**Terms of Reference for Tuvalu R2R Project**

**UNDP Individual Consultancy Ref: PN/FJI-035-18**

**UNDP-GEF Midterm Review Terms of Reference Team Leader for Mid Term Evaluation of Tuvalu Ridge to Reef Project (International Consultancy)**

**Title: *Midterm Review of Implementing a Ridge to Reef Approach to protect biodiversity and ecosystem functions in Tuvalu (R2R Tuvalu)*Position Title:** Midterm Review Consultant – Team Leader **Location:** Home-based and selected duty station

**Duration of contract:** 24 days within 9 weeks period **Application closure date:** 10 August **Starting date:** 17 August **Completion date:** 22 October

Consultancy Proposal should be mailed to C/- UNDP Fiji MCO, Private Mail Bag, Suva, Fiji or sent via email to **etenderbox.pacific@undp.org** no later than **10th August, 2018 (Fiji Time)** clearly stating the title of consultancy applied for. Any proposals received after this date/time will not be accepted. Any request for clarification must be sent in writing, or by standard electronic communication to procurement.fj@undp.org. UNDP will respond in writing or by standard electronic mail and will send written copies of the response, including an explanation of the query without identifying the source of inquiry, to all consultants. Incomplete, late and joint proposals will not be considered and only offers for which there is further interest will be contacted. **Failure to submit your application as stated as per the application submission guide (Procurement Notice) on the above link will be considered incomplete and therefore application will not be considered.**

**1. INTRODUCTION**

This is the Terms of Reference (ToR) for the UNDP-GEF Midterm Review (MTR) of the *full* sized project titled *Implementing a Ridge to Reef Approach to protect biodiversity and ecosystem functions in Tuvalu (R2R Tuvalu* (PIMS:5220) implemented through the *Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Trade, Labour and Environment (MFATEL)*, which is to be undertaken in *2018*. The project started on the *25 August, 2015* 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* (*insert hyperlink*). http://web.undp.org/evaluation/documents/guidance/GEF/mid- term/Guidance\_Midterm%20Review%20\_EN\_2014.pdf

**2. PROJECT BACKGROUND INFORMATION**

The objective of project, “**Implementing ‘Ridge to Reef’ approach to protect biodiversity and ecosystem functions in Tuvalu (Tuvalu R2R Project)**” is *“to preserve ecosystem services, sustain livelihoods and improve resilience in Tuvalu using a ‘ridge-to-reef’ approach”*. To achieve this objective, the project focuses on: enhancing and strengthening conservation and protected areas (Component 1); rehabilitating degraded coastal and inland forests and landscapes and supporting the delivery of integrated water resource management (IWRM) and integrated coastal management (ICM) at a national scale whilst piloting hands-on approaches at the island scale (on three selected pilot islands) (Component 2); enhancing governance and institutional capacities at the national, island, and community levels for enhanced inland and coastal natural resource management (Component 3); and improving data and information systems that would enable improve evidence based planning, decision-making, and management of natural resources in Tuvalu (Component 4).

The project is part of the Pacific R2R program on *“Pacific Islands Ridge-to-Reef National Priorities – Integrated Water, Land, Forest & Coastal Management to Preserve Ecosystem Services, Store Carbon, Improve Climate Resilience and Sustain Livelihoods*”. It is consistent with three of the GEF-5 focal areas including Biodiversity, International Waters, and Land Degradation, and is designed to advance Tuvalu’s work towards achieving national and international priorities in these key focal areas through a comprehensive Ridge to Reef approach.

As such, the project will deliver directly on: the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD)’s Programme of Work of Protected Areas (PoWPA) of the Aichi Targets and the National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (NBSAP 2012 – 2016); the UN Convention to Combat Desertification (CCD)’s National Action Programme (NAP); the Sustainable and Integrated Water and Sanitation Policy (2012 – 2021); and the Climate Change Policy and Action Plan. Building on ongoing initiatives3, the project will work across the 9 islands of Tuvalu on assessing natural resources status (baseline analysis and data collection), rehabilitating damaged island and coastal ecosystems including forests, and improving or developing Locally Managed Marine Areas (LMMAs), including Marine Protected Areas (MPAs) governed by the 8 Kaupules and Falekaupules (Island Councils). These activities assist in the recovery of degraded corals and breeding of fish populations. By the end of the five year implementation, the project aims to: increase and enhance Tuvalu’s LMMAs, including MPAs, by 15% with 9 formalized community management systems of marine conservation areas across 9 islands equipped with functional management plans; enhance and/or develop a centralized GIS database system on biodiversity, natural resources, and governance systems; implement sustainable land management interventions and agroforestry interventions; carry out remedial measures for algal bloom in Funafuti Lagoon; mainstream Ridge to Reef4 into national policies and Kaupule budgets; develop and implement national standard operational procedure on knowledge management; and enhance awareness and build capacities on Ridge to Reef.

The whole of Tuvalu is considered within this R2R project. Only Component 2 focusing on integrated land and water management (LD and IW) are limited to one of, or all 3 islands of Funafuti, Nukufetau and Nanumea, whilst other Components include all 9 islands of Tuvalu. The project will directly benefit the 6,194 people living in the urban capital Funafuti (55% of the population) as well as two outer islands of Nanumea (556 inhabitants) and Nukufetau (540 inhabitants) with improved integrated water and land management measures. In addition, the project will indirectly benefit the livelihoods of the entire population of Tuvalu through the long-term impacts of the R2R approach and the enhanced management of inland and coastal resources through the additional/improved LMMA/MPA networks formalized in all 9 islands.

The R2R Project is funded through the Global Environment Facility over a 5 year period and budget of USD3,762,844 whilst co-financing amounts to USD 15,680,591. Within the MFATEL, the Department of Environment is responsible for executing the project. Led by a Project Coordinator, there are at least 6 officers of the Project Implementation Unit based in Funafuti and supported by 8 Island officers on each island.

**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 team 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 team considers useful for this evidence-based review). The MTR team will review the baseline GEF focal area Tracking Tool submitted to the GEF at CEO endorsement, and the midterm GEF focal area Tracking Tool that must be completed before the MTR field mission begins.

The MTR team is expected to follow a collaborative and participatory approach1 ensuring close engagement with the Project Team, government counterparts (the GEF Operational Focal Point), the UNDP Country Office(s), UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Advisers, and other key stakeholders.

Engagement of stakeholders is vital to a successful MTR.2 Stakeholder involvement should include interviews with stakeholders who have project responsibilities, including but not limited to *(list*); executing agencies, senior officials and task team/ component leaders, key experts and consultants in the subject area, Project Board, project implementation unit, island councils (kaupule), community project stakeholders, academia, local government, University of the South Pacific, Secretariat of the Pacific Community (SPC) Geo -Science Division, UNDP, UNDP supported Projects in Tuvalu (e.g. NAPA 2 and TCAP Project) and CSOs, etc. Additionally, the MTR team is expected to conduct field missions to *four islands including the main island of Funafuti*. The PMU will be responsible for organizing Consultants transportation outside islands of Funafuti.

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 team 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.

1 For ideas on innovative and participatory Monitoring and Evaluation strategies and techniques, see UNDP Discussion Paper: Innovations in Monitoring & Evaluating Results, 05 Nov 2013. 2 For more stakeholder engagement in the M&E process, see the UNDP Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results, Chapter 3, pg. 93.

**i. Project Strategy**

Project design:

1. 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.
2. 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?
3. Review how the project addresses country priorities. Review country ownership. Was the  project concept in line with the national sector development priorities and plans of the country  (or of participating countries in the case of multi-country projects)?
4. 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?
5. 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.
6. If there are major areas of concern, recommend areas for improvement.  Results Framework/Logframe:
* Undertake a critical analysis of the project’s logframe indicators and targets, assess how  “SMART” the midterm and end-of-project targets are (Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Relevant, Time-bound), and suggest specific amendments/revisions to the targets and indicators as necessary.
* Are the project’s objectives and outcomes or components clear, practical, and feasible within its time frame?
* 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 p

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

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Project Strategy**  | **Indicator3**  | **Baseline Level4**  | **Level in 1st PIR (self- reported )**  | **Midter m Target5**  | **End-of- project Target**  | **Midterm Level & Assessmen t6**  | **Achieveme nt Rating7**  | **Justificati on for Rating**  |
| **Objective:**  | Indicator (if applicable):  |    |  |  |    |   |  |  |
| **Outcome 1:**  | Indicator 1:  |    |  |  |    |   |  |  |
| Indicator 2:  |    |  |  |    |   |
| **Outcome 2:**  | Indicator 3:  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Indicator 4:  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Etc.  |    |  |  |    |   |
| **Etc.**  |  |    |  |  |    |   |  |  |

**Indicator Assessment Key**

In addition to the progress towards outcomes analysis:

1. Compare and analyse the GEF Tracking Tool at the Baseline with the one completed right before the Midterm Review.
2. Identify remaining barriers to achieving the project objective in the remainder of the project.
3. 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.

3 Populate with data from the Logframe and scorecards 4 Populate with data from the Project Document 5 If available 6 Colour code this column only

7 Use the 6 point Progress Towards Results Rating Scale: HS, S, MS, MU, U, HU

rogress achieved; assign a rating on progress for each outcome; make recommendations from the areas marked as “Not on target to be achieved” (red).

1. Are work-planning processes results-based? If not, suggest ways to re-orientate work planning to focus on results?
2. 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 Team 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 Team and 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?

1. 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?)
2. 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 Team 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 team will include a section of the report setting out the MTR’s evidence-based conclusions, in light of the findings.8

8 Alternatively, MTR conclusions may be integrated into the body of the report.

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 team should make no more than 15 recommendations total.

**Ratings**

The MTR team 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 *Tuvalu R2R Project* )**

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

**6. TIMEFRAME**

The total duration of the MTR will be approximately (*30 days)* over a time period of *9 weeks* starting *August 16,* and shall not exceed five months from when the consultant(s) are hired. The tentative MTR timeframe is as follows:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **TIMEFRAME**  | **ACTIVITY**  |
| *10August*  | Application closes  |
| *10 – 13 August*  | Select MTR Team  |
| 14 -15 August  | Contracting of consultant  |
| *16 – 22 August*  | Document review and preparing MTR Inception Report  |
| *23 – 27 August*  | Finalization and Validation of MTR Inception Report- latest start of MTR mission  |
| *30 August – 13 September*  | MTR mission: stakeholder meetings, interviews, field visits. Pre- evaluation briefing & Post mission debriefing with key stakeholders.  |
| *14 September*  | Mission wrap-up meeting & presentation of initial findings- earliest end of MTR mission. Presentation at UNDP Pacific Office (Suva, Fiji)  |
| *15 September – October 1*  | Preparing draft report  |
| *2 October - 15 October*  | Incorporating audit trail from feedback on draft report/Finalization of MTR report (note: accommodate time delay in dates for circulation and review of the draft report)  |
| 16 -18 October  | Preparation & Issue of Management Response  |
| 22 October  | 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 team clarifies objectives and methods of Midterm Review

No later weeks before the MTR mission: 8 August

than 2

MTR team submits to the Commissioning Unit and project management

 

**Presentation**

Initial Findings

End of MTR mission: 12 September in Tuvalu and 14 September at UNDP pacific Office

MTR Team presents to project management and the Commissioning Unit

**Draft Final Report**

Full report (using guidelines on content outlined in Annex B) with annexes

of the MTR mission: 1

October

Within 3 weeks

Sent to the Commissioning Unit, reviewed by RTA, Project Coordinating Unit, GEF OFP

**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: 22 October

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 the UNDP Pacific Office.

The commissioning unit will contract the consultants and ensure the timely provision of payments as per contracts. Travel arrangements within the Tuvalu for the MTR Team will be organized by the Department of Environment. Travel arrangement outside of Funafuti will be the responsibility of the Project. The Project Team will be responsible for liaising with the MTR team to provide all relevant documents, set up stakeholder interviews, and arrange field visits.

**9. TEAM COMPOSITION**

A team of two independent consultants will conduct the MTR - one team leader (with experience and exposure to projects and evaluations in other regions globally) and one team expert, usually from the country of the project. 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 “team” qualities in the following areas:

1. Recent experience with result-based management evaluation methodologies;
2. Experience applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios;
3. Competence in adaptive management, as applied to (*fill in GEF Focal Area*);
4. Experience working with the GEF or GEF-evaluations;
5. Experience working in (*region of project*); small island developing states or South Pacific Region.
6. Work experience in relevant technical areas for at least 10 years;
7. Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender and (biodiversity, land degradation and  international waters; experience in gender sensitive evaluation and analysis.
8. Excellent communication skills;
9. Demonstrable analytical skills;
10. Project evaluation/review experiences within United Nations system will be considered an asset;  *Education*

• A Masters degree in Natural Resource Management, Conservation, Development , or other closely related field and /or at least 10 years of relevant work experience;

*Experience*

* Competence in adaptive management, as applied to biodiversity, land degradation and international waters
* Experience working with UND\_ GEF or other donor funds projects;
* Work experience in relevant technical areas for at least 5 years i.e. to biodiversity, land  degradation and international waters
* Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender and biodiversity, land degradation and  international waters; experience in gender sensitive evaluation and analysis.
* Excellent communication skills;
* Proficient in English and local language Project evaluation/review experiences within United Nations system and managing evaluation team will be considered an asset; Previous experience leading evaluation teams