

## General information

- Procurement at UNDP
- Sustainable procurement
- Procurement training
- About us

## Business opportunities

- Procurement notices
- Contract awards

## Vendors


- Doing business with UNDP
- How we buy
- Qualifications and eligibility
- Protest and sanctions
- Supplier ethics/code of conduct (pdf)
- eTendering guide and other information

[Current Procurement Notices](#)

[Search Notices](#)

[Awards](#)

## View Notice

International Terminal Evaluator	
Procurement Process :	IC - Individual contractor
Office :	UNDP Country Office - PHILIPPINES
Deadline :	01-Aug-19
Posted on :	18-Jul-19
Development Area :	CONSULTANTS 
Reference Number :	57661
Link to Atlas Project : 00077221 - Sustainable Management of Highly Migratory Fish Stocks i	
<b>Documents :</b> <a href="#">P11 Template</a> <a href="#">Offerors Template/Financial Proposal</a> <a href="#">General Terms &amp; Conditions for IC</a>	
Overview :	
<p><b>PROJECT TITLE:</b> Sustainable Management of Highly Migratory Fish Stocks in the West Pacific and East Asian Seas</p> <p><b>IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS</b></p> <p>For the duration of the contract, the consultant shall be under the supervision of the UNDP CO Philippines through the Inclusive and Sustainable Development (ISD) Programme Manager in the delivery of the terms of reference.</p> <p><b>EVALUATION TIMEFRAME</b></p> <p>The total duration of the evaluation will be <b>40 days spread over 2 months.</b></p> <p><b>DUTY STATION</b></p> <p>The International Consultant shall be required to come to the UNDP CO in the Philippines to start the evaluation and is required to do field work in all three countries (Philippines, Indonesia, Vietnam).</p> <p><b>SCOPE OF PRICE PROPOSAL AND SCHEDULE OF PAYMENTS</b></p> <p>This is a fixed output-based contract price regardless of extension of the herein specific duration. The consultant will be paid an all-inclusive lump sum amount (i.e. professional fees, transportation/travel to and from country of origin if residing outside the Philippines, and living allowance not exceeding the UN DSA rate. Airfare, food and accommodation of the consultant for mission to Manila, Indonesia and Vietnam will be shouldered by UNDP separately.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• First Tranche - 20% Upon submission and approval of the Inception Report;</li> <li>• Second Tranche - 50% Upon submission and approval of the draft Terminal Evaluation Report which contains the following major parts:                         <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ An executive summary, including findings and recommendations;</li> <li>◦ A detailed Final Evaluation Report, with attention to lessons learned, IW Tracking Tools; and</li> <li>◦ List of Annexes prepared by the consultants, which includes TORs, Itinerary, List of Persons Interviewed, Summary of Field Visits, List of Documents reviewed, Questionnaire used and Summary of results, Co-financing &amp; Leveraged Resources;</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Third Tranche - 30% Upon submission and approval (UNDP-CO and UNDP RTA) of the final Terminal Evaluation Report</li> </ul>	

## EVALUATOR ETHICS

Evaluation consultants will be held to the highest ethical standards and are required to sign a Code of Conduct (Annex E) upon acceptance of the assignment. UNDP evaluations are conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluations'.

## Description of Responsibilities :

### OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE

The objective of the terminal evaluation is to enable the GEF and UNDP assess the relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability of **Sustainable Management of Highly Migratory Fish Stocks in the West Pacific and East Asian Seas (PIMS# 4753) – WPEA-SM Project**. The evaluation will assess achievements of the project against its objectives, including a re-examination of the relevance of the objectives and project design. It will also identify factors that have facilitated or impeded the achievement of the objectives. While a thorough review of the past is in itself very important, the in-depth evaluation is expected to lead to detailed overview and lessons learned for the future.

#### 2.1 Review Methodology and Inception Phase

The evaluation will be conducted in a participatory manner working on the basis that its essential objective is to assess the project implementation and impacts in order to provide basis for improvement in the implementation and other decisions. This would include missions to the three participating countries (Indonesia, Philippines and Vietnam). A visit to Micronesia will be determined and dictated by the schedule of the Project Manager.

During the evaluation it shall be the responsibility of UNDP shall support the Consultant to notify the relevant government bodies, and obtain required permits, permissions and visas if needed. The Western and Central Pacific Fisheries Commission (WCPFC) will aid in facilitating communication with the relevant national government representatives to streamline obtaining the required documents.

The Consultant will prepare an Inception Report for discussion with UNDP and WCPFC. This will outline the proposed approach to the assignment and will include, but not be limited to, a detailed work plan of activities, and methodologies of approach. It is anticipated that the Consultant will look at the entire evaluation and its activities in a holistic manner to maximize efficiencies and minimize number of field trips. It is also envisioned that several of the activities can be run concurrently.

The Inception Report should be produced before field interviews are undertaken to ensure that methods are aligned with the GEF guidelines for final evaluation.

#### 2.2 Methodology for Review Mission

An overall approach and method for conducting project terminal evaluations of UNDP supported GEF financed projects has developed over time. The evaluation should include a mixed methodology of document review, interviews, and observations from project site visits, at minimum, and the evaluators should make an effort to triangulate information. The consultant must conduct the following:

1. Desk review of project documents, outputs, monitoring reports, mid-term evaluation report,
2. Review of specific products including datasets, management and action plans, publications and other material and reports;
3. Interviews with the Project Management Units in the 3 participating countries, WCPFC, UNDP Philippines Country Office and the UNDP RTA in Bangkok, Thailand.
4. Interviews with the Project Manager and other project staff; and
5. Consultations and/or interviews with relevant stakeholders involved, including government representatives of WPEA-SM project.

#### Assessment of Project Results

The evaluator is expected to frame the evaluation effort using the criteria of **relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and impact**, as defined and explained in the UNDP Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-supported, GEF-financed Projects. The evaluation must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful.

#### Project Outcomes

The evaluation will assess the achievement of outputs and outcomes and provide ratings for targeted objectives and outcomes. The assessment of project results seeks to determine the extent to which the project objectives were achieved, or are expected to be achieved, and determine if the project has led to any other short- or long-term and positive or negative consequences. In assessing project results, the Consultant will seek to determine the extent of achievement and shortcomings in reaching project objectives as stated in the project appraisal document, and indicate if there were any changes and

whether those changes were approved. In assessing project performance, the Consultant can focus on achievements in terms of outputs, outcomes, or impacts. Although the GEF is more interested in assessing impacts, these may take a long time to manifest. On the other

end, output achievement is easy to assess but tells very little about whether GEF investments were effective in delivering global environmental benefits. Focus on outcomes is, therefore, an appropriate compromise. It captures project efficacy in terms of delivering medium-term expected results, thus assessment of project outcomes should be a priority.

To assess level of achievement of outcomes and objectives, these three criteria will be used in the evaluation to assess level of achievement of project outcomes and objectives.

- **Relevance.** Were the project's outcomes consistent with the focal areas/operational program strategies and country priorities?
- **Effectiveness.** Are the actual project outcomes commensurate with the original or modified project objectives? If the original or modified expected results are merely outputs/inputs, the evaluators should assess if there were any real outcomes of the project and, if there were, determine whether these are commensurate with realistic expectations from such projects,
- **Efficiency.** Was the project cost effective? Was the project the least cost option? Was project implementation delayed, and, if it was, did that affect cost effectiveness? Wherever possible, the evaluator should also compare the costs incurred and the time taken to achieve outcomes with that for similar projects.

The evaluation of relevance, effectiveness, and efficiency will be as objective as possible and will include sufficient and convincing empirical evidence. Ideally, the project monitoring system should deliver quantifiable information that can lead to a robust assessment of project effectiveness and efficiency. Since projects have different objectives, assessed results are not comparable and cannot be aggregated. Outcomes will be rated as follows for relevance, effectiveness, and efficiency:

1. *Highly satisfactory (HS).* The project had no shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives in terms of relevance, effectiveness, or efficiency.
2. *Satisfactory (S).* The project had minor shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives in terms of relevance, effectiveness, or efficiency.
3. *Moderately satisfactory (MS).* The project had moderate shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives in terms of relevance, effectiveness, or efficiency.
4. *Moderately unsatisfactory (MU).* The project had significant shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives in terms of relevance, effectiveness, or efficiency.
5. *Unsatisfactory (U).* The project had major shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives in terms of relevance, effectiveness, or efficiency.
6. *Highly unsatisfactory (HU).* The project had severe shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives in terms of relevance, effectiveness, or efficiency.

### **Sustainability**

The evaluation will assess, at minimum, the likelihood of sustainability of outcomes at project termination, and provide a rating for this. Sustainability is understood as the likelihood of continued benefits after the GEF project ends. Given the uncertainties involved, it may be difficult to have a realistic a priori assessment of sustainability of outcomes. Therefore, assessment of sustainability of outcomes will give special attention to analysis of the risks that are likely to affect the persistence of project outcomes. This assessment should explain how the risks to project outcomes will affect continuation of benefits after the GEF project ends. It will include both exogenous and endogenous

risks. For sustainability of outcomes the following ratings should be provided:

1. **Likely (L).** There are no or negligible risks that affect this dimension of sustainability.
2. **Moderately likely (ML).** There are moderate risks that affect this dimension of sustainability.
3. **Moderately unlikely (MU).** There are significant risks that affect this dimension of sustainability.
4. **Unlikely (U).** There are severe risks that affect this dimension of sustainability.

### **Assessment of M&E Systems**

The evaluation will assess whether the project met the minimum requirements for project design of M&E and the implementation of the project M&E plan.

**M&E design.** Projects should have a sound M&E plan to monitor results and track progress toward achieving project objectives. An M&E plan should include a baseline (including data, methodology, and so on), SMART (specific, measurable, achievable, realistic, and timely) indicators and data analysis systems, and evaluation studies at specific times to assess results and adequate funding for M&E activities. The time frame for various M&E activities and standards for outputs should have been specified.

**M&E plan implementation.** The evaluation should verify that an M&E system was in place and facilitated timely tracking of progress toward project objectives by collecting information on chosen indicators continually throughout the project implementation period; annual project reports were complete and accurate, with well-justified ratings; the information provided by the M&E system was used during the project to improve performance and to adapt to changing needs; and projects had an M&E system in place with proper training for parties responsible for M&E activities to ensure that data will continue to be collected and used after project closure.

**Budgeting and funding for M&E activities.** In addition to incorporating information on funding for M&E while assessing M&E design, the evaluators will determine whether M&E was sufficiently budgeted for at the project planning stage and whether M&E was funded adequately and in a timely manner during implementation.

Project M&E systems will be rated as follows on quality of M&E design and quality of M&E implementation:

1. *Highly satisfactory (HS).* There were no shortcomings in the project M&E system.
2. *Satisfactory (S).* There were minor shortcomings in the project M&E system.

3. *Moderately satisfactory (MS)*. There were moderate shortcomings in the project M&E system.
4. *Moderately unsatisfactory (MU)*. There were significant shortcomings in the project M&E system.
5. *Unsatisfactory (U)*. There were major shortcomings in the project M&E system.
6. *Highly unsatisfactory (HU)*. The project had no M&E system.

The overall rating of M&E during project implementation will be based solely on the quality of M&E plan implementation. The ratings on quality at entry of M&E design and sufficiency of funding during planning and implementation will be used as explanatory variables.

#### **Project Co-Financing**

The Evaluation will assess the key financial aspects of the project, including the extent of co-financing planned and realized. Project cost and funding data will be required, including annual expenditures. Variances between planned and actual expenditures will need to be assessed and explained. Results from recent financial audits, as available, should be taken into consideration. The evaluator(s) will receive assistance from the Country Office (CO) and Project Team to obtain financial data in order to complete the co-financing table below, which will be included in the terminal evaluation report.

#### **Lessons and Recommendations**

The Consultant will present lessons and recommendations in the Final Evaluation Report on all aspects of the project that they consider relevant. Special attention to analyzing lessons and proposing recommendations on aspects related to factors that contributed to or hindered attainment of project objectives, sustainability of project benefits, innovation, catalytic effect and replication, and project M&E is expected.

The consultant should refrain from providing recommendations to improve the project. Instead, should seek to provide a few well-formulated lessons applicable to the type of project at hand or to the GEF's overall portfolio. This evaluation should not be undertaken with the motive of appraisal, preparation, or justification for a follow-up phase. Wherever possible, evaluation report should include examples of good practices for other projects in a focal area, country, or region.

#### **Competencies :**

Core values

- Demonstrates integrity and fairness by modelling UN values and ethical standards;
- Demonstrates professional competence to meet responsibilities and post requirements and is conscientious and efficient in meeting commitments, observing deadlines and achieving results;
- Displays cultural, gender, religion, race, nationality and age sensitivity and adaptability;

Core competencies;

- Results-Oriented: Plans and produces quality results to meet established goals, generates innovative, practical solutions to challenging situations;
- Communication: Excellent communication skills, including the ability to convey complex concepts and recommendations, both orally and in writing, in a clear and persuasive style tailored to match different audiences;
- Team work: Ability to interact, establish and maintain effective working relations with a culturally diverse team;
- Client orientation: Ability to establish and maintain productive partnerships with national partners and stakeholders and pro-activeness in identifying of beneficiaries and partners' needs and matching them to appropriate solutions.

#### **Qualifications :**

Offers will be evaluated based on combined scoring method – where the Technical Proposal will be evaluated based on qualifications in the CV and brief description of previous work. The Technical evaluation is weighted a max. of 70%.

The Financial Proposal that will be evaluated through submission of the Offeror's Letter to UNDP Confirming Interest and Availability for the IC including Financial Proposal Template and combined with the price offer will be weighted a max of 30%;

For the evaluation of the Technical Proposal, the selection of the successful consultant must be based in the following qualifications (with the appropriate obtainable points):

<b>Criteria for Evaluation</b>	<b>Points Obtainable (100 points)</b>
<p><b>Education</b></p> <p>Master's Degree on sociology, development studies/ management, environmental science, environment &amp; natural resources management, social anthropology, or any related course</p>	20 points

<i>(Minimum of 15 points for Masters Degree, with additional points for each additional degree, maximum up to 20 points)</i>	
<b>Experience</b>	
Minimum Fifteen (15) years of relevant professional experience in the in fisheries research, development and policy, especially tuna fisheries, would be an asset <i>(Minimum of 15 points for 15 years, additional points for additional years of experience, maximum up to 20 points)</i>	20 points
Substantive experience in reviewing and evaluating similar technical assistance projects, preferably those involving GEF or UN agencies and major donors;	10 points
Experience Working with governments particularly in the South East Asian Region	10 points
<b>Key Competencies</b>	10 points
Fluency in the English language (written)	10 points
An ability to assess the institutional capacity and incentives required;	10 points
Understanding of political, economic and institutional issues associated with transboundary waters and groundwater in the region;	10 points
Atleast 6 months experience working with the diplomatic community;	10 points

*Applicants who will only receive 70 points from the assessment of the CV and Brief description of why the individual considers him/herself as the most suitable for the assignment will be qualified for the assessment of the Financial Proposal.*

**Recommended Presentation of Offer**

Applicants **must upload in one (1) file the documents listed below at** [https://jobs.undp.org/cj\\_view\\_job.cfm?cur\\_job\\_id=86468](https://jobs.undp.org/cj_view_job.cfm?cur_job_id=86468)

All applications should be deposited at the given link.

**Editable forms listed below are attached on this advertisement:**

1. Duly accomplished Offeror's **Letter to UNDP Confirming Interest and Availability** for the IC that indicates the all-inclusive lumpsum contract price, supported by a breakdown of costs, as per template provided; If an Offeror is employed by an organization/company/institution, and he/she expects his/her employer to charge a management fee in the process of releasing him/her to UNDP under Reimbursable Loan Agreement (RLA), the Offeror must indicate at this point, and ensure that all such costs are duly incorporated in the financial proposal submitted to UNDP;
2. **Financial Proposal** (Annex 2 of Offeror's Letter to UNDP Confirming Interest and Availability)
3. **Personal CV or P11**, indicating all past experience from similar projects, as well as the contact details (email and telephone number) of the Candidate and at least three (3) professional references;

*In view of the volume of applications UNDP receives, only shortlisted offerors will be notified.*