

Terms of Reference for the Midterm Review (MTR)

Project Name: Global Sustainable Supply Chains for Marine Commodities Project (GMC)

Functional Name: Independent consultancy for the Midterm Review (MTR)

Duration: 47 days over a period of 11 weeks

1. INTRODUCTION

This is the Terms of Reference (ToR) for the UNDP-GEF Midterm Review (MTR) of the *full-sized* project titled Global Sustainable Supply Chains for Marine Commodities Project (PIMS #4754) implemented through the United Nations Development Programme and Implementing Partner Agency, Sustainable Fisheries Partnership (for the international component), which is to be undertaken in 2019. The project operates in four countries (Ecuador, Costa Rica, Indonesia and the Philippines) and has an international component, and therefore has five distinct budgets and project document cover pages. The project is in its third year of implementation (See table 1 for the ProDoc cover page signature dates). 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 Global Sustainable Supply Chains for Marine Commodities Project (GMC Project) is an inter-regional project implemented under differing types of National Implementation Modality (NIM) in Costa Rica, Ecuador, Indonesia and Philippines (see Table 1). The United Nations Development Programme is the **GEF implementing agency** (IA) and is therefore ultimately responsible to GEF for the channelling of resources to the executing agencies in accordance with UNDP rules and regulations. The **implementing partners (IPs)** are the Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock of Costa Rica (MAG), the Ministry of Production, Export Industry, Investment and Fisheries of Ecuador (MPCEIP), the Ministry of National Development Planning of Indonesia (BAPPENAS), and the Bureau of Fisheries and Aquatic Resources of Philippines (BFAR). The project has an international project coordination unit (IPCU) comprised of service contracts from UNDP and its implementing partner, international NGO Sustainable Fisheries Partnership (SFP).

Responding to requests from both the Ecuadorian national authority in November 2017 (Ministry of Aquaculture and Fishing) and from SFP in early 2018, the international component has since operated under the Direct Implementation Modality (DIM). The ProDoc cover page signatures differ between countries and the IPCU, and timing of commencement of project activities also differs (See Table 1).

Table 1: Project Unit/Country general information

Country/Facilitating Agency	Contract Modality	National Authority/ Implementing Partner	Date of ProDoc cover page signature	Date of Project Implementation Start
Costa Rica	National Implementation Modality (NIM) with UNDP Support	Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock of Costa Rica (MAG)	May 2016	July 2016 (platform launch date – May 2017)
Ecuador	NIM with UNDP Support	Ministry of Production, Export Industry, Investment and Fisheries (MPCEIP)	September 2017	November 2017

Philippines	NIM with UNDP Support	Bureau of Fisheries and Aquatic Resources of Philippines (BFAR)	March 2017	November 2017
Indonesia	Full NIM (funding managed by the national government, including the SFP component)	Ministry of National Development Planning of Indonesia (BAPPENAS)	March 2018	March 2018
IPCU	Direct Implementation Modality (DIM)	UNDP and Sustainable Fisheries Partnership	September 2017	November 2017 ¹

The GMC Project objective is to contribute to the transformation of the seafood market by mainstreaming sustainability in the value chain of important seafood commodities from developing countries, improving emerging tools such as corporate sustainable purchasing policies and Fishery Improvement Projects (FIPs)², developing a shared vision and agenda for long-term action and investment on sustainable commodity production with multi-stakeholders dialogue, thereby driving changes in national fisheries policy for improved fisheries administration.

The project will allocate Global Environment Facility (GEF) resources strategically to:

1. Engage major seafood buyers in the main world markets (EU, Japan, US) into responsible sourcing, providing tools to prepare and implement sustainable seafood sourcing policies.
2. Establish green commodities platforms (currently used in a variety of agricultural sectors) for target seafood value chains in Costa Rica, Ecuador, Indonesia and Philippines.
3. Generate experience that could be used in other countries, support the stakeholders of these platforms to develop practical experience with FIPs and upgrade existing tools for FIP implementation and monitoring, and,
4. Upgrade existing information platforms to facilitate access to reliable materials to value chain stakeholders in support of sound decision making, and capturing, documenting and disseminating the learnings of the project.

The project has four Components and six distinct Outcomes. While UNDP is responsible for the implementation of Component 2 and Outcome 6 under Component 4, SFP implements Components 1, 3 and Outcome 5 of Component 4 of the Project (See table 2).

Table 2: Project Components, Outcomes and Facilitating Partners

Component	Outcome	Implementing Partner
Component 1. Promotion of global demand for sustainable marine commodities	Outcome 1. Increased global market demand for sustainable certified marine commodities and associated reduction of Illegal, Underreported and Unregulated (IUU) fisheries.	SFP
	Outcome 2. Increased pressure on Regional Fishery Management Organizations (RFMOs) and their Contracting Parties to adopt more sustainable and science-based practices for shark and tuna conservation and management measures through engagement of	SFP

¹ In November 2017, the project held its inception workshop providing the first opportunity for national authorities from the four countries to interact and plan project activities in coordination. In addition, the project hired its international project coordinator, SFP implementation initiated, and UNDP activities related to implementation commenced in Ecuador and the Philippines.

² A multi-stakeholder effort to address environmental challenges in a fishery. These projects utilize the power of the private sector to incentivize positive changes toward sustainability in the fishery and seek to make these changes endure through policy change (CASS, 2015).

	international value chains.	
Component 2. Enabling environments for sustainable marine commodities supply chains	Outcome 3. Increased synergy and involvement of national and international players (i.e., retailers, traders, processors, fishermen and fisheries authorities) in sustainable seafood value chains.	UNDP Country Offices (CO)
Component 3. Demonstration fisheries improvement projects (FIP)	Outcome 4. Increased sustainability scores of marine commodities purchased from project fisheries.	SFP in coordination with UNDP COs
Component 4. Sustainable marine commodities information and knowledge management systems	Outcome 5. Reliable and verifiable information of target marine commodities is publicly available and is used by value chain stakeholders for decision making and engagement in fishery improvement projects.	SFP
	Outcome 6. Better knowledge management on mainstreaming sustainability into seafood value chains	UNDP IPCU

Total amount of GEF resources committed to the GMC Project by country and international coordination unit is described in the table below.

Table 3: Resources committed per country, GMC Project

Project Unit/Country	Total GEF Resources Committed
International Project Coordination Unit (UNDP and SFP)	\$3,053,301.35
Philippines	\$505,974.19
Indonesia	\$1,002,880.19
Costa Rica	\$505,974.19
Ecuador	\$431,870.08
Total	\$5,500,000.00

The project has strategic alliances with three US-based organizations that actively contribute to advancing sustainable seafood production and demand: the Monterey Bay Aquarium, National Fisheries Institute Crab Council and the Marine Stewardship Council. The National Fisheries Institute Crab Council provides funding to support the Blue Swimming Crab FIPs in Indonesia and the Philippines, the Monterey Bay Aquarium collaborates with the project through its ongoing work in building the demand for sustainable seafood in the United States, and the Marine Stewardship Council implements awareness-raising campaigns for international consumers and provides training on sustainable seafood certification and MSC standards for sustainable fishing and chain of custody to private sector representatives in GMC project countries.

3. OBJECTIVES OF THE MTR

The MTR will assess progress towards the achievement of the project objectives and outcomes as specified in the Project Document, and assess early signs of project success or failure with the goal of identifying the necessary changes to be made in order to set the project on-track to achieve its intended results. The MTR will also review the project's strategy, its risks to sustainability.

4. MTR APPROACH & METHODOLOGY

The MTR must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The MTR consultant will review all relevant sources of information including documents prepared during the preparation phase (i.e. PIF, UNDP Initiation Plan, UNDP Environmental & Social Safeguard Policy, the Project Document, project reports including Annual Project Review/PIRs, project budget revisions, lesson learned reports, national strategic and legal documents, and any other materials that the consultant considers useful for this evidence-based review). The MTR consultant will review the baseline GEF focal area Tracking Tool submitted to the GEF, and the midterm GEF focal area Tracking Tool that will be completed before the MTR field mission begins.

The MTR consultant is expected to follow a collaborative and participatory approach³ ensuring close engagement with the Project Team, government counterparts, the GEF Operational Focal Point, the UNDP Country Offices, UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Advisers, and other key stakeholders.

Engagement of stakeholders is vital to a successful MTR⁴ and should include interviews with stakeholders who have project responsibilities, including but not limited to executing agencies, senior officials and task team/component leaders, key experts and consultants in the subject area, Project Steering Committee members, academia, local government representatives, etc. Additionally, the MTR consultant is expected to conduct field missions to Quito and Manta (Ecuador), San Jose (Costa Rica), Jakarta (Indonesia) and Manila (Philippines) to carry out meetings and consultations with, at minimum, the following stakeholders.

Table 4: Stakeholder group list by location

Location	Stakeholder Group List	Number of days to be spent in each location ⁵
Quito, Ecuador	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · UNDP Country Office (CO) · Sustainable Fisheries Partnership (SFP) Consultant · Project Coordinator · Monitoring and Evaluation specialist · Knowledge Management and Communications specialist · Finance and Administration specialist 	2
Manta, Ecuador	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Under-secretary of Fisheries Vice Ministry of Fisheries and Aquaculture · Ecuador Platform Coordinator · Additional project stakeholder meetings (Platform and FIP) to be determined 	2
San Jose, Costa Rica	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · UNDP CO · Government representatives · Former Platform Coordinator · Additional project stakeholder meetings (Platform and FIP) to be determined 	2
Manila, Philippines	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · UNDP CO · Bureau of Fisheries and Aquatic Resources (BFAR), National Coordinator · National Platform Officer · SFP Consultant · Additional project stakeholder meetings (Platform and FIP) to be determined 	3

³ For ideas on innovative and participatory Monitoring and Evaluation strategies and techniques, see [UNDP Discussion Paper: Innovations in Monitoring & Evaluating Results](#), 05 Nov 2013.

⁴ 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.

⁵ Does not include time for travel between countries.

Jakarta, Indonesia	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · UNDP CO · Platform Coordinator · Ministry of National Development Planning (BAPPENAS) · Additional project stakeholder meetings (Platform and FIP) to be determined 	3
At-a-distance consultation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · GMC Project Latin America Regional Fisheries Advisor · GMC Project Asia Regional Fisheries Advisor · SFP Latin America Coordinator and GMC Point of Contact · Green Commodities Programme Global Head 	2

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

5. DETAILED SCOPE OF THE MTR

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

i. Project Strategy

Project design:

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

Results Framework/Logframe:

- Undertake a critical analysis of the project’s logframe indicators and targets, assess how “SMART” the midterm and end-of-project targets are (Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Relevant, Time-bound), and suggest specific amendments/revisions to the targets and indicators as necessary.
- Are the project’s objectives and outcomes or components clear, practical, and feasible within its time frame?
- Examine if progress so far has led to or could in the future catalyse beneficial development effects (i.e. income generation, women’s empowerment, improved governance etc.) that should be included in the project results framework and monitored on an annual basis.
- Ensure the project is in the process of developing and/or implementing its gender mainstreaming strategy and that it has a plan for the monitoring and evaluation of this strategy. Gender aspects of the project are being monitored effectively.

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), include/ or recommend sex disaggregated data.

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

Project Strategy	Indicator ⁶	Baseline Level ⁷	Level in 1 st PIR (self-reported)	Level in 2 nd PIR (draft) ⁸	Midterm Target ⁹	End-of-project Target	Midterm Level & Assessment ¹⁰	Achievement Rating ¹¹	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, including those related to gender-based power relations, or any other cross-cutting issue.
- 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? Does the team have gender equality capacities? Recommend areas for improvement.
- Review the quality of execution of the Executing Agency/Implementing Partner(s) and recommend areas for improvement.

⁶ Populate with data from the Logframe and scorecards

⁷ Populate with data from the Project Document

⁸ Initial results from the 2nd PIR process will be available for review at the time of the MTR

⁹ If available

¹⁰ Color code this column only

¹¹ Use the 6-point Progress Towards Results Rating Scale: HS, S, MS, MU, U, HU

- 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.
- Determine whether gender mainstreaming activities have been planned and/or implemented and are appropriately aligned with the project's gender marker rating.

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?
- Review the results of the project Audit carried out in 2019 to determine the status of implementation of the measures recommended by the Audit.
- 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? Are they considering the gender sensitive results?¹²
- 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.

¹² See the UNDP Ecuador "Guía para para incorporar el género en programas y proyectos, 2019", the UNDP GENDER EQUALITY SEAL "Recommendations & Good Practices Guidance Note, 2019", and the United Nations Evaluation group "Guidance on Evaluating Institutional Gender Mainstreaming 2018."

- 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?
- 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 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.

Institutionalization of Gender Mainstreaming

- Has the project effectively left capacities and/or knowledge installed within host government or host country institutions to continue mainstreaming gender issues in decision making processes regarding legal frameworks, policies, governance structures?

Environmental risks to sustainability:

- Are there any environmental risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project outcomes?

Conclusions & Recommendations

The MTR consultant will include a section of the report setting out the MTR’s evidence-based conclusions, in light of the findings.

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

The MTR consultant should make no more than 15 recommendations total.

Ratings

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

Table. MTR Ratings & Achievement Summary Table for the Global Marine Commodities 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 47 days over a period of 11 weeks starting July 15. The tentative MTR timeframe is as follows:

TIMEFRAME	ACTIVITY
July 1	Application closes
July 12	Select MTR consultant
July 15	Prep the MTR consultant (handover of Project Documents)
July 15 – July 19 (5 days)	Document review and preparing MTR Inception Report
July 22	Submission of the MTR Inception Report First Draft
August 5 – 9 (5 days)	Reception of Project Steering Committee comments, and finalization of MTR Inception Report
August 9	Virtual presentation of MTR inception report and work plan for MTR mission to the Project Steering Committee.
August 12 – August 29 (18 days, including weekend days)	MTR mission: stakeholder meetings, interviews, field visits

August 29	Virtual mission wrap-up meeting & presentation of initial findings to the Project Steering Committee.
August 30 – September 9 (11 days, including weekend days)	Prepare and submit draft report. Report must be submitted in English with an executive summary translation in Spanish
September 23 – 30 (8 days, including weekend days)	Incorporating audit trail from feedback on draft report/Finalization of MTR report including the Management Response
September 30	Expected date of full MTR completion

7. MIDTERM REVIEW DELIVERABLES

#	Deliverable	Description	Timing	Responsibilities
1	MTR Inception Report¹³	MTR consultant clarifies objectives and methods of Midterm Review	No later than 2 weeks before the MTR mission: July 22	MTR consultant submits to the Project Steering Committee
2	Virtual Mission Wrap-Up Presentation	Initial Findings	End of MTR mission: August 29	MTR Consultant presents to Project Steering Committee
3	Draft Final Report	Full report (using guidelines on content outlined in Annex B) with annexes	Within 11 days of the MTR mission: September 9	Sent to the Project Steering Committee
4	Final Report*	Revised report with audit trail detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final MTR report, as well as the Management Response indicating how the recommendations will be addressed.	Within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft: September 30	Sent to Project Steering Committee

*The final MTR report must be in English. A Spanish language translation of the executive summary must be provided.

8. MTR ARRANGEMENTS

The principal responsibility for managing this MTR resides with the Project Steering Committee (PSC). The PSC is comprised of the following individuals:

Name	Job title	Institution	Acronym
Nelson Zambrano	Under-Secretary of Aquaculture and Fisheries	Ministry of Production, Foreign Trade, Investment and Fisheries	MPCEIP
Victor Fernandez	Advisor to the Executive Presidency	Costa Rican Institute of Fishing and Aquaculture	INCOPECA
Rafael Ramiscal	Chief of Fisheries Division	Bureau for Fisheries and Aquatic Resources of The Philippines	BFAR-RD

¹³ The inception report is a means to ensure that the evaluator and the project stakeholders have a shared understanding of the objective(s), scope, expected contents and structure of the evaluation and its related deliverables or outputs in the form of reports and (de)briefings. The inception report, which is the first contractual deliverable of the MTR, presents the Consultant's understanding of the purpose and scope of the evaluation, and how the evaluation questions will be addressed.

Roby Fadillah	Deputy Director for Institutional Marine Development and Maritime Affairs <i>Chairman of Steering Committee</i>	Ministry of National Development Planning of Indonesia	BAPPENAS-DD
Enrique Alonso	Latin America Fisheries Coordinator	Sustainable Fisheries Partnership	SFP LatC
Joana Troyano	Programme Associate UNDP RBLAC	United Nations Development Programme, Regional Center for Latin America and the Caribbean, Panama	UNDP-RH
Ana María Núñez	Program Officer Environment and Energy Area UNDP Ecuador	United Nations Development Programme, Ecuador	UNDP-lead CO
Diego Orellana	International Project Coordinator (IPC) <i>Secretary of Steering Committee</i>	United Nations Development Programme	IPCU

The lead UNDP Country Office (Ecuador) will contract the consultants. Per diem and travel costs for the MTR field mission to Ecuador, Costa Rica, Indonesia and Philippines is included in the consultant's fee. Air fare should consider the most direct and economic route to the place and country, and the consultant must include in its economic proposal a daily expense allowance that does not exceed the United Nations rate for the place and country in which the MTR mission will be performed.¹⁴

The Project Team will be responsible for liaising with the MTR consultant to provide all relevant documents, set up stakeholder interviews, and arrange field visits.

9. DESIRED EXPERIENCE

The MTR consultant must have experience and exposure to GEF projects, project evaluations, and fisheries management in either Latin America or Asia (ideally in both regions). The consultant cannot have participated in the project preparation, formulation, and/or implementation (including the writing of the Project Document) and should not have a conflict of interest with project's related activities.

The following list of qualifications and experience describes the ideal candidate for the MTR consultant.

- At minimum, must possess a master's degree in Marine biology, fisheries management, oceanography, natural resource management, or other closely related field. MA or certification in Gender Studies considered an asset.
- At least 8 years' experience in fisheries or marine/ocean policy in either Latin America or Asia with preference for both regions;
- Has carried out at least 5 evaluations that follow result-based management methodologies;
- Experience in at least one (1) process applying SMART indicators and reconstructing and validating baseline scenarios in the last five years;
- Verifiable experience of participation in at least two (2) UNDP or GEF project evaluation processes, either midterm or final reviews, in the last five years;
- Demonstrated experience in gender sensitive evaluation and analysis;

¹⁴ See United Nations Daily Subsistence Allowance rates by country and city published here: <https://icsc.un.org/>

- Fluency in English required, working proficiency in Spanish, Bahasa or Filipino preferred;
- Demonstrable analytical skills.

10. PAYMENT MODALITIES AND SPECIFICATIONS

Payments will be made in two disbursements after the PSC approval of each deliverable, or as otherwise agreed between the UNDP Ecuador Country Office and the MTR Consultant.

- 20% upon approval of Inception Report as an advance to cover costs of travel.
- 30% upon approval of the draft MTR report.
- 50% upon approval of the final MTR report and management response.

11. APPLICATION PROCESS

Applicants must submit their CV, a Technical Proposal, Economic Proposal, and a separate attachment that describes the scope of at least two (2) UNDP or GEF project midterm or final evaluation processes that the consultant led over the last five years, including a description of the evaluations' activities, methodology, contract value and time-period.

Only those applications which are responsive and compliant will be evaluated. Offers will be evaluated according to the Combined Scoring method – where the educational background and experience on similar assignments will be weighted at 70% and the price proposal will weigh as 30% of the total scoring. The applicant receiving the Highest Combined Score that has also accepted UNDP's General Terms and Conditions will be awarded the contract.

The evaluation criteria are the following:

Criteria	Points	Percentage
CVs: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General experience • Specific experience 	100	30%
Technical proposal	100	40%
Economic proposal	100	30%
		100%

Rating parameter	Criteria	Score	Percentage
CV	Education:		30%
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Undergraduate degree in science, economics, administration, or similar fields 	10	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Master's or PhD. degree in marine biology, fisheries management, marine economics or policy, oceanography, natural resource management, environmental sciences or another related field. 	10	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fluency in reading, speaking and writing English 	7	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Working proficiency in either Spanish, Bahasa or Filipino 	3	
	General experience:		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has carried out at least 5 project/program evaluations utilizing a result-based management methodology 	20	
	Specific experience:		

<i>Rating parameter</i>	<i>Criteria</i>	<i>Score</i>	<i>Percentage</i>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Verifiable experience of participation in at least two (2) UNDP or GEF project evaluation processes, either midterm or final reviews, in the last five years. 	20	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> At least 8 years' experience in fisheries in either Latin America or Asia. 	15	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Experience in fisheries in both Latin America and Asia. 	5	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Experience in at least one (1) process applying SMART indicators and reconstructing and validating baseline scenarios in the last five years. 	10	
	TOTAL	100	
Technical Proposal	Methodology, agenda and implementation schedule:		40%
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Appropriate understanding the nature of work and understanding of the ToR. 	25	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development of the relevant aspects of the work with a sufficient level of detail. 	25	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development of appropriate conceptual and methodological framework for the work to be performed. 	25	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Appropriate sequence of activities and planning. 	25	
	TOTAL	100	

<i>Economical proposal</i>	<i>Score</i>	<i>Percentage</i>
<p>The highest score (30%) will be awarded to the most economical offer and the inverse proportional to the other offers.</p> <p>Only the technical proposals that achieve a score of at least 49/70 will proceed to the economic proposal review stage.</p>	100	30%

ToR ANNEX A: List of Documents to be reviewed by the MTR Consultant

1. PIF
2. UNDP Initiation Plan
3. UNDP Project Document
4. UNDP Environmental and Social Screening results
5. Project Inception Report
6. All Project Implementation Reports (PIR's)
7. Quarterly progress reports and work plans of the various implementation task teams
8. Audit reports
9. Finalized GEF International Waters Tracking Tools at CEO endorsement and midterm
10. Oversight mission reports
11. All monitoring reports prepared by the project
12. Financial and Administration guidelines used by Project Team

The following documents will also be available:

13. Project operational guidelines, manuals and systems
14. UNDP country/countries programme document(s)
15. Minutes of the GMC Project Steering Committee Meetings and other meetings (i.e. Project Appraisal Committee meetings)

ToR ANNEX B: Guidelines on Contents for the Midterm Review Report¹⁵

- 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 Consultant
 - Acknowledgements
- ii. Table of Contents
- iii. Acronyms and Abbreviations
1. Executive Summary (*3-5 pages*)
 - Project Information Table
 - Project Description (brief)
 - Project Progress Summary (between 200-500 words)
 - MTR Ratings & Achievement Summary Table
 - Concise summary of conclusions
 - Recommendation Summary Table
2. Introduction (*2-3 pages*)
 - Purpose of the MTR and objectives
 - Scope & Methodology: principles of design and execution of the MTR, MTR approach and data 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.

¹⁵ The Report length should not exceed 40 pages in total (not including annexes).

- 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 C: 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?			

Evaluators/Consultants:

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

MTR Consultant Agreement Form

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

Name of Consultant: _____

Name of Consultancy Organization (where relevant): _____

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

Signed at _____ (*Place*) on _____ (*Date*)

Signature: _____

¹⁶ www.undp.org/uneqcodeofconduct

ToR ANNEX E: 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.
3	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 F: MTR Report Clearance Form

(to be completed by the Commissioning Unit and UNDP-GEF RTA and included in the final document)

Midterm Review Report Reviewed and Cleared By:	
Commissioning Unit	
Name: _____	
Signature: _____	Date: _____
UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Advisor	
Name: _____	
Signature: _____	Date: _____