UNDP-GEF Midterm Review Terms of Reference
Creation of Marine Protected Areas Project

1. INTRODUCTION

This is the Terms of Reference (ToR) for the UNDP-GEF Midterm Review (MTR) of the medium-sized project titled *Creation of Marine Protected Areas in Angola* (PIMS# 6051) implemented by the *Ministry of Culture, Tourism and Environment (MCTA)* through the *National Institute of Biodiversity and Conservation (INBC)*, which is to be undertaken between end 2021 and early 2022. The project started on the 5th *July 2019* with the *inception workshop* held on July 30, 2019, however, due to delays the project management unit was only functional by mid-2020 and the project is currently in its *first (effective)* year of implementation (July 2020 – June 2021). 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*).

2. PROJECT BACKGROUND INFORMATION

The project was designed at a time when Angola's economy became increasingly dependent on marine resources and mineral oil and there is still increasing movement of the population to coastal areas. This is particularly important because development pressures from fisheries, oil and gas exploration and coastal development could potentially result in mounting pressures on the country's natural marine resources and biodiversity. Moreover, the rich marine natural resources on which these three economic sectors depend are especially vulnerable to such pressures. However, in part as a result of the low oil prices, there is currently large interest of the Government of Angola in the diversification of the economy, including through developing the significant potential for tourism. This interest as well as Angola's international obligations under agreements such as CBD and CITES have reinforced political support for the expansion and strengthening of the country's marine protected areas (MPA) system.

This project aims to address the negative impacts of unsustainable sector-led development practices on biodiversity-rich coastal and marine ecosystems of Angola, while taking into account inclusive and equitable social and economic development for dependent communities and local economies, as well as safeguarding against threats to marine biodiversity from unplanned and haphazard developments. The objective of the project is to expand the protected area network into the marine environment through the creation of Angola's first marine protected area.

The project recognizes the fact that the seascapes underpin the lives and livelihoods of a large number of local communities and that implementation of a coherent strategy to promote sustainable, biodiversity-friendly livelihood and economic options is an integral part of the solution. The project objective is to be achieved through the implementation of three inter-related and mutually complementary Project Outcomes that are focused on addressing existing barriers. The three Outcomes of the project are:

Outcome 1: Strengthened policy, legal and institutional framework for creation and management of Marine Protected Areas;

Outcome 2: Integrated management plan implemented for a priority high biodiversity marine protected area to protect endangered marine species and reduce threats; and

Outcome 3: Lessons learned through knowledge management, monitoring and evaluation, and equitable gender mainstreaming available to support the creation and implementation of MPAs nationally and internationally.

The project duration is 4 years from July 2019 to June 2023 with a total budget is 1,776,484 USD and planned co-financing of 6,368,440 USD from the Government of Angola and Bilateral Development Agencies.

Institutional arrangements of the project, relevant partners, and stakeholders

The project is implemented by UNDP and executed by the Ministry of Culture, Tourism and Environment (MCTA), through the National Institute for Biodiversity and Conservation (INBC). INBC is a public institution within the Ministry of Environment of the Republic of Angola and has legal, administrative, financial and patrimonial autonomy. The INBC was establish in 2011 through a Presidential Decree n.º10/11 of 7th January to ensure the implementation and coordination of the National Biodiversity Conservation Policies and the Management of the National Protected Areas Network. Among others, constitutes INBC's duties the following:

- to execute policies and strategies in the domain of biodiversity conservation and management of the national protected areas network;
- to promote scientific research to improve the knowledge of the national biodiversity;
- to propose the creation of new protected areas and ensure their effective management;
- to establish partnerships in the domain of biodiversity with national, regional or international institutions;
- to participate in the implementation of international Conventions related to biodiversity conservation and management of natural resources;
- to promote an inclusive and integrated management of protected areas ensuring a fair and equitable sharing of benefits arising from the utilisation of biodiversity resources;
- to disseminate and publish information related to national biodiversity and protected areas and other relevant issues;
- to promote capacity building in all areas of biological diversity and related scientific applied technologies;
- to participate in national, regional and international forum of discussions on biodiversity related issues.

The Project Management Unit (PMU) is hosted at INBC offices, based in Luanda. The PMU is comprised of a Project Manager and Field Project Coordinator (based in Namibe).

As of 04 October 2021, Angola reported a total 58,076 of confirmed cases of COVID, of which 48,079 are fully recovered. The country registered 1,567 deaths due to COVID. The country is exercising smart sanitary fencing in areas where there is increased number of reported cases (particularly for the capital city – Luanda). Travelers moving from Luanda to the provinces are required to undergo mandatory COVID testing. The flights are open for few airline companies with limited weekly flights. The pandemic affected negatively some of the project planned activities as a result of limited travels in-country and internationally.

3. OBJECTIVES OF THE MTR

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

4. MTR APPROACH & METHODOLOGY

The MTR must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The MTR 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 focal area Tracking Tool submitted to the GEF at CEO endorsement, and the midterm GEF focal area Tracking Tool that must be completed before the MTR field mission begins.

The MTR consultant is expected to follow a collaborative and participatory approach[1] ensuring close engagement with the Project Team, government counterparts (the GEF Operational Focal Point), the UNDP Country Office(s), UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Advisers, and other key stakeholders.

Engagement of stakeholders is vital to a successful MTR.[2] Stakeholder involvement should include interviews with stakeholders who have project responsibilities, including but not limited to the *Ministry of Culture, Tourism and Environment / National Institute for Biodiversity and Conservation, Ministry of Fisheries and Sea, Ministry of Interior, Ministry of Defense, Ministry of Higher Education, Science, Technology and Innovation, Ministry of Mineral Resources, Oil and Gas, academia and NGOs.* The evaluator is also expected to conduct consultations with relevant INBC development partner (detailed list to be provided during the inception phase), and ultimately with *Local Government* and *Communities, CSOs* in the project site.

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.

As of 11 March 2020, the World Health Organization (WHO) declared COVID-19 a global pandemic as the new coronavirus rapidly spread to all regions of the world. Travel to the country has been restricted since 25 March and travel in the country is also restricted. If it is not possible to travel to or within the country for the evaluation, then the evaluator should develop a methodology that takes this into account virtual and remote process, including the use of remote interview methods and extended desk reviews, data analysis, surveys and evaluation questionnaires. This should be detailed in the Inception report and agreed with the Country Office.

If all or part of the evaluation is to be carried out virtually then consideration should be taken for stakeholder availability, ability or willingness to be interviewed remotely. In addition, their accessibility to the internet/ computer may be an issue as many government and national counterparts may be working from home. These limitations must be reflected in the evaluation report.

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

The final methodological approach including interview schedule, field visits and data to be used in the MTR must be clearly outlined in the Inception Report and be fully discussed and agreed between UNDP, stakeholders and the MTR team.

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

5. DETAILED SCOPE OF THE MTR

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

i. Project Strategy

Project design:

---

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

- 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.
  o Were relevant gender issues (e.g. the impact of the project on gender equality in the programme country, involvement of women's groups, engaging women in project activities) raised in the Project Document?
- If there are major areas of concern, recommend areas for improvement.

Results Framework/Logframe:
- Undertake a critical analysis of the project's logframe indicators and targets, assess how "SMART" the midterm and end-of-project targets are (Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Relevant, Time-bound), and suggest specific amendments/revisions to the targets and indicators as necessary.
- Are the project's objectives and outcomes or components clear, practical, and feasible within its time frame?
- Examine if progress so far has led to, or could in the future catalyse beneficial development effects (i.e. income generation, gender equality and women's empowerment, improved governance etc...) that should be included in the project results framework and monitored on an annual basis.
- Ensure broader development and gender aspects of the project are being monitored effectively. Develop and recommend SMART 'development' indicators, including sex-disaggregated indicators and indicators that capture development benefits.

ii.   Progress Towards Results

Progress Towards Outcomes Analysis:
- Review the logframe indicators against progress made towards the end-of-project targets using the Progress Towards Results Matrix and following the *Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects*; colour code progress in a "traffic light system" based on the level of 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	Baseline Level	Level in 1st PIR (self-reported)	Midterm Target	End-of-project Target	Midterm Level & Assessment[3]	Achievement Rating[4]	Justification for Rating
Objective: To expand the protected areas network into the marine environment through creation of Angola's first marine protected area[5] (MPA).	Mandatory Indicator 1.3.1: Area of sustainable management solutions at sub-national level for conservation of biodiversity and ecosystem services that benefit from integrated landscape and seascape planning and management approaches	*No MPAs established in Angola*	N/A	*Baseline surveys and assessment completed and proclamation dossier for new MPA submitted under Law of Biological Aquatic Resources*	*At least 150,000 hectares of new MPA formally established expanding marine species protection.*			
	Mandatory indicator 1.3.2: Number of households participating in improved and sustainable marine resources use and best practice	*Little of no sustainable marine resource use practices*	N/A	*Agreement reached with marine resource users on sustainable resource use practices and capture targets and species*	*At least 300 of 550 households practicing sustainable marine resource use based on agreed capture targets and species composition*			
	Mandatory indicator 2.5: Extent to which legal and regulatory frameworks enabled to ensure conservation and sustainable marine resource management	*Law of Biological Aquatic Resources provides overarching framework for MPAs, but lack clear criteria and institutional responsibilities for planning and management*	N/A	*Proclamation dossier submitted to Council of Ministers for MPA with defined boundaries, agency mandates, management structure, community*	*Creation of first Angolan MPA approved by Government of Angola on basis of existing legislation with clear defined responsibilities for their management*			
Outcome 1: Strengthened policy, legal and institutional framework for creation and management of Marine Protected Areas	Indicator 4: Level of institutional capacities for planning, implementation and monitoring integrated MPA planning and management as measured by UNDP's capacity development scorecard (refer Annex 14)	*Limited institutional capacities for planning, implementation and monitoring of multiple use seascapes as measured by UNDP Capacity Development Scorecard*		*Increase of institutional capacity as measured by a 10% increase in UNDP Seascape Capacity Development Scorecard at National and Provincial levels over baseline value of 39 (Systemic-11; Institutional-20 and Individual-8)*	*Increase of institutional capacity as measured by a 50 % increase in UNDP Seascape Capacity Development Scorecard at national and provincial levels from baseline value of 39 (Systemic-11; Institutional-20 and Individual-8)*			

---

[3] Colour code this column only

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

[5] The CBD describes an MPA as 'any defined area within or adjacent to the marine environment, together with its overlying waters and associated flora, fauna and historical and cultural features, which has been reserved by legislation or other effective means, including custom, with the effect that its marine and/or coastal biodiversity enjoys a higher level of protection than its surroundings' (Decision VII/5, paragraph 10). This definition incorporates all protection levels of the IUCN categories.

Project Strategy	Indicator	Baseline Level	Level in 1st PIR (self-reported)	Midterm Target	End-of-project Target	Midterm Level & Assessment[3]	Achievement Rating[4]	Justification for Rating
	Indicator 5: Extent to which MPAs are integrated and coordinated with marine spatial planning and sectoral planning and to which institutional responsibilities and collaboration in the creation and management of MPAs has been established and formalized	*National MPA strategy and action plan under development*		*National MPA strategy and action plan submitted for Council of Ministers review and approval*	*National MPA strategy and action plan approved by Council of Ministers along with functional inter-ministerial and inter-sectoral coordination arrangements, activities and time frame for creation and management of MPAs in Angola*			
Outcome 2: Integrated management plan implemented for a priority high biodiversity marine protected area to protect endangered marine species and reduce threats	Indicator 6: Extent to which Institutional frameworks are in place for integration of conservation, sustainable marine resource use, control and management of biodiversity and ecosystems and improved livelihoods into integrated seascape planning and management	*No comprehensive seascape planning and management approaches exists in the country*		*Institutional arrangements and planning process for multiple use and sustainable seascape on-going for target MPA*	*Multiple use and sustainable seascape approaches institutionalized by national legislative, policy, and institutional arrangements and planning and practice effected in target MPA*			
	Indicator 7: Level of improvement of management effectiveness of MPA as measured by METT tracking Tool (refer Annex 15)	*No institutional structure, management plan, zonation and monitoring of multiple use marine environment within Iona MPA with baseline METT score of 17*		*Increase by at least 10 points in METT from current MPA baseline*	*Increase by at least 30 points in METT from current MPA baseline*			
	Indicator 8: Level of transboundary collaboration in managing cross-border marine conservation, marine resource use and control of threats	*Trans-boundary collaboration exists, but this is focused broadly on collaborative research, capacity development and information sharing on spatial planning and governance related to BCLME*		*At least one trans-boundary agreement to reduce threats and improve marine species conservation negotiated*	*At least one trans-boundary agreement to reduce threats and improve marine species conservation effective*			
Outcome 3: Lessons learned through knowledge management, monitoring and evaluation, and equitable gender mainstreaming are available to support the creation and implementation of MPAs	Indicator 9: Increase in community and stakeholder awareness of conservation and sustainable use and threats to marine biodiversity	*Baseline to be established in Year 1*		*At least 20% of participating households and stakeholders (of which 50% of whom are women) have good awareness of conservation, sustainable marine resource use and threat prevention benefits*	*At least 50% of participating households and stakeholders (of which 50% of whom are women) are aware of value of conservation, sustainable marine resources use and threat prevention benefits*			

Project Strategy	Indicator	Baseline Level	Level in 1st PIR (self-reported)	Midterm Target	End-of-project Target	Midterm Level & Assessment[3]	Achievement Rating[4]	Justification for Rating
nationally and internationally	Indicator 10: Number of best practice conservation and sustainable marine resource management codified and disseminated nationally and internationally	*No concerted effort exists in promoting best practices*		*A majority of best practice and lessons identified and at least 2under documentation*	*At least 3-4 best practices of sustainable marine resource use, such as sustainable fisheries practices; MPA zoning practices; responsible ecotourism and revenue sharing; gender mainstreaming, etc. readily available and accessed nationally and internationally*			

Indicator Assessment Key

Green= Achieved	Yellow= On target to be achieved	Red= Not on target to be achieved

In addition to the progress towards outcomes analysis:

- Compare and analyse the GEF Tracking Tool at the Baseline with the one completed right before the Midterm Review.
- Identify remaining barriers to achieving the project objective in the remainder of the project.
- By reviewing the aspects of the project that have already been successful, identify ways in which the project can further expand these benefits.

iii. Project Implementation and Adaptive Management

Management Arrangements:
- Review overall effectiveness of project management as outlined in the Project Document. Have changes been made and are they effective? Are responsibilities and reporting lines clear? Is decision-making transparent and undertaken in a timely manner? Recommend areas for improvement.
- Review the quality of execution of the Executing Agency/Implementing Partner(s) and recommend areas for improvement.
- Review the quality of support provided by the GEF Partner Agency (UNDP) and recommend areas for improvement.
- Do the Executing Agency/Implementing Partner and/or UNDP and other partners have the capacity to deliver benefits to or involve women? If yes, how?
- What is the gender balance of project staff? What steps have been taken to ensure gender balance in project staff?
- What is the gender balance of the Project Board? What steps have been taken to ensure gender balance in the Project Board?

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/ log-frame as a management tool and review any changes made to it since project start.

Finance and co-finance:
- Consider the financial management of the project, with specific reference to the cost-effectiveness of interventions.
- Review the changes to fund allocations as a result of budget revisions and assess the appropriateness and relevance of such revisions.
- Does the project have the appropriate financial controls, including reporting and planning, that allow management to make informed decisions regarding the budget and allow for timely flow of funds?
- Informed by the co-financing monitoring table to be filled out, provide commentary on co-financing: is co-financing being used strategically to help the objectives of the project? Is the Project Team meeting with all co-financing partners regularly in order to align financing priorities and annual work plans?

Sources of Co-financeng	Name of Co-financer	Type of Co-financing	Co-financing amount confirmed at CEO Endorsement (US$)	Actual Amount Contributed at stage of Midterm Review (US$)	Actual % of Expected Amount
Recipient Country Government	Ministry of Environment	Government	5,218,440	*To be provided during MTR*	
Donor Agency	Royal Norwegian Embassy	Bilateral Development Agency	1,150,000	*To be provided during MTR*	
		TOTAL	6,368,440		

- Include the separate GEF Co-Financing template (filled out by the Commissioning Unit and project team) which categorizes each co-financing amount as 'investment mobilized' or 'recurrent expenditures'. (This template will be annexed as a separate file.)

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?
- Review the extent to which relevant gender issues were incorporated in monitoring systems. See Annex 9 of *Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects* for further guidelines

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?
- How does the project engage women and girls? Is the project likely to have the same positive and/or negative effects on women and men, girls and boys? Identify, if possible, legal, cultural, or religious constraints on women's participation in the project. What can the project do to enhance its gender benefits?

Social and Environmental Standards (Safeguards)
- Validate the risks identified in the project's most current SESP, and those risks' ratings; are any revisions needed?
- Summarize and assess the revisions made since CEO Endorsement/Approval (if any) to:
    o The project's overall safeguards risk categorization.
    o The identified types of risks[6] (in the SESP).
    o The individual risk ratings (in the SESP) .
- Describe and assess progress made in the implementation of the project's social and environmental management measures as outlined in the SESP submitted at CEO Endorsement/Approval (and prepared during implementation, if any), including any revisions to those measures. Such management measures might include Environmental and Social Management Plans (ESMPs) or other management plans, though can also include aspects of a project's design; refer to Question 6 in the SESP template for a summary of the identified management measures.

A given project should be assessed against the version of UNDP's safeguards policy that was in effect at the time of the project's approval.

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 & Knowledge Management::
- 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.
- List knowledge activities/products developed (based on knowledge management approach approved at CEO Endorsement/Approval).

Impact of COVID-19 on project implementation:
Assess the impacts of COVID-19 on the execution of the project, in the past year and for the remaining duration of the project, and provide recommendations on how the project can mitigate these.

---

[6] Risks are to be labeled with both the UNDP SES Principles and Standards, and the GEF's "types of risks and potential impacts": Climate Change and Disaster; Disadvantaged or Vulnerable Individuals or Groups; Disability Inclusion; Adverse Gender-Related impact, including Gender-based Violence and Sexual Exploitation; Biodiversity Conservation and the Sustainable Management of Living Natural Resources; Restrictions on Land Use and Involuntary Resettlement; Indigenous Peoples; Cultural Heritage; Resource Efficiency and Pollution Prevention; Labor and Working Conditions; Community Health, Safety and Security.

iv. Sustainability

- Validate whether the risks identified in the Project Document, Annual Project Review/PIRs and the ATLAS Risk Management Module are the most important and whether the risk ratings applied are appropriate and up to date. If not, explain why.
- In addition, assess the following risks to sustainability:

Financial risks to sustainability:
- What is the likelihood of financial and economic resources not being available once the GEF assistance ends (consider potential resources can be from multiple sources, such as the public and private sectors, income generating activities, and other funding that will be adequate financial resources for sustaining project's outcomes)?

Socio-economic risks to sustainability:
- Are there any social or political risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project outcomes? What is the risk that the level of stakeholder ownership (including ownership by governments and other key stakeholders) will be insufficient to allow for the project outcomes/benefits to be sustained? Do the various key stakeholders see that it is in their interest that the project benefits continue to flow? Is there sufficient public / stakeholder awareness in support of the long-term objectives of the project? Are lessons learned being documented by the Project Team on a continual basis and shared/ transferred to appropriate parties who could learn from the project and potentially replicate and/or scale it in the future?

Institutional Framework and Governance risks to sustainability:
- Do the legal frameworks, policies, governance structures and processes pose risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project benefits? While assessing this parameter, also consider if the required systems/ mechanisms for accountability, transparency, and technical knowledge transfer are in place.

Environmental risks to sustainability:
- Are there any environmental risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project outcomes?

Conclusions & Recommendations

The MTR team will include a section of the report setting out the MTR's evidence-based conclusions, in light of the findings.[7]

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

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

Ratings

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

---

[7] Alternatively, MTR conclusions may be integrated into the body of the report.

Table. MTR Ratings & Achievement Summary Table for (*Support to the Cubango-Okavango River Basin Strategic Action Programme Implementation*)

Measure	MTR Rating	Achievement Description
Project Strategy	N/A	
Progress Towards Results	Objective Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale)	
	Outcome 1 Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale)	
	Outcome 2 Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale)	
	Outcome 3 Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale)	
	Etc.	
Project Implementation & Adaptive Management	(rate 6 pt. scale)	
Sustainability	(rate 4 pt. scale)	

6. TIMEFRAME

In line with the UNDP's financial regulations, when determined by the Country Office and/or the consultant that a deliverable or service cannot be satisfactorily completed due to the impact of COVID19 and limitations to the evaluation, that deliverable or service will not be paid.

The total duration of the MTR will be approximately *30 days* over a time period of *16 of weeks* starting *01 November 2021* and shall not exceed five months from when the consultant is hired. The tentative MTR timeframe is as follows:

TIMEFRAME NUMBER OF WORKING DAYS and COMPLETION DATE	ACTIVITY	Responsibility
18 October 2021	Application closes (through existing roster)	UNDP CO
25 October 2021	Select MTR Consultant	UNDP CO
01 November 2021	Prep the MTR Consultant (handover of Project Documents)	UNDP CO & PCU
The week of 01 – 05 November 2021 (3 days)	Document review and preparing MTR Inception Report	MTR Evaluator
The week of 15 – 19 November 2021 (2 days)	Finalization and Validation of MTR Inception Report	MTR Evaluator, UNDP CO, UNDP RTA, PCU
22 November 2021 – 17 January 2022 (15 days) [includes potential delays with Christmas and Year End holidays]	MTR Consultations (remote / virtual): stakeholder meetings and interviews	MTR Evaluator, UNDP CO, PCU
The week of 24 - 28 January 2022 (exact date to be confirmed) (1 day)	Consultations wrap-up meeting & presentation of initial findings- earliest end of MTR consultations (this includes presentation of preliminary findings to the Project Steering Committee if possible)	MTR Consultant, UNDP CO, UNDP RTA, PCU
The week of 07 – 18 February 2022 (5 days)	Preparing draft report	MTR Consultant
01 and 02 March 2022 (2 days)	Incorporating audit trail from feedback on draft report/Finalization of MTR report.	MTR Consultant, UNDP CO, UNDP RTA
15 and 16 March 2022 (2 days)	Preparation & Issue of Management Response	UNDP CO
31 March 2022	Expected date of full MTR completion	UNDP CO, UNDP-GEF RTA

7. MIDTERM REVIEW DELIVERABLES

#	Deliverable	Description	Timing	Responsibilities
1	**MTR Inception Report**	MTR consultant clarifies objectives and methods of Midterm Review	No later than 2 weeks before the MTR consultations: November 19, 2021	MTR consultant submits to the Commissioning Unit and project management unit
2	**Presentation**	Initial Findings	End of MTR Consultations: January 28, 2022	MTR consultant presents to project management unit and the Commissioning Unit (PSC if possible)
3	**Draft Final Report**	Full report (using guidelines on content outlined in Annex B) with annexes	Within 2 weeks of the MTR Consultations: February 18, 2021	Sent to the Commissioning Unit, reviewed by RTA, Project Coordinating Unit, GEF OFP
4	**Final Report***	Revised report with audit trail detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final MTR report	Within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft: March 31, 2022	Sent to the Commissioning Unit

*The final MTR report must be in English. If applicable, the Commissioning Unit may choose to arrange for a translation of the report into a language more widely shared by national stakeholders.

8. MTR ARRANGEMENTS

The principal responsibility for managing this MTR resides with the Commissioning Unit. The Commissioning Unit for this project's MTR is *UNDP Angola Country Office (CO).*

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

UNDP Country Office will support the implementation of remote/ virtual meetings. An updated stakeholder list with contact details (phone and email) will be provided by the Project Manager to the evaluation Consultant.

The Project Team will arrange introductory virtual meetings within the CO and the DRR, also to establish initial contacts with partners and project staff.

The Project Team will convene an Advisory Panel comprising of technical experts to enhance the quality of the evaluation. This Panel will review the inception report and the draft evaluation report to provide detail comments related to the quality of methodology, evidence collected, analysis and reporting. The Panel will also advise on the conformity of evaluation processes to the UNEG standards.

The Consultant is required to address all comments of the Panel completely and comprehensively. The Evaluator will provide a detail rationale to the advisory panel for any comment that remain unaddressed. The evaluation will use a system of ratings standardizing assessments proposed by the evaluator in the inception report. The evaluation acknowledges that rating cannot be a standalone assessment, and it will

not be feasible to entirely quantify judgements. Performance rating will be carried out for the four evaluation criteria: relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability.

The Project Team will provide support to assisting in setting virtual interviews with senior government officials and to arrange most interviews with project beneficiaries.

9. TEAM COMPOSITION

The MTR will be conducted by 1 consultant (with experience and exposure to projects and evaluations in the region or 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 the consultant will be aimed at maximizing the qualities in the areas indicated below, such as the qualification, experience, and technical expertise and competencies of the applicants, which will be evaluated using the criteria indicated below; thus, it is important that the relevant expertise and experience are highlighted in the applications. The overall assessment rating is out of 100.

Education (20):
- Minimum a master's degree in natural resources management, ecology, protected areas management, natural sciences, environmental management, environment, development studies, or other closely related field; (20 points)

Professional Experiences (70):
- Previous work experience in protected areas management, biodiversity and ecosystems or related fields for at least 10 years; (10 points)
- Recent experience with result-based management evaluation methodologies; (10 points)
- Competence in adaptive management, as applied to biodiversity and ecosystems projects; (10 points)
- Experience in evaluation of UNDP-GEF funded projects (MSP and/or FSP); (15 points)
- Experience working in SADC region, exposure into the realities of Angola is an added value; (5 points)
- Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender and natural resources management; experience in gender sensitive evaluation and analysis; (10 points)
- Demonstrated experience in the (re-)construction of Theory of Change; (5 points)
- Project evaluation/review experiences within United Nations system will be considered an asset; (5 points)

Language (10):
- Excellent English and Portuguese communication and report writing skills. (10 points)

10. ETHICS

The MTR team will be held to the highest ethical standards and is required to sign a code of conduct upon acceptance of the assignment. This MTR will be conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation'. The MTR team 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 MTR team must also ensure security of collected information before and after the MTR and protocols to ensure anonymity and confidentiality of sources of information where that is expected. The information, knowledge and data gathered in the MTR process must also be solely used for the MTR and not for other uses without the express authorization of UNDP and partners.

11. PAYMENT MODALITIES AND SPECIFICATIONS

- 20% payment upon satisfactory delivery of the final MTR Inception Report (with an evaluation design matrix, and a data collection plan and tools) and approval of work plan by the Commissioning Unit
- 40% payment upon satisfactory delivery of the draft MTR report to the Commissioning Unit
- 40% payment upon satisfactory delivery of the final MTR report and approval by the Commissioning Unit and RTA (via signatures on the TE Report Clearance Form) and delivery of completed TE Audit Trail

Criteria for issuing the final payment of 40%[8]:
- The final MTR report includes all requirements outlined in the MTR TOR and is in accordance with the MTR guidance.
- The final MTR report is clearly written, logically organized, and is specific for this project (i.e. text has not been cut & pasted from other MTR reports).
- The Audit Trail includes responses to and justification for each comment listed.

12. APPLICATION PROCESS[9]

Recommended Presentation of Proposal:

a) **Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability** using the template[10] provided by UNDP;
b) **CV** and a **Personal History Form** (P11 form[11]);
c) **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)
d) **Financial Proposal** that indicates the all-inclusive fixed total contract price and all other related costs, 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.

All application materials should be submitted by email at the following address ONLY: aguiar.cuiundana@undp.org by **October, 18 2021 at 5 pm**. Incomplete applications will be excluded from further consideration.

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.

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

---

[8] The Commissioning Unit is obligated to issue payments to the MTR team 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 MTR team, 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.

[9] 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

[10] https://intranet.undp.org/unit/bom/pso/Support%20documents%20on%20IC%20Guidelines/Template%20for%20Confirmation%20of%20Interest%20and%20Submission%20of%20Financial%20Proposal.docx

[11] http://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/corporate/Careers/P11_Personal_history_form.doc

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 (*Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool (METT)*)
10. Oversight mission reports
11. All monitoring reports prepared by the project
12. Financial and Administration guidelines used by Project Team

The following documents will also be available:
13. Project operational guidelines, manuals and systems
14. UNDP country/countries programme document(s)
15. Minutes of the *Creation of Marine Protected Areas in Angola* project Board Meetings and other meetings (i.e. Project Appraisal Committee meetings)
16. Project site location maps

ToR ANNEX B: Guidelines on Contents for the Midterm Review Report[12]

    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 Abbreviations
    1.   Executive Summary *(3-5 pages)*
- Project Information Table
- Project Description (brief)
- Project Progress Summary (between 200-500 words)
- MTR Ratings & Achievement Summary Table
- Concise summary of conclusions
- Recommendation Summary Table

    2.   Introduction *(2-3 pages)*
- Purpose of the MTR and objectives
- Scope & Methodology: principles of design and execution of the MTR, MTR approach and data collection methods, limitations to the MTR
- Structure of the MTR report

    3.   Project Description and Background Context *(3-5 pages)*
- Development context: environmental, socio-economic, institutional, and policy factors relevant to the project objective and scope
- Problems that the project sought to address: threats and barriers targeted
- Project Description and Strategy: objective, outcomes and expected results, description of field sites (if any)

---

[12] The Report length should not exceed *40* pages in total (not including annexes).

- 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

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 (*GEF International Waters Tracking Tool)*

ToR ANNEX C: Midterm Review Evaluative Matrix Template

This Midterm Review Evaluative Matrix must be fully completed/amended by the consultant and included in the MTR inception report and as an Annex to the MTR report.

Evaluative Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
Project Strategy: To what extent is the project strategy **relevant** to the country priorities, country ownership, and the best route towards expected results? Is the project responsive to the regional and global development agenda (e.g. Africa Agenda 2063 and SDGs?			
(include evaluative question(s))	(i.e. relationships established, level of coherence between project design and implementation approach, specific activities conducted, quality of risk mitigation strategies, etc.)	(i.e. project documents, national policies or strategies, websites, project staff, project partners, data collected throughout the MTR mission, etc.)	(i.e. document analysis, data analysis, interviews with project staff, interviews with stakeholders, etc.)
Progress Towards Results: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved thus far?			
Project Implementation and Adaptive Management: i. To what extent has the project efficiently used its resources (human, technical and financial to achieve its planned results since implementation started. ii. Has the project been able to adapt to any changing conditions thus far i.e. has the project recognized and effectively responded to urgent and emerging priorities which were not originally in the project document? iii. To what extent are project-level monitoring and evaluation systems, reporting, and project communications supporting the project's implementation?			
Sustainability: i. To what extent are there financial, institutional, socio-economic, and/or environmental **risks** to sustaining long-term project results? **ii.** How strong and sustainable are systems put in place through national systems to continue delivering quality services to the target groups or beneficiaries.			
Cross cutting issues: **i. Human Rights:** To what extent have the poor, people with disabilities, women and other marginalized groups benefitted from implementation of the project **ii. Gender Equality:** To what extent has gender been addressed in the design, implementation and monitoring the different interventions? To what extent has programme support promoted positive changes in gender equality? Were there any unintended effects? **iii. Capacity Building:** Did the programme adequately invest in, and focus on, national capacity development to ensure sustainability and promote efficiency. Are the knowledge products (reports, studies, etc.) delivered by the programme utilized by the country?			
Partnerships: i. To what extent has the project been able to form and maintain partnerships with other development actors including bilateral and multilateral organizations, civil society organizations, academia and the private sector to leverage results?			
Knowledge Management: i. To what extent has the project compiled, documented and disseminated key actions, lessons and findings to its key stakeholders?			

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.

<div align="center">**MTR Consultant Agreement Form**</div>

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

Ratings for Progress Towards Results: (one rating for each outcome and for the objective)		
6	Highly Satisfactory (HS)	The objective/outcome is expected to achieve or exceed all its end-of-project targets, without major shortcomings. The progress towards the objective/outcome can be presented as "good practice".
5	Satisfactory (S)	The objective/outcome is expected to achieve most of its end-of-project targets, with only minor shortcomings.
4	Moderately Satisfactory (MS)	The objective/outcome is expected to achieve most of its end-of-project targets but with significant shortcomings.
3	Moderately Unsatisfactory (HU)	The objective/outcome is expected to achieve its end-of-project targets with major shortcomings.
2	Unsatisfactory (U)	The objective/outcome is expected not to achieve most of its end-of-project targets.
1	Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)	The objective/outcome has failed to achieve its midterm targets, and is not expected to achieve any of its end-of-project targets.

Ratings for Project Implementation & Adaptive Management: (one overall rating)		
6	Highly Satisfactory (HS)	Implementation of all seven components – management arrangements, work planning, finance and co-finance, project-level monitoring and evaluation systems, stakeholder engagement, reporting, and communications – is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management. The project can be presented as "good practice".
5	Satisfactory (S)	Implementation of most of the seven components is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management except for only few that are subject to remedial action.
4	Moderately Satisfactory (MS)	Implementation of some of the seven components is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management, with some components requiring remedial action.
3	Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)	Implementation of some of the seven components is not leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive, with most components requiring remedial action.
2	Unsatisfactory (U)	Implementation of most of the seven components is not leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management.
1	Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)	Implementation of none of the seven components is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management.

Ratings for Sustainability: (one overall rating)		
4	Likely (L)	Negligible risks to sustainability, with key outcomes on track to be achieved by the project's closure and expected to continue into the foreseeable future
3	Moderately Likely (ML)	Moderate risks, but expectations that at least some outcomes will be sustained due to the progress towards results on outcomes at the Midterm Review
2	Moderately Unlikely (MU)	Significant risk that key outcomes will not carry on after project closure, although some outputs and activities should carry on
1	Unlikely (U)	Severe risks that project outcomes as well as key outputs will not be sustained

ToR ANNEX F: MTR Report Clearance Form
(to be completed by the Commissioning Unit and UNDP-GEF RTA and included in the final document)

Midterm Review Report Reviewed and Cleared By:

Commissioning Unit

Name: _____

Signature: _____ Date: _____

UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Advisor

Name: _____

Signature: _____ Date: _____