve as the team leader and will be responsible in consolidating the full 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 maximizing the overall qualities in the following areas:

Institutional, Legal and Governance Consultant
- Experience applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios (5%);
- Previous Experience working with the GEF or GEF-evaluations (15%);
- Experience working in the East Asian Region (15%);
- Academic and/or professional background in coastal and ocean governance, preferably with international exposure, and policy and resource and environmental management with a minimum of 15 years relevant experience (20%);
- Detailed knowledge of the international sustainable development agenda, with particular emphasis on regional priorities (10%);
- Familiarity with policies, institutions, programmes and operational dynamics of local and national governments in East Asia (10%);
- Professional experience in the application of the ICM approach for sustainable development of coastal and marine resources and environment (10%);
- Project evaluation/review experiences within United Nations system will be considered an asset (5%);
- Excellent communication analytical skills (10%)

Coastal and Ocean Management Consultant

- Experience applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios (5%);
- Previous Experience working with the GEF or GEF-evaluations (15%);
- A postgraduate degree in marine affairs, environment, economics or relevant field (10%)
- At least 15 years professional experience in the application of the ICM or similar approach for the sustainable development of coastal and marine resources, with working knowledge of relevant international instruments (20%);
- Knowledge of project development, including environmental investments and market-based instruments (10%);
- Experience working in and has knowledge of the East Asian region, with experience in the development and implementation of technical assistance programs in support of human resources development and institutional capacity-building in various aspects of sustainable coastal and ocean development, including in area of biodiversity, fisheries, land-based and marine pollution management, water use management, natural and man-made hazards, and relevant issues (15%);
- Knowledge of trends and markets related to information products and services (10%);
- Project evaluation/review experiences within United Nations system will be considered an asset (5%);
- Excellent communication analytical skills (10%)

The International Consultants, 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 PRF no later than 2 weeks before the MTR mission
2. Ensure the conduct of evaluation activities as agreed on with PRF and UNDP; (including visits to/interviews with 8 participating countries)
3. Consolidate and analyze data and information gathered during the evaluation;
4. Finalize the MTE Report.

In consultation with the Consultants and as requested, the PRF and UNDP CO will make available all relevant documentation and provide contact information to key project partners and stakeholders, and facilitate contact where needed. The Consultants will request PRF 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

%	Milestone
20%	Following submission and acceptance of the MTR mission Inception Report
40%	Following submission and approval of the 1ST draft MTR report
40%	Following submission and approval (UNDP CO and IW RTA) of the final MTR report

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 (including daily fee, per diem and travel costs).

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

TOR ANNEX A

LIST OF DOCUMENTS TO BE REVIEWED BY THE MTR Consultants[10]

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
14. Annual Reports (Inception Report, 2015 and 2016)
15. Quarterly Reports
16. APRs/PIRs (2015, 2016, 2017)
17. Minutes of Project Steering Committee meetings
18. Work and Financial Plans (2014, 2015, 2016 and 2017)

ToR ANNEX B: Guidelines on Contents for the Midterm Review Report[11]

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

---

[10] This list will be updated before MTE as more documents become available.

[11] The Report length should not exceed *40* pages in total (not including annexes).

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 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

Evaluative Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
Project Strategy: To what extent is the project strategy relevant to country priorities, country ownership, and the best route towards expected results?			
(include evaluative question(s))	(i.e. relationships established, level of coherence between project design and implementation approach, specific activities conducted, quality of risk mitigation strategies, etc.)	(i.e. project documents, national policies or strategies, websites, project staff, project partners, data collected throughout the MTR mission, etc.)	(i.e. document analysis, data analysis, interviews with project staff, interviews with stakeholders, etc.)
Progress Towards Results: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved thus far?			
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?			
Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, socio-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?			

TOR ANNEX C: MTR RATINGS

Ratings for Progress Towards Results: (one rating for each outcome and for the objective)		
6	Highly Satisfactory (HS)	The objective/outcome is expected to achieve or exceed all its end-of-project targets, without major shortcomings. The progress towards the objective/outcome can be presented as "good practice".
5	Satisfactory (S)	The objective/outcome is expected to achieve most of its end-of-project targets, with only minor shortcomings.
4	Moderately Satisfactory (MS)	The objective/outcome is expected to achieve most of its end-of-project targets but with significant shortcomings.
3	Moderately Unsatisfactory (HU)	The objective/outcome is expected to achieve its end-of-project targets with major shortcomings.
2	Unsatisfactory (U)	The objective/outcome is expected not to achieve most of its end-of-project targets.
1	Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)	The objective/outcome has failed to achieve its midterm targets, and is not expected to achieve any of its end-of-project targets.

Ratings for Project Implementation & Adaptive Management: (one overall rating)		
6	Highly Satisfactory (HS)	Implementation of all seven components – management arrangements, work planning, finance and co-finance, project-level monitoring and evaluation systems, stakeholder engagement, reporting, and communications – is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management. The project can be presented as "good practice".
5	Satisfactory (S)	Implementation of most of the seven components is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management except for only few that are subject to remedial action.
4	Moderately Satisfactory (MS)	Implementation of some of the seven components is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management, with some components requiring remedial action.

	Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)	Implementation of some of the seven components is not leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive, with most components requiring remedial action.
2	Unsatisfactory (U)	Implementation of most of the seven components is not leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management.
1	Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)	Implementation of none of the seven components is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management.

Ratings for Sustainability: (one overall rating)		
4	Likely (L)	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
3	Moderately Likely (ML)	Moderate risks, but expectations that at least some outcomes will be sustained due to the progress towards results on outcomes at the Midterm Review
2	Moderately Unlikely (MU)	Significant risk that key outcomes will not carry on after project closure, although some outputs and activities should carry on
1	Unlikely (U)	Severe risks that project outcomes as well as key outputs will not be sustained

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

Evaluators:

1. Must present information that is complete and fair in its assessment of strengths and weaknesses so that decisions or actions taken are well founded.

2. Must disclose the full set of evaluation findings along with information on their limitations and have this accessible to all affected by the evaluation with expressed legal rights to receive results.

3. Should protect the anonymity and confidentiality of individual informants. They should provide maximum notice, minimize demands on time, and respect people's right not to engage. Evaluators must respect people's right to provide information in confidence, and must ensure that sensitive information cannot be traced to its source. Evaluators are not expected to evaluate individuals, and must balance an evaluation of management functions with this general principle.

4. Sometimes uncover evidence of wrongdoing while conducting evaluations. Such cases must be reported discreetly to the appropriate investigative body. Evaluators should consult with other relevant oversight entities when there is any doubt about if and how issues should be reported.

5. Should be sensitive to beliefs, manners and customs and act with integrity and honesty in their relations with all stakeholders. In line with the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights, evaluators must be sensitive to and address issues of discrimination and gender equality. They should avoid offending the dignity and self-respect of those persons with whom they come in contact in the course of the evaluation. Knowing that evaluation might negatively affect the interests of some stakeholders, evaluators should conduct the evaluation and communicate its purpose and results in a way that clearly respects the stakeholders' dignity and self-worth.

6. Are responsible for their performance and their product(s). They are responsible for the clear, accurate and fair written and/or oral presentation of study imitations, findings and recommendations.

7. Should reflect sound accounting procedures and be prudent in using the resources of the evaluation.

Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form[12]

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: _____

---

[12] www.undp.org/unegcodeofconduct

TOR ANNEX G
EVALUATION REPORT OUTLINE[13]

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 Consultants
- 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[14])

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[15])

---

[13] The Report length should not exceed *40* pages in total (not including annexes).
[14] 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

---

[15] Using a six-point rating scale: 6: Highly Satisfactory, 5: Satisfactory, 4: Marginally Satisfactory, 3: Marginally Unsatisfactory, 2: Unsatisfactory and 1: Highly Unsatisfactory, see section 3.5, page 37 for ratings explanations.

- 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)

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

Annex I

CO-FINANCING TABLE FOR UNDP
SUPPORTED GEF FINANCED PROJECTS

Co Financing Types/Sources	IA Own Financing (Million US $)		Government (Million US $)		Other Sources[16] (Million US $)		Total Financing (Million US $)		Total Disbursement (Million US $)	
	Proposed	Actual	Proposed	Actual	Proposed	Actual	Proposed	Actual	Proposed	Actual
Grant										
Credits										
Equity										
In Kind										
Non grant instruments[17]										
Other Types										
TOTAL										

---

[16] 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.
[17] Describe "Non-grant instruments" (such as guarantees, contingent grants, etc.)

TERMS OF REFERENCE
UNDP-GEF Mid-Term Review Consultant (International)
Coastal and Ocean Governance Consultant

Scaling up the Implementation of the Sustainable Development Strategy for the Seas of East Asia (SDS-SEA)

1. INTRODUCTION

This is the Terms of Reference (ToR) for the UNDP-GEF Midterm Review (MTR) of the full-sized project titled *Scaling up the Implementation of the Sustainable Development Strategy for the Seas of East Asia (SDS-SEA)*, which is to be undertaken in January 2018. 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 UNDP/GEF/PEMSEA Project on Scaling up the Implementation of the Sustainable Development Strategy for the Seas of East Asia (SDS-SEA) is a GEF project being implemented by UNDP and executed by PEMSEA. The countries bordering the EAS region - Cambodia, China, Indonesia, Japan, Lao PDR, Philippines, RO Korea, Singapore, Thailand, Timor Leste, and Vietnam - endorsed the Project. The Project commenced in 2014 and will end in December 2019.

The Project is the fourth phase of the UNDP-GEF projects under the Partnerships in Environmental Management for the Seas of East Asia (PEMSEA)[18]. The overall goal of the project is to reduce pollution and rebuild degraded marine resources through scaling up the implementation of the Sustainable Development Strategy for the Seas of East Asia (SDS-SEA) in Cambodia, PR China, Indonesia, Lao PDR, Philippines, Thailand, Timor Leste and Vietnam that share six large marine ecosystems (LMEs), and related catchment areas. The project covering 2014-2019 represents the "transformation phase" of a series of GEF support, culminating in the sustainability of PEMSEA as the regional coordinating mechanism for implementation of the SDS-SEA. It also makes a stronger linkage between sustainable development of river basins, coastal and marine areas and local, national and regional investment processes in a "blue economy".

The project objective is to catalyze actions and investments at the regional, national and local levels to rehabilitate and sustain coastal and marine ecosystem services and build a sustainable coastal and ocean-based economy in the East Asian region.

This objective will be achieved through the implementation of the following three interconnected Project components:

---

[18] Pilot phase project (1994-1999): "Marine Pollution Protection and Management of the East Asian Seas Region."; Second phase project (1999-2008): "Building Partnerships in Environmental Management for the Seas of East Asia". Third phase project (2008-2014): "Implementation of the SDS-SEA".

Component 1: PARTNERSHIPS IN COASTAL AND OCEAN GOVERNANCE ENABLING A SELF-SUSTAINING, COUNTRY-OWNED REGIONAL MECHANISM GOVERNING THE LMEs IN THE EAST ASIAN REGION

4. A self-sustaining, country-owned, regional mechanism governing and managing LMEs and coastal waters, rebuilding and sustaining ecosystems services and reducing the impacts of climate change on coastal populations in the East Asian Seas region.
5. National and local governments adopt and initiate ocean policy and institutional improvements
6. Innovative financing mechanisms in place for sustained operation of the country-owned regional coordinating mechanism

Outputs:
*   Signed Agreements with Country and Non-Country Partners on voluntary financing
*   Signed Partnership Agreements between PEMSEA with YSLME Commission, WCPF Commission and other regional governance mechanisms for collaborative planning, coordination and implementation among the respective SAPS, while addressing program sustainability and integration with broader regional cooperation frameworks
*   The EAS program monitored, evaluated and reported to stakeholders via Regional State of Coasts and Oceans Report
*   Improved national coastal and ocean policies and institutional arrangements for sustainable management of priority coastal and marine areas, surrounding watershed and blue economy development initiated in at least 6 participating countries
*   National sector legislative agenda developed in at least 6 participating countries on ICM, CCA/DRR, integrated land and sea use zoning/marine spatial planning and other innovative regulatory and economic instruments
*   SDS-SEA targets incorporated into national and local medium-term development and investment plans in at least 3 participating countries and 8 participating local governments, etc.
*   Suite of products, services, funding mechanisms and partnership arrangements adopted and implemented in collaboration with Partners, Sponsoring Organizations, donors and private sector/business community

Component 2: HEALTHY AND RESILIENT MARINE AND COASTAL ECOSYSTEMS THROUGH CONSERVATION-FOCUSED ICM PROGRAMS THEREBY INCREASING AREAL EXTENT OF HEALTHY AND RESILIENT HABITATS

6. Increased areal extent of healthy, resilient habitats, including mangroves, coral reefs, sea grass and other coastal habitats
7. Improved management of overexploited and depleted fisheries, leading to recovery
8. Reduced discharge of pollutants from land-based activities and improved water use efficiency/conservation in priority river basins and coastal areas
9. Increased preparedness and capability of coastal communities to respond to natural and manmade hazards
10. Innovative economic and investment instruments generate funds to rehabilitate and sustain coastal and marine ecosystem services

Outputs:
*   ICM program coverage extended to 25 percent (45,000 km) of the region's coastline, with scaled-up national and local ICM program implementation in 8 participating countries
*   Increased proportion of coastal and watershed areas and LMEs have zoning schemes, MSPs, PAs/MPAs, EAFM, IRBCAM and other management processes in place and functioning effectively as part of ICM programs
*   Measurable improvements in the areal extent, health and resiliency of habitats in coastal waters and watershed areas, including biodiversity hotspots and areas-at-risk to climate change
*   Strengthened MPAs functioning effectively in priority coastal and marine biodiversity areas, demonstrating improved management effectiveness, sustainability and benefits

- Innovative fisheries management schemes (i.e., ICM/EAFM) developed and implemented using ecosystem-based approach to reduce overexploitation in selected threatened fishing grounds
- Reduced stress on coastal fisheries and improved household incomes, with implementation of alternative/ supplemental livelihood policies, capacities and incentive programs in coastal communities
- Reductions of pollutants (e.g., N; P; BOD) measured in priority river basins and coastal areas
- Innovative technologies and good practices in nutrient management and water use conservation demonstrated in priority coastal areas and river basins
- Adaptive management measures implemented in ICM sites to reduce impacts of climate change, improve oil spill preparedness, and strengthen maritime safety measures
- Port Safety Health and Environmental Management (PSHEM) Code adopted as an international standard for voluntary use in ports of participating countries
- Innovative economic and investment mechanisms (e.g., revolving funds, PPP, PES, carbon credits) tested and applied to help participating countries' national and local governments sustain and scale up ICM programs
- Corporations and the business community engaged as partners of local governments in ICM programs

Component 3: A KNOWLEDGE PLATFORM FOR BUILDING A SUSTAINABLE OCEAN-BASED BLUE ECONOMY
3. Regional knowledge sharing platform for ecosystem management established and enabling decision makers to translate policies and strategies into actions
4. Program contributed to global learning on scaling up investments in sustainable coastal and ocean management

Outputs:
- National and sub-national environmental monitoring programs for ICM sites, coastal seas and priority watersheds providing scientific and evidenced-based data on the effectiveness and impacts of management interventions and commitments
- State of the Oceans and Coasts Reports published and disseminated by participating countries
- Skills, knowledge and support services of national and sub-national governments enhanced through ICM Communities of Practice, including the PEMSEA Network for Local Governments (PNLG), Regional Task Force/National Task Force (RTF/NTF), etc.
- Evidence-based sound policy on ICM, climate change adaptation and disaster risk reduction (DRR) in priority areas supported by research results on ecosystem modelling, including total allowable nutrient loading, etc.
- One percent of IW budget allocated to the regional knowledge platform to contribute to IWLearn activities, including IWLearn project websites, experience notes and IW Conferences
- Knowledge and best practice in ICM facilitated by outreach to programs promoting sustainable coastal and ocean development in large marine ecosystems of South Asia, South Pacific, Latin America and Caribbean, etc.

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 and 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 Consultants are expected to follow a collaborative and participatory approach[19] 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 eight participating countries, and the PEMSEA Resource Facility.

Engagement of stakeholders is vital to a successful MTR.[20] 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 the 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 Consultants 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 and Regional (East Asian Seas) strategies. Review country ownership. Was the project concept in line with the national sector development priorities and plans of participating countries?
- 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.

---

[19] For ideas on innovative and participatory Monitoring and Evaluation strategies and techniques, see <u>UNDP Discussion Paper: Innovations in Monitoring & Evaluating Results</u>, 05 Nov 2013.

[20] For more stakeholder engagement in the M&E process, see the <u>UNDP Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results</u>, Chapter 3, pg. 93.

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?
- 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)

Project Strategy	Indicator[21]	Baseline Level[22]	Level in 1st PIR (self-reported)	Midterm Target[23]	End-of-project Target	Midterm Level & Assessment[24]	Achievement Rating[25]	Justification for Rating
Objective:	Indicator (if applicable):							
Outcome 1:	Indicator 1:							
	Indicator 2:							
Outcome 2:	Indicator 3:							
	Indicator 4:							
	Etc.							
Etc.								

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:

---

[21] Populate with data from the Logframe and scorecards
[22] Populate with data from the Project Document
[23] If available
[24] Colour code this column only
[25] Use the 6 point Progress Towards Results Rating Scale: HS, S, MS, MU, U, HU

- 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:
- 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 Consultants will include a section of the report setting out the MTR's evidence-based conclusions, in light of the findings.[26]

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 Consultants should make no more than 10 recommendations total.

Ratings

The MTR Consultants 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. MTR Ratings & Achievement Summary Table

Measure	MTR Rating	Achievement Description
Project Strategy	N/A	
Progress Towards Results	Objective Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale)	
	Outcome 1 Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale)	
	Outcome 2 Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale)	
	Outcome 3 Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale)	
	Etc.	

---

[26] Alternatively, MTR conclusions may be integrated into the body of the report.

Project Implementation & Adaptive Management	(rate 6 pt. scale)	
Sustainability	(rate 4 pt. scale)	

6. TIMEFRAME

The tentative MTR timeframe is as follows:

TIMEFRAME	ACTIVITY
November 2017	Application closes
December 2017	Select MTR Consultants
Within 1 week after contract signing	Prep the MTR Consultants (handover of Project Documents)
2 weeks after contract signing	Document review and preparing MTR Inception Report
Mid-January 2018	Finalization and Validation of MTR Inception Report- latest start of MTR mission
30 days	MTR mission: stakeholder meetings, interviews, field visits
1 day	Mission wrap-up meeting & presentation of initial findings- earliest end of MTR mission
15 days	Preparing draft report
5 days	Incorporating audit trail from feedback on draft report/Finalization of MTR report
5 days	Preparation & Issue of Management Response
1 day (June/July 2018)	Presentation to the Project Steering Committee
31 August 2018	Expected date of full MTR completion

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

7. MIDTERM REVIEW DELIVERABLES

#	Deliverable	Description	Timing	Responsibilities
1	**MTR Inception Report**	MTR Consultants clarify objectives and methods of Midterm Review	No later than 2 weeks before the MTR mission	MTR Consultants submit to the Commissioning Unit and project management
2	**Presentation**	Initial Findings	End of MTR mission	MTR Consultants present to project management and the Commissioning Unit
3	**Draft Final Report**	Full report (using guidelines on content outlined in	Within 3 weeks of the MTR mission	Sent to the Commissioning Unit,

		Annex B) with annexes		reviewed by RTA, Project Coordinating Unit, GEF OFP
4	**Final Report***	Revised report with audit trail detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final MTR report	Within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft	Sent to the Commissioning Unit

*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 consultants – after review of the selected candidate by UNDP CO - and ensure the timely provision of per diems and travel arrangements for the MTR Consultants (if necessary). UNDP CO will be responsible for liaising with the MTR Consultants to provide all relevant documents, set up stakeholder interviews, and arrange field visits.

9. QUALIFICATIONS

A team of specialists will be formed to conduct the MTR. It will consist of an Institutional, Legal and Governance consultant and a Coastal and Ocean Management consultant. The former will serve as the team leader and will be responsible in consolidating the full 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 maximizing the overall qualities in the following areas:

Institutional, Legal and Governance Consultant
- Experience applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios (5%);
- Previous Experience working with the GEF or GEF-evaluations (15%);
- Experience working in the East Asian Region (15%);
- Academic and/or professional background in coastal and ocean governance, preferably with international exposure, and policy and resource and environmental management with a minimum of 15 years relevant experience (20%);
- Detailed knowledge of the international sustainable development agenda, with particular emphasis on regional priorities (10%);
- Familiarity with policies, institutions, programmes and operational dynamics of local and national governments in East Asia (10%);
- Professional experience in the application of the ICM approach for sustainable development of coastal and marine resources and environment (10%);
- Project evaluation/review experiences within United Nations system will be considered an asset (5%);
- Excellent communication analytical skills (10%)

Coastal and Ocean Management Consultant

- Experience applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios (5%);
- Previous Experience working with the GEF or GEF-evaluations (15%);
- A postgraduate degree in marine affairs, environment, economics or relevant field (10%)
- At least 15 years professional experience in the application of the ICM or similar approach for the sustainable development of coastal and marine resources, with working knowledge of relevant international instruments (20%);
- Knowledge of project development, including environmental investments and market-based instruments (10%);
- Experience working in and has knowledge of the East Asian region, with experience in the development and implementation of technical assistance programs in support of human resources development and institutional capacity-building in various aspects of sustainable coastal and ocean development, including in area of biodiversity, fisheries, land-based and marine pollution management, water use management, natural and man-made hazards, and relevant issues (15%);
- Knowledge of trends and markets related to information products and services (10%);
- Project evaluation/review experiences within United Nations system will be considered an asset (5%);
- Excellent communication analytical skills (10%)

The International Consultants, 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 PRF no later than 2 weeks before the MTR mission
2. Ensure the conduct of evaluation activities as agreed on with PRF and UNDP; (including visits to/interviews with 8 participating countries)
3. Consolidate and analyze data and information gathered during the evaluation;
4. Finalize the MTE Report.

In consultation with the Consultants and as requested, the PRF and UNDP CO will make available all relevant documentation and provide contact information to key project partners and stakeholders, and facilitate contact where needed. The Consultants will request PRF 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

%	Milestone
20%	Following submission and acceptance of the MTR mission Inception Report
40%	Following submission and approval of the 1ST draft MTR report
40%	Following submission and approval (UNDP CO and IW RTA) of the final MTR report

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 (including daily fee, per diem and travel costs).

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

TOR ANNEX A

LIST OF DOCUMENTS TO BE REVIEWED BY THE MTR Consultants[27]

19. PIF
20. UNDP Initiation Plan
21. UNDP Project Document
22. UNDP Environmental and Social Screening results
23. Project Inception Report
24. All Project Implementation Reports (PIR's)
25. Quarterly progress reports and work plans of the various implementation task teams
26. Audit reports
27. Finalized GEF focal area Tracking Tools at CEO endorsement and midterm (*fill in specific TTs for this project's focal area*)
28. Oversight mission reports
29. All monitoring reports prepared by the project
30. Financial and Administration guidelines used by the Project

31. Project Document and CEO Endorsement
32. Annual Reports (Inception Report, 2015 and 2016)
33. Quarterly Reports
34. APRs/PIRs (2015, 2016, 2017)
35. Minutes of Project Steering Committee meetings
36. Work and Financial Plans (2014, 2015, 2016 and 2017)

ToR ANNEX B: Guidelines on Contents for the Midterm Review Report[28]

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

---

[27] This list will be updated before MTE as more documents become available.

[28] The Report length should not exceed *40* pages in total (not including annexes).

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 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

Evaluative Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
Project Strategy: To what extent is the project strategy relevant to country priorities, country ownership, and the best route towards expected results?			
(include evaluative question(s))	(i.e. relationships established, level of coherence between project design and implementation approach, specific activities conducted, quality of risk mitigation strategies, etc.)	(i.e. project documents, national policies or strategies, websites, project staff, project partners, data collected throughout the MTR mission, etc.)	(i.e. document analysis, data analysis, interviews with project staff, interviews with stakeholders, etc.)
Progress Towards Results: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved thus far?			
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?			
Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, socio-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?			

TOR ANNEX C: MTR RATINGS

Ratings for Progress Towards Results: (one rating for each outcome and for the objective)		
6	Highly Satisfactory (HS)	The objective/outcome is expected to achieve or exceed all its end-of-project targets, without major shortcomings. The progress towards the objective/outcome can be presented as "good practice".
5	Satisfactory (S)	The objective/outcome is expected to achieve most of its end-of-project targets, with only minor shortcomings.
4	Moderately Satisfactory (MS)	The objective/outcome is expected to achieve most of its end-of-project targets but with significant shortcomings.
3	Moderately Unsatisfactory (HU)	The objective/outcome is expected to achieve its end-of-project targets with major shortcomings.
2	Unsatisfactory (U)	The objective/outcome is expected not to achieve most of its end-of-project targets.
1	Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)	The objective/outcome has failed to achieve its midterm targets, and is not expected to achieve any of its end-of-project targets.

Ratings for Project Implementation & Adaptive Management: (one overall rating)		
6	Highly Satisfactory (HS)	Implementation of all seven components – management arrangements, work planning, finance and co-finance, project-level monitoring and evaluation systems, stakeholder engagement, reporting, and communications – is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management. The project can be presented as "good practice".
5	Satisfactory (S)	Implementation of most of the seven components is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management except for only few that are subject to remedial action.
4	Moderately Satisfactory (MS)	Implementation of some of the seven components is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management, with some components requiring remedial action.

	Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)	Implementation of some of the seven components is not leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive, with most components requiring remedial action.
2	Unsatisfactory (U)	Implementation of most of the seven components is not leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management.
1	Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)	Implementation of none of the seven components is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management.

Ratings for Sustainability: (one overall rating)		
4	Likely (L)	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
3	Moderately Likely (ML)	Moderate risks, but expectations that at least some outcomes will be sustained due to the progress towards results on outcomes at the Midterm Review
2	Moderately Unlikely (MU)	Significant risk that key outcomes will not carry on after project closure, although some outputs and activities should carry on
1	Unlikely (U)	Severe risks that project outcomes as well as key outputs will not be sustained

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

Evaluators:

8. Must present information that is complete and fair in its assessment of strengths and weaknesses so that decisions or actions taken are well founded.

9. 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.

10. 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.

11. 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.

12. 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.

13. 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.

14. Should reflect sound accounting procedures and be prudent in using the resources of the evaluation.

Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form[29]

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: _____

---

[29] www.undp.org/unegcodeofconduct

TOR ANNEX G
EVALUATION REPORT OUTLINE[30]

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 Consultants
- 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[31])

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[32])

---

[30] The Report length should not exceed *40* pages in total (not including annexes).
[31] 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

---

[32] Using a six-point rating scale: 6: Highly Satisfactory, 5: Satisfactory, 4: Marginally Satisfactory, 3: Marginally Unsatisfactory, 2: Unsatisfactory and 1: Highly Unsatisfactory, see section 3.5, page 37 for ratings explanations.

- 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)

Evaluation Report Reviewed and Cleared by

UNDP County Office

Name:_____

Signature:_____ Date:_____

UNDP GEF RTA

Name:

Signature:_____ Date:_____

Annex I

CO-FINANCING TABLE FOR UNDP
SUPPORTED GEF FINANCED PROJECTS

Co Financing Types/Sources	IA Own Financing (Million US $)		Government (Million US $)		Other Sources[33] (Million US $)		Total Financing (Million US $)		Total Disbursement (Million US $)	
	Proposed	Actual	Proposed	Actual	Proposed	Actual	Proposed	Actual	Proposed	Actual
Grant										
Credits										
Equity										
In Kind										
Non grant instruments[34]										
Other Types										
TOTAL										

---

[33] 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.
[34] Describe "Non-grant instruments" (such as guarantees, contingent grants, etc.)