

## Terms of Reference for the Terminal Evaluation

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

Functional Name: Independent consultancy for the Terminal Evaluation (TE)

Duration: 30 working days over a period of 11 weeks

### 1. INTRODUCTION

In accordance with UNDP and GEF M&E policies and procedures, all full- and medium-sized UNDP-supported GEF-financed projects are required to undergo a Terminal Evaluation (TE) at the end of the project. This Terms of Reference (ToR) sets out the expectations for the TE 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). The project operates in four countries (Costa Rica, Ecuador, 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 fourth and final year of implementation (see Table 1 for the ProDoc cover page signature dates). The TE process must follow the guidance outlined in the document ‘Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP Supported, GEF-Financed Projects’ [http://web.undp.org/evaluation/guideline/documents/GEF/TE\\_GuidanceforUNDP-supportedGEFfinancedProjects.pdf](http://web.undp.org/evaluation/guideline/documents/GEF/TE_GuidanceforUNDP-supportedGEFfinancedProjects.pdf)

### 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 (as lead country) in November 2017 (Ministry of Production, Commerce, Investments and, Aquaculture and Fishing<sup>1</sup>) 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)	Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock of Costa Rica (MAG)	May 2016	July 2016

<sup>1</sup> Formerly Ministry of Aquaculture and Fisheries at the time of signature

	with UNDP Support			
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 <sup>2</sup>

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)<sup>3</sup>, 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 allocates 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 the 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**

<sup>2</sup> 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.

<sup>3</sup> 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).

Component	Outcome	Implementing Partner
<b>Component 1.</b> 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 international value chains.	SFP
<b>Component 2.</b> 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)
<b>Component 3.</b> Demonstration fisheries improvement projects (FIP)	Outcome 4. Increased sustainability scores of marine commodities purchased from project fisheries.	SFP in coordination with UNDP COs
<b>Component 4.</b> 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 3 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
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$5,500,000.00</b>

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. TE PURPOSE

The TE report will assess the achievement of project results against what was expected to be achieved and draw lessons that can both improve the sustainability of benefits from this project, and aid in the overall

enhancement of UNDP programming. The TE report promotes accountability and transparency and assesses the extent of project accomplishments. Recommendations from TE will be useful in sustaining the various results and interventions undertaken under this project.

## 4. TE APPROACH & METHODOLOGY

The TE report must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable, and useful.

The TE consultant will review all relevant sources of information including documents prepared during the preparation phase (i.e. PIF, UNDP Initiation Plan, UNDP Social and Environmental Screening Procedure/SESP) the Project Document, project reports including annual 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 evaluation. The TE consultant will review the baseline and midterm GEF focal area Core Indicators/Tracking Tools submitted to the GEF at the CEO endorsement and midterm stages and the terminal Core Indicators/Tracking Tools that must be completed before the TE virtual mission begins.

The TE consultant is expected to follow a collaborative and participatory approach<sup>4</sup> ensuring close engagement with the Project Team, government counterparts, the GEF Operational Focal Point, the UNDP Country Offices, UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Adviser, Implementing Partners, direct female and male beneficiaries and other key stakeholders.

Engagement of stakeholders is vital to a successful TE<sup>5</sup> 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. The TE consultant is expected to carry out online meetings and consultations with actors in Quito and Manta (Ecuador), San Jose (Costa Rica), Jakarta (Indonesia) and Manila (Philippines) and at a minimum, with the following stakeholders (see Table 4).

**Table 4: Stakeholder group list by location**

Location	Stakeholder Group List
Quito, Ecuador	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· UNDP Country Office (CO)</li> <li>· Sustainable Fisheries Partnership (SFP) Consultant</li> <li>· Global Project Coordinator</li> <li>· Monitoring and Evaluation specialist</li> <li>· Knowledge Management and Communications specialist</li> <li>· Finance and Administration specialist</li> <li>· Gender Specialist</li> </ul>
Manta, Ecuador	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Under-secretary of Fisheries Vice Ministry of Fisheries and Aquaculture / Subsecretary of Fisheries</li> <li>· Ecuador Platform Coordinator</li> <li>· Additional project stakeholder meetings (Platform and FIP) to be determined</li> </ul>
San Jose, Costa Rica	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· UNDP CO Programme Officer</li> <li>· Government representatives</li> </ul>

<sup>4</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.

<sup>5</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.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Additional project stakeholder meetings (Platform and FIP) to be determined</li> </ul>
Manila, Philippines	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· UNDP CO</li> <li>· Bureau of Fisheries and Aquatic Resources (BFAR), National Coordinator</li> <li>· Former National Platform Officer</li> <li>· SFP Consultant</li> <li>· Additional project stakeholder meetings (Platform and FIP) to be determined</li> </ul>
Jakarta, Indonesia	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· UNDP CO</li> <li>· Platform Coordinator</li> <li>· Ministry of National Development Planning (BAPPENAS)</li> <li>· Additional project stakeholder meetings (Platform and FIP) to be determined</li> </ul>
Panama, Panama	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Regional Technical Advisor (RTA)</li> <li>· Programme Associate</li> </ul>
At-a-distance consultation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· GMC Project Fisheries Advisor</li> <li>· SFP staff (to be determined)</li> <li>· Other relevant stakeholders (to be determined)</li> </ul>

The specific design and methodology for the TE should emerge from consultations between the TE consultant and the above-mentioned parties regarding what is appropriate and feasible for meeting the TE purpose and objectives and answering the evaluation questions, given limitations of budget, time and data. The TE consultant must use human rights and gender-responsive methodologies and tools to ensure that gender equality and women’s empowerment, as well as other cross-cutting issues and SDGs are incorporated into the TE report.

The final methodological approach including interview schedule and data to be used in the evaluation must be clearly outlined in the TE Inception Report and be fully discussed and agreed between UNDP, stakeholders and the TE consultant.

The final report must describe the full TE approach taken and the rationale for the approach making explicit the underlying assumptions, challenges, strengths and weaknesses about the methods and approach of the evaluation.

## 5. DETAILED SCOPE OF THE TE

The TE will assess project performance against expectations set out in the project’s Logical Framework/Results Framework (see ToR Annex A). The TE will assess results according to the criteria outlined in the Guidance for TEs of UNDP-supported GEF-financed Projects ([http://web.undp.org/evaluation/guideline/documents/GEF/TE\\_GuidanceforUNDP-supportedGEFfinancedProjects.pdf](http://web.undp.org/evaluation/guideline/documents/GEF/TE_GuidanceforUNDP-supportedGEFfinancedProjects.pdf)). The TE is expected to be undertaken in 30 days within a six-week period from June to July 2021.

The Findings section of the TE report will cover the topics listed below. A full outline of the TE report’s content is provided in ToR Annex C.

The asterisk “(\*)” indicates criteria for which a rating is required.

Findings

#### i. Project Design/Formulation

- National priorities and country driven ness
- Theory of Change
- Gender equality and women's empowerment
- Social and Environmental Standards (Safeguards)
- Analysis of Results Framework: project logic and strategy, indicators
- Assumptions and Risks
- Lessons from other relevant projects (e.g., same focal area) incorporated into project design
- Planned stakeholder participation
- Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector
- Management arrangements

#### ii. Project Implementation

- Adaptive management (changes to the project design and project outputs during implementation)
- Actual stakeholder participation and partnership arrangements
- Project Finance and Co-finance
- Monitoring & Evaluation: design at entry (\*), implementation (\*), and overall assessment of M&E (\*)
- Implementing Agency (UNDP) (\*) and Executing Agency (\*), overall project oversight/implementation and execution (\*)
- Risk Management, including Social and Environmental Standards (Safeguards)
- Any impact of COVID-19

#### iii. Project Results

- Assess the achievement of outcomes against indicators by reporting on the level of progress for each objective and outcome indicator at the time of the TE and noting final achievements
- Relevance (\*), Effectiveness (\*), Efficiency (\*) and overall project outcome (\*)
- Sustainability: financial (\*), socio-political (\*), institutional framework and governance (\*), environmental (\*), overall likelihood of sustainability (\*)
- Country ownership
- Gender equality and women's empowerment
- Cross-cutting issues (poverty alleviation, improved governance, climate change mitigation and adaptation, disaster prevention and recovery, human rights, capacity development, South-South cooperation, knowledge management, volunteerism, etc., as relevant)
- GEF Additionality
- Catalytic Role / Replication Effect
- Progress to impact
- Any impact of COVID-19

#### iv. Main Findings, Conclusions, Recommendations and Lessons Learned

- The TE consultant will include a summary of the main findings of the TE report. Findings should be presented as statements of fact that are based on analysis of the data.
- The section on conclusions will be written in light of the findings. Conclusions should be comprehensive and balanced statements that are well substantiated by evidence and logically connected to the TE findings. They should highlight the strengths, weaknesses and results of the project, respond to key evaluation questions and provide insights into the identification of and/or solutions to important problems or issues pertinent to project beneficiaries, UNDP and the GEF, including issues in relation to gender equality and women's empowerment.
- Recommendations should provide concrete, practical, feasible and targeted recommendations directed to the intended users of the evaluation about what actions to take and decisions to make. The recommendations should be specifically supported by the evidence and linked to the findings and conclusions around key questions addressed by the evaluation.
- The TE report should also include lessons that can be taken from the evaluation, including best practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance and success that can provide knowledge gained from

the particular circumstance (programmatic and evaluation methods used, partnerships, financial leveraging, etc.) that are applicable to other GEF and UNDP interventions. When possible, the TE consultant should include examples of good practices in project design and implementation.

- It is important for the conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned of the TE report to incorporate gender equality and empowerment of women.

The TE report will include an Evaluation Ratings Table, as shown in Table 5 below:

Table 5: Evaluation Ratings Table for the Global Sustainable Supply Chains for Marine Commodities Project

<b>Monitoring &amp; Evaluation (M&amp;E)</b>	<b>Rating<sup>6</sup></b>
<b>M&amp;E design at entry</b>	
<b>M&amp;E Plan Implementation</b>	
<b>Overall Quality of M&amp;E</b>	
<b>Implementation &amp; Execution</b>	<b>Rating</b>
<b>Quality of UNDP Implementation/Oversight</b>	
<b>Quality of Implementing Partner Execution</b>	
<b>Overall quality of Implementation/Execution</b>	
<b>Assessment of Outcomes</b>	<b>Rating</b>
<b>Relevance</b>	
<b>Effectiveness</b>	
<b>Efficiency</b>	
<b>Overall Project Outcome Rating</b>	
<b>Sustainability</b>	<b>Rating</b>
<b>Financial resources</b>	
<b>Socio-political/economic</b>	
<b>Institutional framework and governance</b>	
<b>Environmental</b>	
<b>Overall Likelihood of Sustainability</b>	

## 6. TIMEFRAME

The total duration of the TE will be approximately (30 working days) over a time period of 10 weeks) starting on June 1<sup>st</sup>, 2021. The tentative TE timeframe is as follows:

<sup>6</sup> Outcomes, Effectiveness, Efficiency, M&E, Implementation/Oversight & Execution, Relevance are rated on a 6-point scale: 6=Highly Satisfactory (HS), 5=Satisfactory (S), 4=Moderately Satisfactory (MS), 3=Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU), 2=Unsatisfactory (U), 1=Highly Unsatisfactory (HU). Sustainability is rated on a 4-point scale: 4=Likely (L), 3=Moderately Likely (ML), 2=Moderately Unlikely (MU), 1=Unlikely (U)

TIMEFRAME	ACTIVITY
May 10	Application closes
May 17	Selection of TE consultant
June 1	Preparation period for TE consultant (handover of documentation)
June 1 – 13	Document review and preparation of TE Inception Report
June 13	Circulation of draft TE Inception Report
June 14 - 17	Finalization and Validation of TE Inception Report
June 14 – July 2	TE virtual mission: stakeholder meetings, interviews, etc.
July 5-6	Virtual mission wrap-up meeting & presentation of initial findings
July 6 - 14	Preparation of draft TE report
By July 15	Share first draft TE report for comments to the IPCU/SFP/UNDP team
July –16 - 20	Incorporation of comments on draft TE
By July 21	Circulation of draft TE report for comments for project partners and institutions
August 2-6	Incorporation of comments on draft TE report into Audit Trail & finalization of TE report
August 9-12	Preparation and Issuance of Management Response
August 13	Concluding stakeholder workshop (recorded) and turn final TE document and supporting documents
August 18	Expected date of full TE completion

## 7. TE DELIVERABLES

#	Deliverable	Description	Timing	Responsibilities
1	<b>TE Inception Report<sup>7</sup></b>	TE consultant clarifies objectives, methodology and timing of the TE	Before starting the TE virtual mission: June 17	TE consultant submits to the Project Coordination Unit, Programme Officer RTA, and Project Steering Committee
2	<b>Virtual Mission Wrap-Up Presentation</b>	Initial Findings	End of virtual TE mission: July 6	TE Consultant presents to Project Coordination Unit, UNDP-Ecuador Programme Officer RTA, and Project Steering Committee
3	<b>Draft Final Report</b>	Full report (using guidelines on content outlined in Annex C) with annexes	One week after end of the TE virtual mission: July 20	Sent to Project Coordination Unit and Project Steering Committee; reviewed by RTA, Project Coordinating Unit, Programme Officer, GEF Operational Focal Point

<sup>7</sup> 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 TE, presents the Consultant's understanding of the purpose and scope of the evaluation, and how the evaluation questions will be addressed.



4	<b>Final Report<sup>a, b</sup></b>	Revised final report and TE Audit trail in which the TE details how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final TE report (See template in ToR Annex H)	Within 1 week of receiving comments on draft report: August 13	Sent to Project Coordination Unit and Project Steering Committee
---	------------------------------------	---	--	--

<sup>a</sup>The final TE report must be in English. A Spanish language translation of the executive summary must be provided.

<sup>b</sup>All final TE reports will be quality assessed by the UNDP Independent Evaluation Office (IEO). Details of the IEO's quality assessment of decentralized evaluations can be found in Section 6 of the UNDP Evaluation Guidelines.<sup>8</sup>

## 8. TE ARRANGEMENTS

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

Job title	Institution	Acronym
Under-Secretary of Aquaculture and Fisheries	Ministry of Production, Foreign Trade, Investment and Fisheries	MPCEIP
Advisor to the Executive Presidency	Costa Rican Institute of Fishing and Aquaculture	INCOPECA
Chief of Fisheries Division	Bureau for Fisheries and Aquatic Resources of The Philippines	BFAR-RD
Deputy Director for Institutional Marine Development and Maritime Affairs <i>Chairman of Steering Committee</i>	Ministry of National Development Planning of Indonesia	BAPPENAS-DD
Latin America Fisheries Coordinator	Sustainable Fisheries Partnership	SFP LatC
Programme Associate UNDP RBLAC	United Nations Development Programme, Regional Center for Latin America and the Caribbean, Panama	UNDP-RH
Program Officer Environment and Energy Area UNDP Ecuador	United Nations Development Programme, Ecuador	UNDP-lead CO
International Project Coordinator (IPC)  <i>Secretary of Steering Committee</i>	United Nations Development Programme	IPCU

The lead UNDP Country Office (Ecuador) will contract the consultant.

<sup>8</sup> Access at: <http://web.undp.org/evaluation/guideline/section-6.shtml>

The Project Team (IPCU) will be responsible for liaising with the TE consultant to provide all relevant documents, set up stakeholder interviews, etc.

## 9. TE EVALUATOR EXPERIENCE AND QUALIFICATIONS

An independent evaluator will conduct the TE. The TE 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), must not have conducted this project's Mid-Term Review and should not have a conflict of interest with the project's related activities.

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

- Undergraduate degree in science, economics, administration, or similar fields
- Master's or PhD. degree in marine biology, fisheries management, marine economics or policy, oceanography, natural resource management, environmental sciences or another related field.
- Fluency in reading, speaking and writing English
- Working proficiency in either Spanish, Bahasa or Filipino
- Has carried out 5 evaluations that follow result-based management methodologies
- 6 years of experience in fisheries or marine/ocean policy in either Latin America or Asia with preference for both regions;
- Verifiable experience of participation in two (2) UNDP or GEF project evaluation processes, either midterm or final reviews, in the last five years;
- Experience in one (1) process applying SMART indicators and reconstructing and validating baseline scenarios in the last five years;
- Experience in one (1) project evaluation processes with gender considerations

## 10. EVALUATOR ETHICS

The TE consultant will be held to the highest ethical standards and is required to sign a code of conduct upon acceptance of the assignment. This evaluation will be conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation'. The evaluator must safeguard the rights and confidentiality of information providers, interviewees and stakeholders through measures to ensure compliance with legal and other relevant codes governing collection of data and reporting on data. The evaluator must also ensure security of collected information before and after the evaluation and protocols to ensure anonymity and confidentiality of sources of information where that is expected. The information knowledge and data gathered in the evaluation process must also be solely used for the evaluation and not for other uses without the express authorization of UNDP and partners.

## 11. PAYMENT SCHEDULE

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

- 20% upon approval of Inception Report.
- 40% upon approval of the draft TE report.
- 40% upon approval of the final TE report (includes Spanish translations of the Executive Summary), a draft management response and delivery of completed TE Audit Trail.

Criteria for issuing the final payment of 40%<sup>9</sup>:

- The final TE report includes all requirements outlined in the TE TOR and is in accordance with the TE guidance.
- The final TE report is clearly written, logically organized, and is specific for this project (i.e. text has not been cut & pasted from other TE reports).
- The Audit Trail includes responses to and justification for each comment listed.

## 12. APPLICATION PROCESS<sup>10</sup>

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"> <li>• Education (30 points)</li> <li>• General experience (20 points)</li> <li>• Specific experience (50 points)</li> </ul>	100	30%
Technical proposal	100	40%
Economic proposal	100	30%
		<b>100%</b>

Rating parameter	Criteria	Score	Percentage
CV	<b>Education:</b>		30%
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Undergraduate degree in science, economics, administration, or similar fields</li> </ul>	10	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Master's or PhD. degree in marine biology, fisheries management, marine economics or policy, oceanography, natural resource management, environmental sciences or another related field.</li> </ul>	10	

<sup>9</sup> The Commissioning Unit is obligated to issue payments to the TE consultant as soon as the terms under the ToR are fulfilled. If there is an ongoing discussion regarding the quality and completeness of the final deliverables that cannot be resolved between the Commissioning Unit and the TE consultant, the Regional M&E Advisor and Vertical Fund Directorate will be consulted. If needed, the Commissioning Unit's senior management, Procurement Services Unit and Legal Support Office will be notified as well so that a decision can be made about whether or not to withhold payment of any amounts that may be due to the evaluator(s), suspend or terminate the contract and/or remove the individual contractor from any applicable rosters. See the UNDP Individual Contract Policy for further details: [https://popp.undp.org/\\_layouts/15/WopiFrame.aspx?sourcedoc=/UNDP\\_POPP\\_DOCUMENT\\_LIBRARY/Public/PSU\\_Individual%20Contract\\_Individual%20Contract%20Policy.docx&action=default](https://popp.undp.org/_layouts/15/WopiFrame.aspx?sourcedoc=/UNDP_POPP_DOCUMENT_LIBRARY/Public/PSU_Individual%20Contract_Individual%20Contract%20Policy.docx&action=default)

<sup>10</sup> Engagement of evaluators should be done in line with guidelines for hiring consultants in the POPP <https://popp.undp.org/SitePages/POPPRoot.aspx>

<i>Rating parameter</i>	<i>Criteria</i>	<i>Score</i>	<i>Percentage</i>	
	• Fluency in reading, speaking and writing English	7		
	• Working proficiency in either Spanish, Bahasa or Filipino	3		
	<b>General experience:</b>			
	• Has carried out 5 project/program evaluations utilizing a result-based management methodology	20		
	<b>Specific experience:</b>			
	• 6 years of experience in fisheries or marine/ocean policy in either Latin America or Asia, with preference for both regions.	20		
	• Verifiable experience of participation in two (2) UNDP or GEF project evaluation processes, either midterm or final reviews, in the last five years.	20		
	• Experience in one (1) process applying SMART indicators and reconstructing and validating baseline scenarios in the last five years.	7		
	• Experience in one (1) project evaluation processes with gender considerations	3		
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>100</b>		
Technical Proposal	<b>Methodology, agenda, and implementation schedule:</b>		40%	
	• Appropriate understanding the nature of work and understanding of the ToR.	25		
	• Development of the relevant aspects of the work with a sufficient level of detail.	25		
	• Development of appropriate conceptual and methodological framework for the work to be performed.	25		
	• Appropriate sequence of activities and planning.	25		
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>100</b>		

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

### 13. TOR ANNEXES

- ToR Annex A: Project Logical/Results Framework
- ToR Annex B: Project Information Package to be reviewed by TE consultant
- ToR Annex C: Content of the TE report
- ToR Annex D: Evaluation Criteria Matrix template
- ToR Annex E: UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluators

- ToR Annex F: TE Rating Scales
- ToR Annex G: TE Report Clearance Form
- ToR Annex H: TE Audit Trail

## ANNEX A: Logical Framework/Results Framework

	Indicator	Baseline	Targets End of Project	Source of verification	Risks and Assumptions
Project Objective (equivalent to output in ATLAS) To mainstream sustainability into seafood supply chains through market and policy mechanisms and partnerships with the overarching goal of rebuilding and protecting fish stocks and livelihoods	Landings from fisheries either certified sustainable or making regular, verifiable improvements.	2017 <sup>11</sup> : 14.9 million tonnes	15.4 million tonnes	Target 75 Initiative Annual Reports	The end-users and the stakeholders of the seafood value chains have an increased interest in sustainable seafood.

<sup>11</sup> The Prodoc originally established a baseline of 6.5 million tonnes and a target of >7 million by year 4, based on data available by the time ProDoc was designed, however, it has been updated to 2017 data to properly report results at the time of project implementation.

Outcome 1 Increased global market demand for sustainable certified marine commodities and associated reduction of IUU fisheries	1a. Number of fisheries for the targeted commodities (tuna, large pelagics, blue swimming crab and octopus) that are sourced by SFP partners and their suppliers and that are either in a FIP or MSC certified.	Tuna: 36 (20 FIP, 16 MSC) LPF: 20 (13 FIP, 7 MSC) Crab: 9 (All FIP) and Octopus: 0 Total: 65	Year 2. >10% increase (72) Year 4. >20% increase (78)	Annual report from SFP through its Metrics system (used by all retail/buyer partners and their suppliers) APR/PIR	Supply of seafood products from certified fisheries and FIPs. Growing demand from end buyers for seafood products from sustainable sources
	1b. Additional number of international seafood buyers ('buyers' = SFP partners plus suppliers to SFP partners) with sustainable seafood purchasing policies	0	Year 3. 9 Year 4. 15	Annual report from SFP APR/PIR	There is sufficient supply of seafood products from certified fisheries and FIPs. Buyers are interested in sourcing from sustainable fisheries
Outcome 2 Increased pressure on RFMOs and their Contracting Parties to adopt more sustainable	2. Number of position statements issued by industry for IATTC and WCPFC that include support	0	Year 2. 3 <sup>12</sup> (IATTC = 2; WCPFC = 1) Year 4. 5 (IATTC = 3; WCPFC = 2)	Annual report of IATTC and WCPFC meetings APR/PIR	International seafood buyers are willing to issue position statements to the OROPs.

<sup>12</sup> Originally, the ProDoc set >2 as target for year 2, however, as per recommendation of the MTR evaluation, indicators using > sign, will be updated and reported as integral numbers (i.e. from >2 to 3).

and science-based practices for shark and tuna conservation and management measures through engagement of international value chains	of more effective CMMs for tuna, sharks and LPF at the regional level.				
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	3a Number of Sustainable Marine Commodities Platforms created with project support and functional.	1 <sup>13</sup>		Year 2: 4 Year 3: 5	APR/PIR  There is sufficient market leverage to promote engagement of the seafood value chain of target fisheries. Fisheries authorities support SMCPs. The members of the seafood value chain have interest in participating in the SMCPs.
	3b. Number of Sustainable Fisheries	0		Year 3: 5 <sup>14</sup> Year 4: 7	Legal instrument  There is sufficient market leverage to

<sup>13</sup> By November 2017, the GMC project had supported project implementation in Costa Rica for over one year, and UNDP/Costa Rica had established the [Large Pelagic Sustainable Fisheries platform](#).

<sup>14</sup> As the MTR indicated the Ecuadorians TUNA and SHARK national action plans are being updated independently of the GMC project, it is proposed to remove this two national action plans from indicator 3b. If there were any potential cross-collaboration with the GMC project, it could be included as additional reporting.



	Action or Management Plans under implementation as a result of project support				s adopting the SFAPs APR/PIR	promote engagement of the seafood value chain. The fisheries authorities and the members of the seafood value chain support and participate in SFAPs.
Outcome 4 Increased sustainability scores of marine commodities purchased from project fisheries	4a. Number of FIPs uploaded to FisheryProgress.org, have progressed by at least one grade, or have maintained an 'A' grade with project support.	5 <sup>15</sup>		Year 3: 7 Year 4: 9	Annual report from SFP APR/PIR	Buyers prefer seafood products from credible FIPs and certified fisheries Fishermen and processors see market opportunities in FIPs and certification.
	4b. Additional private investment in FIPs supported by the project.	US\$0		Year 4: US\$1,500,000 <sup>16</sup>		

<sup>15</sup> The ProDoc includes as base line: ECU Mahi Mahi Longline; PHI Blue Swimming Crab bottom-set gillnet and pot/trap; IND Yellowfin Tuna Pole and Line; IND Skipjack Tuna Pole and Line; IND Blue Swimming Crab gillnet/trap. It also included as baseline ECU Tuna Purse Seine (TUNACONS), however, from the MTR recommendation, as this FIP has financial sustainability by the industry, it could be removed from the indicator. If there were any potential cross-collaboration, it could be included as additional reporting.

In the indicator 4d, as ECU Tuna Purse Seine (TUNACONS) was removed from 4a indicator, the FishSource profile was also removed in this indicator.

<sup>16</sup> In indicator 4b, as recommended by the MTR, the target of US\$1,500,000 should be for the life of the project and not by year, as this may be a mistake. Baseline indicator 4b has been set as 0 by MTR recommendation.

	4c. Number of additional fisheries in certification process (have entered process, undergoing assessment, or have been certified)	Fisheries entered into certification process: 0					Year 3: 2 Year 4: 3			
	4d. MSC & FishSource scores	<b>Costa Rica</b> <u>CRI Mahi Mahi</u> (longline) score 1: <6 <sup>17</sup> score 2: ≥6 score 3: ≥6 score 4: ≥6 score 5: ≥6	<u>CRI Tuna Yellowfin</u> (longline) Score 1: ≥6 Score 2: ≥6 Score 3: ≥6 Score 4: 7.96 Score 5: 8.56	<u>CRI Swordfish</u> (longline) Score 1: <6 Score 2: <6 Score 3: ≥6 Score 4: ≥6 Score 5: ≥8	Year 1: baseline FishSource scores for all fisheries Year 3: For 50% of the target fisheries (50% = 5 fisheries) there is an improvement of at least one level (levels = <6, ≥6, and ≥8) in 2 of the 5 FishSource scores (assuming not ≥8) <sup>19</sup> Year 4: For 80% of the target fisheries (80% = 8					
		<b>Ecuador</b> <u>ECU Mahi Mahi</u> (longline) score 1: <6 score 2: ≥6 score 3: ≥6 score 4: ≥6 score 5: ≥6	<u>ECU Yellowfin</u> (Pole and Line) No profile developed at baseline	<u>ECU Skipjack</u> (Pole and Line) No profile developed at baseline	<u>ECU Chub Mackerel</u> Score 1: <6 Score 2: ≥6 Score 3: n/a Score 4: <6 Score 5: n/a	<u>ECU Frigate Tuna</u> No profile developed at baseline	<u>ECU Thread Herring</u> No profile developed at baseline			
		<b>Philippines</b> <u>PHI BSC</u> (all gear profiles) Score 1: ≥6 Score 2: ≥6 Score 3: <6 Score 4: n/a Score 5: <6		<u>PHI Octopus</u> (all gear profiles) No profile developed at baseline						

<sup>17</sup> In indicator 4d, reporting maintains the > or < sign, as the FishSource profiles reporting uses this system.

<sup>19</sup> As noted, we will identify THREE levels of FS scores: <6, ≥6, and ≥8. If a score is 8 or above– and we do have scores in the range of 9 and 10 – it will count the same as a score of 8 exactly.

		<b>Indonesia</b> <b>IDN BSC</b> (all gear profiles) Score 1: $\geq 6$ Score 2: $\geq 6$ Score 3: $< 6$ Score 4: $< 6$ Score 5: $< 6$	<b>IDN Skipjack Tuna Pacific Ocean<sup>18</sup></b> (Pole and Line) Score 1: $\geq 8$ Score 2: $\geq 8$ Score 3: $\geq 6$ Score 4: 10.0 Score 5: 9.52	<b>IDN Yellowfin Tuna Pacific Ocean</b> (Pole and Line) Score 1: $\geq 6$ Score 2: $\geq 6$ Score 3: $< 6$ Score 4: 7.6 Score 5: 7.6	fisheries) there is an improvement of at least one level (levels = $< 6$ , $\geq 6$ , and $\geq 8$ ) in 2 of the 5 FishSource scores (assuming not $\geq 8$ )		
Outcome 5 Reliable and verifiable information of target marine commodities is publically available and is used by value chain stakeholders for decision making and engagement in fishery improvement projects	5a. Number of registered users	FishSource: 2,270 Metrics: 1,381			FS Year 3: 2,610 (15% increase) FS Year 4: 2,837 (25% increase) Metrics Year 3: 1,519 (10% increase) Metrics Year 4: 1,657 (20% increase)	Annual report from SFP APR/PIR	Industry and research/NGO audiences see increased value in registering for FishSource to access features not available to public users. Industry partners to SFP see increased value in assessing their sustainability commitments using Metrics risk ratings.
	5b. Number of visitors (average visitors per	FishSource: 2,019			Year 3: 2,322 (15% increase)	Google Analytics-Annual report	Industry and research/NGO audiences see increased value

<sup>18</sup> Though, the ProDoc mentions the Indian Ocean, it did not clearly state which tuna fisheries should the project work. The GMC project is reporting Western and Central Pacific Ocean Tuna, thus FishSource Profiles are only from the Pacific Ocean. Nevertheless, improvements in the pole and line fishery will support overall tuna fishery improvement. If there were any potential cross-collaboration with the GMC project that support other fishery at the Pacific or Indian Ocean, it could be included as additional reporting.

	month to the site) <sup>20</sup>		Year 4: 2,625(30% increase)	from SFP and FishChoice APR/PIR	in obtaining fishery information from FishSource.
	5c. Level of satisfaction (in terms of meeting user expectations) of information users for each site (exceeds expectations =3; meets expectations = 2; below expectations = 1; averaging scores for all areas) <sup>21</sup> :	FishSource: NA <sup>22</sup> Metrics: NA  FishSource: Content - 2.06, Organization - 2.21, and Navigation - 2.55, for a total satisfaction weighted average score of <b>2.27</b> .  Metrics: Content - 2.11, Organization - 2.20 and Navigation - 2.35, for a total satisfaction weighted average score of <b>2.22</b> .	: Year 4: weighted average=2.5	Survey report from SFP APR/PIR	Users of all these sites are increasingly satisfied (in terms of meeting or exceeding their expectations) with the information content, organisation, and navigation.
	5d. Number of scientific reports published by technical	0	Year 2: 2 Year 4: 4	Report publication from SFP APR/PIR	Contributions of technical experts hired to assist FIPs will be adequately

<sup>20</sup> As mentioned by the MTR report, project partner SFP does not maintain FisheryProgress website, which is maintained by FishChoice, another NGO. As a result, the GMC project has had some difficulties to obtain information of monthly visits to the fishery progress website, thus, it is proposed to only report FishSource website visits as the GMC project has access to this information with no limitation. The targets are set only for FishSource website. If there were any potential report shared by FishChoice on Fishery Progress website monthly visits, it could be included as additional reporting.

<sup>21</sup> Level of satisfaction is only reported for FishSource and Metrics, and do not include Fishery Progress as ProDoc Originally stated (see 5b footnote).

<sup>22</sup> As no user satisfaction data was collected at the time of project design, GMC project conducted a baseline measurement in year 2 for FishSource and Metrics. Target is set up at year 4 at an average of 2.5 for FishSource and Metrics.

	experts contracted by the project				captured in scientific reports.	
Outcome 6 Better knowledge management on mainstreaming sustainability into seafood value chains	6a Number of visitors of best practice documents	0		Year 2: 0 Year 3: 750 total Year 4: 1500 total	Survey reports from SFP, GEF APR/PIR	Best practice information shared by the project is increasingly accessed by IW:LEARN users.
	6b Level of utility of best practice documents (exceeds expectations =3; meets expectations = 2; below expectations = 1; averaging scores for all areas)	n/a <sup>23</sup>		Year 2: n/a Year 3: 2 average <sup>24</sup> Year 4: 2.5 average	Survey report from SFP APR/PIR	Users of best practice information increasingly find that it meets or exceeds their expectations.

<sup>23</sup> As recommended by MTR, baseline is set as n/a.

<sup>24</sup> Three-point scale: 3: exceeds expectations, 2: meets expectations, 1: below expectations

## Tour ANNEX B: Project Information Package to be reviewed by the TE Consultant

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

The following documents will also be available:

13. Project operational guidelines, manuals and systems
14. UNDP country/countries programme document(s)

Minutes of the GMC Project Steering Committee Meetings and other meetings

### ToR ANNEX C: Content of the TE Report<sup>25</sup>

#### i. Title page

- Title of UNDP-supported GEF-financed project
- UNDP PIMS ID and GEF ID
- TE timeframe and date of final TE report
- Region and countries included in the project
- GEF Focal Area/Strategic Program
- Executing Agency, Implementing partner and other project partners
- TE consultant

#### ii. Acknowledgements

#### iii. Table of Contents

#### Iv. Acronyms and Abbreviations

##### 1. Executive Summary (3-4 pages)

- Project Information Table
- Project Description (brief)
- Evaluation Ratings Table
- Concise summary of findings, conclusions and lessons learned
- Recommendations summary table

##### 2. Introduction (2-3 pages)

- Purpose and objective of the TE
- Scope
- Methodology
- Data Collection & Analysis
- Ethics
- Limitations to the evaluation

---

<sup>25</sup> The Report length should not exceed 40 pages in total (not including annexes).

- Structure of the TE report

### 3. Project Description (3-5 pages)

- Project start and duration, including milestones
- 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
- Immediate and development objectives of the project
- Expected results
- Main stakeholders: summary list
- Theory of Change

### 4. Findings

(in addition to a descriptive assessment, all criteria marked with (\*) must be given a rating<sup>26</sup>)

#### 4.1 Project Design/Formulation

- Analysis of Results Framework: project logic and strategy, indicators
- Assumptions and Risks
- Lessons from other relevant projects (e.g. same focal area) incorporated into project design
- Planned stakeholder participation
- Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector

#### 4.2 Project Implementation

- Adaptive management (changes to the project design and project outputs during implementation)
- Actual stakeholder participation and partnership arrangements
- Project Finance and Co-finance
- Monitoring & Evaluation: design at entry (\*), implementation (\*), and overall assessment of M&E (\*)
- UNDP implementation/oversight (\*) and Implementing Partner execution (\*), overall project implementation/execution (\*), coordination, and operational issues
- Risk Management incl. Social and Environmental Standards (Safeguards)

#### 4.3 Project Results

- Progress towards objective and expected outcomes (\*)
- Relevance (\*)
- Effectiveness (\*)
- Efficiency (\*)
- Overall Outcome (\*)
- Country ownership
- Gender

<sup>26</sup> See ToR Annex F for rating scales.

- Other Cross-cutting Issues
- Sustainability: financial (\*), socio-economic (\*), institutional framework and governance (\*), environmental (\*), and overall likelihood (\*)
- Country Ownership
- Gender equality and women's empowerment
- Cross-cutting Issues
- GEF Additionality
- Catalytic Role / Replication Effect
- Progress to Impact

#### 4.4 Main Findings, Conclusions, Recommendations & Lessons

- Matrix summarizing findings with correspondent conclusions and recommendations
- Main Findings
- Conclusions
- Recommendations
- Lessons Learned

#### 5. Annexes

- TE ToR (excluding ToR annexes)
- TE Mission itinerary
- List of persons interviewed
- List of documents reviewed
- Evaluation Question Matrix (evaluation criteria with key questions, indicators, sources of data, and methodology)
- Questionnaire used and summary of results
- Co-financing tables (if not include in body of report)
- TE Rating scales
- Signed Evaluation Consultant Agreement form
- Signed UNEG Code of Conduct form
- Signed TE Report Clearance form
- *Annexed in a separate file:* TE Audit Trail
- *Annexed in a separate file:* relevant terminal GEF/LDCF/SCCF Core Indicators or Tracking Tools, as applicable

#### ToR ANNEX D: Evaluative Criteria Matrix Template



Evaluative Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
Relevance: How does the project relate to the main objectives of the GEF Focal area, and to the environment and development priorities at the local, regional and national level?			
(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 TE mission, etc.)	(i.e. document analysis, data analysis, interviews with project staff, interviews with stakeholders, etc.)
Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved?			
Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in line with international and national norms and standards?			
Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, socio-political, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?			
Gender equality and women's empowerment: How did the project contribute to gender equality and women's empowerment?			
Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status?			
<i>(Expand the table to include questions for all criteria being assessed: Monitoring &amp; Evaluation, UNDP oversight/implementation, Implementing Partner Execution, cross-cutting issues, etc.)</i>			

## ToR ANNEX E: UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluators<sup>27</sup>

Independence entails the ability to evaluate without undue influence or pressure by any party (including the hiring unit) and providing evaluators with free access to information on the evaluation subject. Independence provides legitimacy to and ensures an objective perspective on evaluations. An independent evaluation reduces the potential for conflicts of interest which might arise with self-reported ratings by those involved in the management of the project being evaluated. Independence is one of ten general principles for evaluations (together with internationally agreed principles, goals and targets: utility, credibility, impartiality, ethics, transparency, human rights and gender equality, national evaluation capacities, and professionalism).

### 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 imitations, findings and recommendations.
7. Should reflect sound accounting procedures and be prudent in using the resources of the evaluation.
8. Must ensure that independence of judgement is maintained, and that evaluation findings and recommendations are independently presented.
9. Must confirm that they have not been involved in designing, executing or advising on the project being evaluated and did not carry out the project's Mid-Term Review.

### Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form

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

Name of Evaluator: \_\_\_\_\_

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: \_\_\_\_\_

<sup>27</sup> [www.undp.org/uneqcodeofconduct](http://www.undp.org/uneqcodeofconduct)

## ToR ANNEX F: TE Rating Scales

TE Rating Scales	
<b>Ratings for Outcomes, Effectiveness, Efficiency, M&amp;E, Implementation/Oversight, Execution, Relevance</b>	<b>Sustainability ratings:</b>
6 = Highly Satisfactory (HS): exceeds expectations and/or no shortcomings 5 = Satisfactory (S): meets expectations and/or no or minor shortcomings 4 = Moderately Satisfactory (MS): more or less meets expectations and/or some shortcomings 3 = Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): somewhat below expectations and/or significant shortcomings 2 = Unsatisfactory (U): substantially below expectations and/or major shortcomings 1 = Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): severe shortcomings Unable to Assess (U/A): available information does not allow an assessment	4 = Likely (L): negligible risks to sustainability 3 = Moderately Likely (ML): moderate risks to sustainability 2 = Moderately Unlikely (MU): significant risks to sustainability 1 = Unlikely (U): severe risks to sustainability Unable to Assess (U/A): Unable to assess the expected incidence and magnitude of risks to sustainability

<b>Monitoring &amp; Evaluation (M&amp;E)</b>	<b>Rating<sup>28</sup></b>
<b>M&amp;E design at entry</b>	
<b>M&amp;E Plan Implementation</b>	
<b>Overall Quality of M&amp;E</b>	
<b>Implementation &amp; Execution</b>	<b>Rating</b>
<b>Quality of UNDP Implementation/Oversight</b>	
<b>Quality of Implementing Partner Execution</b>	
<b>Overall quality of Implementation/Execution</b>	
<b>Assessment of Outcomes</b>	<b>Rating</b>
<b>Relevance</b>	
<b>Effectiveness</b>	
<b>Efficiency</b>	
<b>Overall Project Outcome Rating</b>	
<b>Sustainability</b>	<b>Rating</b>
<b>Financial resources</b>	
<b>Socio-political/economic</b>	

<sup>28</sup> Outcomes, Effectiveness, Efficiency, M&E, Implementation/Oversight & Execution, Relevance are rated on a 6-point scale: 6=Highly Satisfactory (HS), 5=Satisfactory (S), 4=Moderately Satisfactory (MS), 3=Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU), 2=Unsatisfactory (U), 1=Highly Unsatisfactory (HU). Sustainability is rated on a 4-point scale: 4=Likely (L), 3=Moderately Likely (ML), 2=Moderately Unlikely (MU), 1=Unlikely (U)

<b><u>Institutional framework and governance</u></b>	
<b><u>Environmental</u></b>	
<b><u>Overall Likelihood of Sustainability</u></b>	

### ToR ANNEX G: TE Report Clearance Form

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

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

### ToR ANNEX H: TE Audit Trail

**To the comments received on *(date)* from the Terminal Evaluation of *Increased Resilience to Climate Change in Northern Ghana through the Management of Water Resources and Diversification of Livelihoods (PIMS 4952)***

The following comments were provided to the draft TE report; they are referenced by institution/organization (do not include the commentator's name) and track change comment number (“#” column):

Institution/Organization	#	Para No./comment location	Comment/Feedback on the draft TE report	TE team response and actions taken