



Empowered lives.  
Resilient nations.

## TERMS OF REFERENCE

### Ref: PN/FJ/027/20

**Consultancy Title:** Mid Term Evaluation (MTR) Consultancy  
**Project Name:** RMI National Ridge to Reef Project.  
**Duty Station:** The consultant will be based in Majuro in order to partake in briefing and debriefings with government and non-government partners in the RMI.

**Duration of Assignment:**

Duration of Assignment: 30 days within 12 weeks period  
Application closure date (for submission of application): 16 March 2020.  
Starting date: 26 March 2020  
Completion date: 8 June 2020.  
Number of Days in Country: 10 days between April 20-May 4

**Consultancy Proposal (CV & Financial proposal Template) should be uploaded on UNDP Jobshop website([https://jobs.undp.org/cj view jobs.cfm?cur\\_rgn\\_id\\_c=RAS](https://jobs.undp.org/cj_view_jobs.cfm?cur_rgn_id_c=RAS)) no later than, 18<sup>th</sup> March 2020 (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](mailto: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.**

**NOTE:**

**Proposals must be sent through UNDP job shop web page. Candidates need to upload their CV and financial proposal - using UNDP template**

*If the selected/successful Candidate is over 65 years of age and required to travel outside his home country; He/She will be required provide a full medical report at their expense prior to issuance to contract. Contract will only be issued when Proposed candidate is deemed medically fit to undertake the assignment.*

## Objectives

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. This is the Terms of Reference (ToR) for the UNDP-GEF Midterm Review (MTR) of the project titled: **Looking to the Future: Strengthening natural resources management in atoll communities in the Republic of Marshall Islands Employing Integrated Approaches (RMI R2R)**. This project is the first GEF national R2R project implemented by UNDP through the direct implementation (DIM) modality, working with the RMI Office of the Environmental Planning and Policy Coordination (OEPPC), who will now become the Department of Climate Change after the recent restructure in the Government of RMI. The Director is the GEF Operational Focal Point.

The project started on the *November 2017* 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* ([http://web.undp.org/evaluation/documents/guidance/GEF/mid-term/Guidance\\_Midterm%20Review%20 EN 2014.pdf](http://web.undp.org/evaluation/documents/guidance/GEF/mid-term/Guidance_Midterm%20Review%20EN_2014.pdf))

## Background Information

As a Small Island Developing State (SIDS), the Republic of Marshall Islands (RMI) has a strong dependence on natural resources and biodiversity not only for food and income. The Marshallese relationship with the islands forms the basis of its culture and way of life which has developed in harmony over thousands of years. In the face of global threats, RMI still has pristine waters and coral reefs that contribute to ecosystem services and livelihoods. In recognition of the importance of its natural assets, RMI together with other SIDS responded to global conservation targets through the Micronesia Challenge and specifically for its part, it prepared Reimaanlok to serve as a clear roadmap of the way forward.

This project support operationalizing the Reimaanlok – the National Conservation Area Plan, adopted in 2008 to effectively conserve at least 30% of the nearshore marine resources and 20% of the terrestrial resources across Micronesia by 2020.

The project objective is to sustain atoll biodiversity and livelihoods by building community and ecosystem resilience to threats and degrading influences through integrated management of terrestrial and coastal resources adopting the principles and processes outlined in Reimaanlok. The project will be implemented in 5 islands/atolls within five years (2017-2022) with a \$3.9m support through the Global Environment Facility.

### Project Site Interventions:

The project is piloted on five (5) outer islands of Wotho, Mejit, Likiep, Aur and Ebon. The interventions are designed to strengthen local capacities, enabling local communities to implement the integrated natural resource management plans, and providing scale-able demonstrations of sustainable use of ecosystem goods and services. The lessons from this project will guide replication in other sites.

## Approach and 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 team considers useful for this evidence-based review). The MTR consultant will review the baseline GEF Core Indicators submitted to the GEF at CEO endorsement, and the midterm GEF core indicators that must be completed before the MTR field mission begins.

The MTR consultant is expected to follow a collaborative and participatory approach<sup>1</sup> ensuring close engagement with the

<sup>1</sup> For ideas on innovative and participatory Monitoring and Evaluation strategies and techniques, see [UNDP Discussion Paper: Innovations in Monitoring & Evaluating Results](#), 05 Nov 2013.

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.<sup>2</sup> Stakeholder involvement should include interviews with stakeholders who have project responsibilities, including national government departments, NGO's/ Civil Society Organizations, resource owning communities, community leaders, key experts and consultants in the subject area, Project Steering Committee, other project stakeholders, academia, etc. Below is a detailed list of the stakeholders involved with the project. The MTR consultant will center most of its work on Majuro, however, **travel to the outer island** will be discussed and agreed upon between the Consultant, UNDP, GEF OFP (OEPPC), RTA and the PIU Team at the beginning of the consultancy.

Types	Name
National Government	Department of Climate Change (former OEPPC)
	Marshall Islands Marine Resource Authority (MIMRA)
	Historic Preservation Office (HPO)
	Department of Lands and Survey (L&S)
	Public School System (PSS)
	Ministry of Natural Resource and Commerce (MNRC)
Local Government	Mayors: Five Target Sites
UN Organization	International Organization for Migration (IOM)
NGO/CSO	Marshall Islands Conservation Society (MICS)
	JoJikum
Academic Institution	College of the Marshall Islands (CMI)
	University of the South Pacific

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.

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

#### **i. Project Strategy**

##### Project design:

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

##### Results Framework/Logframe:

- Undertake a critical analysis of the project's logframe indicators and targets, assess how "SMART" the midterm and end-of-project targets are (Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Relevant, Time-bound), and suggest specific amendments/revisions to the targets and indicators as necessary.

<sup>2</sup> 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.

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

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

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

**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 Core Indicators at the baseline with the one completed right before the Midterm Review.
- Identify remaining barriers to achieving the project objective in the remainder of the project.
- By reviewing the aspects of the project that have already been successful, identify ways in which the project can further expand these benefits.

**iii. Project Implementation and Adaptive Management**

Management Arrangements:

- Review overall effectiveness of project management as outlined in the Project Document. Have changes been made and are they effective? Are responsibilities and reporting lines clear? Is decision-making transparent and undertaken in a timely manner? Recommend areas for improvement.
- Review the quality of execution of the Executing Agency/Implementing Partner(s) and recommend areas for

<sup>3</sup> Populate with data from the Logframe and scorecards

<sup>4</sup> Populate with data from the Project Document

<sup>5</sup> If available

<sup>6</sup> Colour code this column only

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

improvement.

- Review the quality of support provided by the GEF Partner Agency (UNDP) and recommend areas for improvement.

#### Work Planning:

- Review any delays in project start-up and implementation, identify the causes and examine if they have been resolved.
- Are work-planning processes results-based? If not, suggest ways to re-orientate work planning to focus on results?
- Examine the use of the project's results framework/ logframe as a management tool and review any changes made to it since project start.
- Examine the relevance of indicators and targets as per the results framework/ log frame and wherever necessary recommend appropriate changes

#### 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?
- 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 to be 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 consultant will include a section of the report setting out the MTR’s evidence-based conclusions, in light of the findings.<sup>8</sup>

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 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 (RMI Ridge to Reef Project)**

<sup>8</sup> Alternatively, MTR conclusions may be integrated into the body of the report.

Measure	MTR Rating	Achievement Description
<b>Project Strategy</b>	N/A	
<b>Progress Towards Results</b>	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.	
<b>Project Implementation &amp; Adaptive Management</b>	(rate 6 pt. scale)	
<b>Sustainability</b>	(rate 4 pt. scale)	

#### TIMEFRAME

The total duration of the MTR will be 30 days within 12 weeks period starting 26 March to 8 June 2020. The tentative MTR timeframe is as follows:

TIMEFRAME	ACTIVITY
March 12-16	Advertising Consultant position.
March 17-25	Application closed and Assessment of applications
March 26-April 3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Contracting of consultant</li> <li>- Submission of workplan</li> <li>- Handing over document for review</li> <li>- Submission of inception report</li> </ul>
April 20-May 4	MTR mission in country: conducting stakeholder meetings, interviews, field visits to demo sites (to be confirmed) Mission wrap up meeting and Presentation of initial findings of the MTR
May 18	- Submission of draft report
May 19-June 1	Government, UNDP and other stakeholders provide feedback on the draft report
June 8	Finalization of MTR incorporating audit trail from feedback on draft report.

#### MIDTERM REVIEW DELIVERABLES

#	Deliverable	Description	Timing	Responsibilities
1	MTR Inception Report	MTR team clarifies objectives and methods of Midterm Review	No later than 2 weeks before the MTR mission – by 3 April.	MTR consultant submits to the UNDP, OEPPC (GEF OFP) and project management
2	Presentation	Initial Findings	End of MTR mission – by 4 May	MTR consultant presents to project management, and the OEPPC
3	Draft Final Report	Full report (using guidelines on content outlined in Annex B) with annexes	Within 2 weeks after the MTR mission –by 18 May	Sent to UNDP, reviewed by RTA, Project Coordinating Unit, GEF OFP
4	Final Report*	Revised report with audit trail detailing how all received	Within 1 week of receiving UNDP	Sent to the UNDP

		comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final MTR report	comments on draft - by 8 June	
--	--	---------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------	--

\*The final MTR report must be in English. If applicable, the UNDP/GEF OFP may choose to arrange for a translation of the report into a language more widely shared by national stakeholders. Options for site visits should be provided in the Inception Report

**MTR ARRANGEMENTS**

The principal responsibility for managing this MTR resides with the UNDP Pacific Office, as commissioning unit.

The commissioning unit will contract the consultant and ensure the timely provision of per diems and travel arrangements for the MTR consultant. 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 as well as focal points in each state.

**CONSULTANCY CRITERIA**

An independent consultant will conduct the MTR with experience and exposure to projects and evaluations in other regions globally. The consultant cannot have participated in the project preparation, formulation, and/or implementation (including the writing of the Project Document) and should not have a conflict of interest with project’s related activities.

The selection of consultant will be aimed at maximizing the overall qualities in the following areas

- Recent experience with result-based management evaluation methodologies;
- Experience applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios;
- Competence in adaptive management, as applied to GEF *Focal Areas of* land degradation, international waters and biodiversity);
- Previous experience facilitating evaluations of GEF/UNDP and other development agency supported projects/initiatives;
- Experience working in the Pacific region and/or small island state is advantageous;
- Work experience in relevant technical areas for at least 10 years;
- Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender and biodiversity, land degradation and international waters; experience in gender sensitive evaluation and analysis.
- Excellent communication skills;
- Demonstrable analytical skills;
- A Master’s degree in Environmental Conservation, Sustainable Development, Development studies and /or 10 years of relevant experience in a closely related field is necessary
- Familiarity and experience with Strategic Environmental Assessment approaches is preferred



Criteria	Max. Point
<b>Qualification</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Minimum Master’s degree in Environmental Conservation, Sustainable Development, Development studies and /or 10 years of relevant experience in a closely related field is necessary</li> </ul>	10%
<b>Experience</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Previous experience facilitating evaluations of GEF/UNDP and other development agency supported projects/initiatives;</li> <li>▪ Experience applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios;</li> <li>▪ Competence in adaptive management, as applied to GEF <i>Focal Areas of</i> land degradation, international waters and biodiversity);</li> <li>▪ Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender and biodiversity, land degradation and international waters; experience in gender sensitive evaluation and analysis.</li> <li>▪ Excellent communication skills;</li> <li>▪ Demonstrable analytical skills;</li> <li>▪ Familiarity and experience with Strategic Environmental Assessment approaches is preferred</li> </ul>	20% 10% 10% 5% 5% 10%
<b>Total</b>	70%

**Criteria for Evaluation of Proposal:** 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.

**PAYMENT MODALITIES AND SPECIFICATIONS**

- 20% of payment upon signing of contract and acceptance of work plan by March 26.
- 40% upon approval of the draft MTR report by May18.
- 40% upon approval of final MTR report and submission of supporting document including GCF Core Indicators by June 8

**Supervision/Reporting**

The Consultant will report and supervised by the Deputy Team Leader Resilience and Sustainable Development Unit, UNDP Pacific Office in Fiji. While working in RMI, will be required to also report to the Project Manager, PIU and Director OEPPC (GEF OFF).

The consultant is expected to provide for his/her own laptop. Works station and other support will be provided for by the project.

He/ She is expected to coordinate closely with the Office of the Environmental Planning and Policy Coordination (OEPPC), Project Implementation Unit, and UNDP Pacific Office in Fiji.

## APPLICATION PROCESS<sup>9</sup>

### Recommended Presentation of Proposal:

- a) **Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability** using the [template](#)<sup>10</sup> provided by UNDP;
- b) **CV Brief description of approach to work/technical proposal** of why the individual considers him/herself as the most suitable for the assignment, and a proposed methodology on how they will approach and complete the assignment; (max 1 page)
- c) **Financial Proposal** that indicates the all-inclusive fixed total contract price and all other travel related costs (excluding in country costs of travel), supported by a breakdown of costs, as per template attached to the Letter of Confirmation of Interest template. If an applicant 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 applicant must indicate at this point, and ensure that all such costs are duly incorporated in the financial proposal submitted to UNDP.

The Consultant must send a financial proposal based on a **Lump Sum Amount**. The total amount quoted shall be all-inclusive and include all costs components required to perform the deliverables identified in the TOR, including professional fee, travel costs, living allowance (if any work is to be done outside the IC's duty station) and any other applicable cost to be incurred by the IC in completing the assignment. The contract price will be fixed output-based price regardless of extension of the herein specified duration. Payments will be done upon completion of the deliverables/outputs.

In general, UNDP shall not accept travel costs exceeding those of an economy class ticket. Should the IC wish to travel on a higher class he/she should do so using their own resources. In the event of unforeseeable travel not anticipated in this TOR, payment of travel costs including tickets, lodging and terminal expenses should be agreed upon, between the respective business unit and the Individual Consultant, prior to travel and will be reimbursed.

The P11 form and Template for confirmation of interest and Submission of Financial Proposal is available under the procurement section of UNDP Fiji website ([www.pacific.undp.org](http://www.pacific.undp.org))

***Women candidates are encouraged to apply.***

---

<sup>9</sup> Engagement of the consultants should be done in line with guidelines for hiring consultants in the POPP:

<https://info.undp.org/global/popp/Pages/default.aspx>

<sup>10</sup>

<https://intranet.undp.org/unit/bom/psa/Support%20documents%20on%20IC%20Guidelines/Template%20for%20Confirmation%20of%20Interest%20and%20Submission%20of%20Financial%20Proposal.docx>

## TOR ANNEX A: LIST OF DOCUMENTS TO BE REVIEWED BY THE MTR TEAM

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

The following documents will also be available:

14. Project operational guidelines, manuals and systems
15. UNDP country/countries program document(s)
16. Minutes of the RMI Ridge to Reef Project Board Meetings and other meetings (i.e. Project Appraisal Committee meetings)
17. Project site location maps

## TOR ANNEX B: GUIDELINES ON CONTENTS FOR THE MIDTERM REVIEW REPORT<sup>11</sup>

- 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 team members
  - Acknowledgements
- ii. Table of Contents
- iii. Acronyms and Abbreviation
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

---

<sup>11</sup> The Report length should not exceed 40 pages in total (not including annexes).

3. Project Description and Background Context (3-5 pages)
  - Development context: environmental, socio-economic, institutional, and policy factors relevant to the project objective and scope
  - Problems that the project sought to address, threats and barriers targeted
  - Project Description and Strategy: objective, outcomes and expected results, description of field sites (if any)
  - Project Implementation Arrangements: short description of the Project Board, key implementing partner arrangements, etc.
  - Project timing and milestones
  - Main stakeholders: summary list
4. Findings (12-14 pages)
  - 4.1 Project Strategy
    - Project Design
    - Results Framework/Logframe
  - 4.2 Progress Towards Results
    - Progress towards outcomes analysis
    - Remaining barriers to achieving the project objective
  - 4.3 Project Implementation and Adaptive Management
    - Management Arrangements
    - Work planning
    - Finance and co-finance
    - Project-level monitoring and evaluation systems
    - Stakeholder engagement
    - Reporting
    - Communications
  - 4.4 Sustainability
    - Financial risks to sustainability
    - Socio-economic to sustainability
    - Institutional framework and governance risks to sustainability
    - Environmental risks to sustainability
5. Conclusions and Recommendations (4-6 pages)
  - 5.1 Conclusions
    - Comprehensive and balanced statements (that are evidence-based and connected to the MTR's findings) which highlight the strengths, weaknesses and results of the project
  - 5.2 Recommendations
    - Corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project
    - Actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the project
    - Proposals for future directions underlining main objectives
    - Assess the progress of the projects and the prospects of completing project on time, and provide recommendation if there is need for project extension.
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**

<b>Evaluative Questions</b>	<b>Indicators</b>	<b>Sources</b>	<b>Methodology</b>
<b>Project Strategy: To what extent is the project strategy relevant to country priorities, country ownership, and the best route towards expected results?</b>			
(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.)
<b>Progress Towards Results: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved thus far?</b>			
<b>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?</b>			
<b>Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, socio-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?</b>			

**TOR ANNEX D: UNEG CODE OF CONDUCT FOR EVALUATORS/MIDTERM REVIEW  
CONSULTANTS<sup>1</sup>**

**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: \_\_\_\_\_

## TOR ANNEX E: MTR RATINGS

<b>Ratings for Progress Towards Results: (one rating for each outcome and for the objective)</b>		
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.

<b>Ratings for Project Implementation &amp; Adaptive Management: (one overall rating)</b>		
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.

<b>Ratings for Sustainability: (one overall rating)</b>		
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)*

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



## TOR ANNEX G: AUDIT TRAIL TEMPLATE

Note: The following is a template for the MTR Team to show how the received comments on the draft MTR report have (or have not) been incorporated into the final MTR report. This audit trail should be included as an annex in the final MTR report.

To the comments received on **(date)** from the Midterm Review of RMI R2R , **PIMS # 5685**

The following comments were provided in track changes to the draft Midterm Review report; they are referenced by institution (“Author” column) and track change comment number (“#” column):

Author	#	Para No./ comment location	Comment/Feedback on the draft MTR report	MTR team response and actions taken

## ANNE H: GEF CORE INDICATORS

UNDP PIMS **xxxx** country (GEFID **xxxx**)  
 FY19 / **MTR or TE**  
 GEF 7 Core Indicator Worksheet

Core Indicator 1	Terrestrial protected areas created or under improved management for conservation and sustainable use				(Hectares)		
	<i>Hectares (1.1+1.2)</i>						
	<i>Expected</i>			<i>Achieved</i>			
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE	
Indicator 1.1	Terrestrial protected areas newly created						
Name of Protected Area	WDPA ID	IUCN category	Hectares				
			Expected		Achieved		
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE	
			(select)				
		(select)					
		Sum					
Indicator 1.2	Terrestrial protected areas under improved management effectiveness						
Name of Protected Area	WDPA ID	IUCN category	Hectares	METT Score			
				Baseline		Achieved	
					Endorsement	MTR	TE
				(select)			
		(select)					
		Sum					

<b>Core Indicator 2</b>	<b>Marine protected areas created or under improved management for conservation and sustainable use</b>				<b>(Hectares)</b>		
	Hectares (2.1+2.2)						
	Expected		Achieved				
	PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE			
<b>Indicator 2.1</b>	<b>Marine protected areas newly created</b>						
Name of Protected Area	WDPA ID	IUCN category	Hectares				
			Expected		Achieved		
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE	
			(select)				
		(select)					
		Sum					
<b>Indicator 2.2</b>	<b>Marine protected areas under improved management effectiveness</b>						
Name of Protected Area	WDPA ID	IUCN category	Hectares	METT Score			
				Baseline		Achieved	
				PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE
				(select)			
		(select)					
		Sum					
<b>Core Indicator 3</b>	<b>Area of land restored</b>				<b>(Hectares)</b>		
	Hectares (3.1+3.2+3.3+3.4)						
	Expected		Achieved				
	PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE			
<b>Indicator 3.1</b>	<b>Area of degraded agricultural land restored</b>						
			Hectares				
			Expected		Achieved		
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE	
<b>Indicator 3.2</b>	<b>Area of forest and forest land restored</b>						
			Hectares				
			Expected		Achieved		
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE	
<b>Indicator 3.3</b>	<b>Area of natural grass and shrublands restored</b>						
			Hectares				
			Expected		Achieved		
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE	
<b>Indicator 3.4</b>	<b>Area of wetlands (including estuaries, mangroves) restored</b>						
			Hectares				
			Expected		Achieved		
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE	
<b>Core Indicator 4</b>	<b>Area of landscapes under improved practices (hectares; excluding protected areas)</b>				<b>(Hectares)</b>		
	Hectares (4.1+4.2+4.3+4.4)						
	Expected		Achieved				
	PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE			
<b>Indicator 4.1</b>	<b>Area of landscapes under improved management to benefit biodiversity</b>						
			Hectares				
			Expected		Achieved		
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE	

Indicator 4.2	Area of landscapes that meet national or international third-party certification that incorporates biodiversity considerations						
Third party certification(s):			Hectares				
			Expected		Achieved		
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE	
Indicator 4.3	Area of landscapes under sustainable land management in production systems						
			Hectares				
			Expected		Achieved		
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE	
Indicator 4.4	Area of High Conservation Value Forest (HCVF) loss avoided						
Include documentation that justifies HCVF			Hectares				
			Expected		Achieved		
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE	
<b>Core Indicator 5</b>	<b>Area of marine habitat under improved practices to benefit biodiversity</b>			<b>(Hectares)</b>			
Indicator 5.1	Number of fisheries that meet national or international third-party certification that incorporates biodiversity considerations						
Third party certification(s):			Number				
			Expected		Achieved		
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE	
Indicator 5.2	Number of large marine ecosystems (LMEs) with reduced pollution and hypoxial						
			Number				
			Expected		Achieved		
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE	
Indicator 5.3	Amount of Marine Litter Avoided						
			Metric Tons				
			Expected		Achieved		
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE	
<b>Core Indicator 6</b>	<b>Greenhouse gas emission mitigated</b>			<b>(Metric tons of CO<sub>2</sub>e)</b>			
			Expected metric tons of CO <sub>2</sub> e (6.1+6.2)				
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE	
Expected CO <sub>2</sub> e (direct)							
Expected CO <sub>2</sub> e (indirect)							
Indicator 6.1	Carbon sequestered or emissions avoided in the AFOLU sector						
			Expected metric tons of CO <sub>2</sub> e				
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE	
			Expected CO <sub>2</sub> e (direct)				
			Expected CO <sub>2</sub> e (indirect)				
			Anticipated start year of accounting				
			Duration of accounting				
Indicator 6.2	Emissions avoided Outside AFOLU						
			Expected metric tons of CO <sub>2</sub> e				
			Expected		Achieved		
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE	
			Expected CO <sub>2</sub> e (direct)				
			Expected CO <sub>2</sub> e (indirect)				
			Anticipated start year of				

		accounting				
		Duration of accounting				
Indicator 6.3	Energy saved					
			MJ			
			Expected		Achieved	
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE
Indicator 6.4	Increase in installed renewable energy capacity per technology					
		Technology	Capacity (MW)			
			Expected		Achieved	
		(select)	PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE
		(select)				
<b>Core Indicator 7</b>	<b>Number of shared water ecosystems (fresh or marine) under new or improved cooperative management</b>					<b>(Number)</b>
Indicator 7.1	Level of Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis and Strategic Action Program (TDA/SAP) formulation and implementation					
		Shared water ecosystem	Rating (scale 1-4)			
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE
Indicator 7.2	Level of Regional Legal Agreements and Regional Management Institutions to support its implementation					
		Shared water ecosystem	Rating (scale 1-4)			
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE
Indicator 7.3	Level of National/Local reforms and active participation of Inter-Ministerial Committees					
		Shared water ecosystem	Rating (scale 1-4)			
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE
Indicator 7.4	Level of engagement in IWLEARN through participation and delivery of key products					
		Shared water ecosystem	Rating (scale 1-4)			
			Rating		Rating	
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE
<b>Core Indicator 8</b>	<b>Globally over-exploited marine fisheries Moved to more sustainable levels</b>					<b>(Metric Tons)</b>
Fishery Details			Metric Tons			
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE
<b>Core Indicator 9</b>	<b>Reduction, disposal/destruction, phase out, elimination and avoidance of chemicals of global concern and their waste in the environment and in processes, materials and products</b>					<b>(Metric Tons)</b>
			Metric Tons (9.1+9.2+9.3)			
			Expected		Achieved	
			PIF stage	PIF stage	MTR	TE
Indicator 9.1	Solid and liquid Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs) removed or disposed (POPs type)					
			Metric Tons			
			Expected		Achieved	
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE
(select)	(select)	(select)				
(select)	(select)	(select)				
(select)	(select)	(select)				

Indicator 9.2	Quantity of mercury reduced					
			Metric Tons			
			Expected		Achieved	
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE
Indicator 9.3	Hydrochlorofluorocarbons (HCFC) Reduced/Phased out					
			Metric Tons			
			Expected		Achieved	
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE
Indicator 9.4	Number of countries with legislation and policy implemented to control chemicals and waste					
			Number of Countries			
			Expected		Achieved	
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE
Indicator 9.5	Number of low-chemical/non-chemical systems implemented particularly in food production, manufacturing and cities					
		Technology	Number			
			Expected		Achieved	
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE
Indicator 9.6	Quantity of POPs/Mercury containing materials and products directly avoided					
			Metric Tons			
			Expected		Achieved	
			PIF stage	Endorsement	PIF stage	Endorsement
<b>Core Indicator 10</b>	<b>Reduction, avoidance of emissions of POPs to air from point and non-point sources</b>					<b>(grams of toxic equivalent gTEQ)</b>
Indicator 10.1	Number of countries with legislation and policy implemented to control emissions of POPs to air					
			Number of Countries			
			Expected		Achieved	
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE
Indicator 10.2	Number of emission control technologies/practices implemented					
			Number			
			Expected		Achieved	
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE
<b>Core Indicator 11</b>	<b>Number of direct beneficiaries disaggregated by gender as co-benefit of GEF investment</b>					<b>(Number)</b>
			Number			
			Expected		Achieved	
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE
		Female				
		Male				
		Total				