## **Midterm Review Terms of Reference**

**BASIC CONTRACT INFORMATION**

**Location:** Home based, with possibility of travel to sites

**Application Deadline:** March 18, 2022

**Type of Contract:** Individual Contract

**Post Level:** National In-Country Consultant (for Indonesia)

**Languages Required:** English; knowledge of Bahasa would be an advantage

**Starting Date:** April 1, 2022

**Duration of Initial Contract:** 30 working days

**Expected Duration of Assignment:** 9 weeks (April to June 2022)

**BACKGROUND**

**A. Project Title**

Implementation of the Arafura and Timor Seas Regional and National Strategic Action Programs (ATSEA-2); Second Phase of the Arafura Timor Seas Ecosystem Action (ATSEA) Program

**B. Project Description**

This is the Terms of Reference for the UNDP-GEF Midterm Review (MTR) of the full or medium-sized project titled “Implementation of the Arafura and Timor Seas Regional and National Strategic Action Programs (ATSEA-2); Second Phase of the Arafura Timor Seas Ecosystem Action (ATSEA) Program *” (PIMS 5439)*, implemented through UNDP/PEMSEA, which is to be undertaken in 2022. The project started in 2019 and is in its third year of implementation. This Term of Reference (ToR) sets out the expectations for this MTR. The MTR process must follow the guidance outlined in the document 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) and the UNDP’s Evaluation Guidelines [www.undp.org/evaluation](http://www.undp.org/evaluation) (Jan 2019).

The ATSEA-2 Project is the 2nd phase of the GEF-financed, UNDP-supported ATSEA program, and was designed to enhance regional collaboration and coordination in the Arafura and Timor Seas (ATS) region, which is composed of Australia, Indonesia, Papua New Guinea (PNG), and Timor-Leste.

Building upon the foundational results realized in the first phase of the ATSEA program (2009-2014), whereby the ATS Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis (TDA) and regional ATS Strategic Action Program (SAP) and corresponding National Action Programs (NAPs)[[1]](#footnote-0) were developed and adopted, the ATSEA-2 project focuses on supporting the implementation of the 10-year ATS SAP endorsed through a Ministerial Declaration in 2014. The SAP responds to the findings of the TDA and aims to pursue the following environmental objectives addressing the five major transboundary concerns in the ATS region: (1) Recovering and sustaining fisheries; (2) Restoring degraded habitats for sustainable provision of ecosystem services; (3) Reducing land-based and marine sources of pollution; (4) Protecting key marine species; and (5) Adaptation to the impacts of climate change.

In accordance with the SAP’s long-term objective, the ATSEA-2 project aims to enhance sustainable development of the ATS region to protect biodiversity and improve the quality of life of its inhabitants through conservation and sustainable management of marine-coastal ecosystems. To achieve this objective, the project’s intervention has been organized in three components, under which nine outcomes and 22 outputs are expected. The project components include:

Component 1: Regional, National and Local Governance for Large Marine Ecosystem Management

Component 2: Improving LME Carrying Capacity to Sustain Provisioning, Regulating and Supporting Ecosystem Services

Component 3: Knowledge Management

The project is closely aligned with the GEF-6 International Waters (IW) strategic programs, particularly Objective 3 “Enhance multi-state cooperation and catalyze investments to foster sustainable fisheries and protect coastal habitats, and reduce pollution of coasts and Large Marine Ecosystems (LMEs)”. It also applies a multifocal approach which covers international waters and biodiversity focal areas, as well as increased resilience to climate change.

The project is being managed under National Implementation Modality (NIM) with full country office support. In particular, UNDP Indonesia serving as the Principal Project Representative (PPR) is managing Indonesia component (Award ID 00096036) and Regional and PNG component (Award ID 00111335), while Timor-Leste component (Award ID 00111339) is being executed by UNDP Timor-Leste. The Partnerships in Environmental Management for the Seas of East Asia (PEMSEA) is serving as executing agency for the regional and PNG component of the project. Indonesia, PNG, and Timor-Leste are the three participating countries to the project with corresponding co-financing support, while Australia is providing technical and co-financing support to the project.

The project has a five-year timeframe starting from 2019 to 2024. The project implementation began in 2019 but with varying starting dates based on the signing of the Project Document by member countries: Indonesia-01 February 2019; Timor-Leste-05 March 2019, Papua New Guinea-29 July 2019, while at the regional level the activities started from 24 July 2019 following the signature of Project Cooperation Agreement (PCA) between PEMSEA and UNDP Indonesia. The Indonesia, Timor-Leste, and regional components’ project inception meetings were conducted in the last quarter of 2019, while PNG’s inception meeting was conducted only on 31 May 2021, following the series of discussions and finalization of the Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) between PEMSEA and the National Fisheries Agency (NFA) of PNG which was signed on 21 October 2020. The Regional Project Management Unit (RPMU) serving as Secretariat and based in Bali, Indonesia was operationalized beginning early 2020, while National Coordinating Units (NCUs) were operationalized in Indonesia and Timor-Leste in 2019, and in PNG in 2021.

The total GEF grant for the project is US$ 9,745,662, with corresponding co-financing commitments (in-kind and in cash) amounting to US$60,201,173 from the ATS government partners, UNDP Indonesia, UNDP PNG, and NGO partners. For the Indonesia component, the total GEF grant is at US$ 3,180,00, with corresponding co-financing commitment amounting to US$ 33,490,522.

Based on World Health Organization (WHO) data on COVID19, from January 3, 2021 to February 9, 2022, there have been a total of 4,626,936 confirmed cases and 144,784 deaths from COVID-19 in Indonesia; 20,942 confirmed cases and 122 deaths in Timor-Leste; and 37,983 confirmed cases and 597 deaths in Papua New Guinea. Large social restrictions or lockdowns in these countries, including in the ATSEA-2 project sites, were implemented since 2020 to prevent Covid-19 pandemics. In Indonesia large-scale social restrictions were put in place since March 2020 with some restrictions reduced towards end of 2021. The latest Minister of Home Affairs Instruction (Inmendagri) No. 12/2022 stated that PPKM Level 4 to Level 1 on the islands of Java and Bali would be implemented until February 28, 2022, while the regions of Jakarta and its greater areas, the major cities of Yogyakarta and Surabaya, as well as Bali, will continue to enforce PPKM Level 3. In Timor-Leste, varying measures (lockdowns and sanitary fences) were implemented in different municipalities since 2020. Temporary measures in response to COVID-19 has been imposed up to March 2022. In Papua New Guinea, state of emergency and lockdowns were implemented for several months from March 2020, followed by specific lockdowns in September to October 2021 due to spike in COVID cases. In line with this, as early as March 2020 the Regional Project Management Unit (RPMU) together with the National Coordinating Units (NCUs) have identified and put in place adaptive management measures by maximizing the use of virtual or online mechanisms for coordination and communication as well as strengthening coordination with local counterparts for on-the-ground initiatives. While the project has managed to carry out significant number of activities, the various lockdowns and safety measures implemented by the ATS countries from 2020 and up to current time, have impeded the conduct of planned regional exchange learning visits as well as some field validation and primary data gathering activities. This has also affected some of the project financial delivery as several site visits and face to face activities or meetings had to be converted to virtual means or postponed to a later date. Based on internal assessment, some works can continue on-schedule, while some may need to be further deferred and likely to delay and some may need readjustment to adapt to the new normal. Apart from COVID-19, natural calamities such as the Seroja cyclone in April 2021 have also affected some activities including in the area of Rote Ndao in Indonesia, and large parts of Timor-Leste.

**C. MTR Purpose**

The MTR will assess progress towards the achievement of the project objectives and outcomes as specified in the Project Document’s Strategic Results Framework, 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, including gender mainstreaming and approach to the vulnerable group, and its risks to sustainability. The MTR will also look at any project interventions that have contributed directly or indirectly to government’s effort of COVID-19 recovery both at the national level and project sites. Related to COVID-19, key ATSEA-2 initiatives such as the inclusion of COVID-19 impacts in the conduct of the Gender Equity and Social Inclusion (GESI) survey and analysis, particularly to women in the fisheries sector, as well as to community livelihoods, would be worth looking into as part of the MTR. The MTR is targeted to be conducted at this time given that the project is already halfway through its implementation. This MTR is in accordance with the UNDP/GEF evaluation plan for the project.

Result of the MTR will be submitted to the GEF. The MTR findings and responses outlined in the management response will be incorporated as recommendations for enhanced implementation during the final half of the project’s duration.

**DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES**

**D. MTR Approach and Methodology**

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

The MTR team 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 Project Review/PIRs, project budget revisions, national strategic and legal documents, and any other materials that the team considers useful for this evidence-based review. The MTR team will review the baseline GEF focal area [GEF Core Indicators](https://eur03.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.thegef.org%2Fdocuments%2Fcore-indicators-worksheet-march-2019&data=04%7C01%7Cnittaya.saengow%40undp.org%7C6e54cb7e61454d1402cd08d9fb22bf1e%7Cb3e5db5e2944483799f57488ace54319%7C0%7C0%7C637816948917218737%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWIjoiMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzIiLCJBTiI6Ik1haWwiLCJXVCI6Mn0%3D%7C3000&sdata=49C%2Fo9AVWXejFGMk0tozvjY1vfeQ15nMs%2FnxISeINMo%3D&reserved=0)[[2]](#footnote-1)//Tracking Tools submitted to the GEF at CEO endorsement, and the midterm GEF focal area Core Indicators/Tracking Tools that must be completed before the MTR field mission begins.

The MTR team is expected to follow a collaborative and participatory approach[[3]](#footnote-2) ensuring close engagement with the Project Team, government counterparts (the GEF Operational Focal Point), the UNDP Country Office(s), the UNDP Regional Technical Advisor, direct beneficiaries, and other key stakeholders.

Engagement of stakeholders is vital to a successful MTR.[[4]](#footnote-3) Stakeholder involvement should include interviews with stakeholders who have project responsibilities, including but not limited to executing agencies (UNDP, PEMSEA), senior officials and task team/ component leaders, key experts and consultants in the subject area, Project Board, project stakeholders, academia, local government and CSOs, etc. Additionally, the MTR team, particularly the national in-country consultants are expected to conduct field missions subject to travel and safety restrictions in the project sites. In Indonesia, the following project sites will be covered by the MTR:

| **No** | **Location** |
| --- | --- |
| 1 | Kabupaten Aru Islands (District) |
| 2 | Kabupaten Merauke (District) |
| 3 | Kabupaten Rote Ndao (District) |

On 11 March 2020, the World Health Organization (WHO) declared COVID-19 a global pandemic. It should be noted that an overall approach and method for conducting of MTR of UNDP-supported GEF-financed projects has been adjusted to consider the COVID19 pandemic, particularly on the conduct of field visits[[5]](#footnote-4). As COVID19 restrictions and challenges are still very much prevalent in the project participating countries and sites, the review should consider a mixed methodology that takes into account the conduct of the MTR virtually and remotely, including the use of remote interview methods and extended desk reviews, data analysis, surveys and evaluation questionnaires. This should be detailed in the MTR Inception Report and agreed with the Commissioning Unit.

For this MTR, an International Consultant (IC) will be engaged and will work remotely with national in-country consultants’ support in the field if it is safe for them to operate and travel. There will be one national in-country consultant (NC) for Indonesia and one for Timor-Leste. No stakeholders, consultants or UNDP staff should be put in harm’s way and safety is the key priority. A short validation mission may be considered for the national in-country consultants if it is confirmed to be safe for staff, consultants, stakeholders and if such a mission is possible within the MTR schedule.

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, however, 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 (for country/national consultants, if possible), tools (i.e., surveys, evaluation questionnaires, remote interviews if travel is not feasible, etc.) and data to be used in the MTR should 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.

**E. Detailed Scope of the MTR**

The MTR team will assess the following four categories of project progress (in national reports and full MTR report). See the [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) for extended descriptions.

# Project Strategy

Project design:

* Review the problem addressed by the project and the underlying assumptions. Review the effect of any incorrect assumptions or changes to the context to achieving the project results as outlined in the Project Document.
* Review the relevance of the project strategy and assess whether it provides the most effective route towards expected/intended results. Were lessons from other relevant projects properly incorporated into the project design?
* Review how the project addresses country priorities. Review country ownership. Was the project concept in line with the national sector development priorities and plans of participating countries?
* 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 (e.g. the impact of the project on gender equality in the programme country, involvement of women’s groups, engaging women in project activities). See Annex 9 of [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) for further guidelines.
* If there are major areas of concern, recommend areas for improvement.

Strategic Results Framework (SRF)/Logframe:

* Undertake a critical analysis of the project’s SRF 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.

# Progress Towards Results

* Review the logframe indicators against progress made towards the end-of-project targets; populate the Progress Towards Results Matrix, as described in 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 the project objective and 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[[6]](#footnote-5)** | **Baseline Level[[7]](#footnote-6)** | **Level in 1st PIR (self- reported)** | **Midterm Target[[8]](#footnote-7)** | **End-of-project Target** | **Midterm Level & Assessment[[9]](#footnote-8)** | **Achievement Rating[[10]](#footnote-9)** | **Justification for Rating**  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Objective:**  | Indicator (if applicable): |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Outcome 1:** | Indicator 1: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Indicator 2: |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Outcome 2:** | Indicator 3: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Indicator 4: |  |  |  |  |  |
| Etc. |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Etc.** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**Indicator Assessment Key**

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

In addition to the progress towards outcomes analysis:

* Compare and analyse the GEF Tracking Tool/Core Indicators at the Baseline with the one completed right before the Midterm Review.
* Identify remaining barriers to achieving the project objective in the remainder of the project.
* By reviewing the aspects of the project that have already been successful, identify ways in which the project can further expand these benefits.
1. **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/ logframe 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 by the Commissioning Unit and project team, 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-financing** | **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** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | **TOTAL** |  |  |  |

* Include the separate GEF Co-Financing template (filled out by the Commissioning Unit and project team) which categorizes co-financing amounts by source 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](http://web.undp.org/evaluation/documents/guidance/GEF/mid-term/Guidance_Midterm%20Review%20_EN_2014.pdf) 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:
	+ The project’s overall safeguards risk categorization.
	+ The identified types of risks[[11]](#footnote-10) (in the SESP).
	+ 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 oard.
* 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).
1. **Sustainability**
* Validate whether the risks identified in the Project Document, Annual Project Review/PIRs and the ATLAS Risk Register 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 consultant/team will include a section in the MTR report for evidence-based **conclusions**, in light of the findings.

Additionally, the MTR consultant/team is expected to make **recommendations** to the Project Team. 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.

The MTR consultant/team 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 the TOR Annexes for the Rating Table and ratings scales.

*Table. MTR Ratings & Achievement Summary Table for (Project Title)*

| **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) |  |

##### **F. Expected Outputs and Deliverables**

The MTR team shall prepare and submit:

* MTR Inception Report: MTR team clarifies objectives and methods of the Midterm Review no later than 2 weeks before the MTR mission. To be sent to the Commissioning Unit and project management. Completion date: (April 8, 2022)
* Presentation: MTR team presents initial findings to project management and the Commissioning Unit at the end of the MTR mission. Completion date: (April 30, 2022)
* Draft MTR Report: MTR team submits the draft full report with annexes within 3 weeks of the MTR mission. Completion date: (May 15, 2022)
* Final Report\*: MTR team submits the revised report with annexed and completed Audit Trail detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final MTR report. To be sent to the Commissioning Unit within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft. Completion date: (May 30, 2022)

\*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.

**G. Institutional Arrangements**

The principal responsibility for managing this MTR resides with the Commissioning Units. The Commissioning Unit for this project’s MTR is UNDP Indonesia Country Office for the contracting of International Consultant (IC) who will be in-charge of the review of the regional and PNG component and overall MTR, as well as for the contracting of a National In-Country Consultant (NC) for the Indonesia component. While UNDP Timor-Leste will serve as the Commissioning Unit for the contracting of NC for the Timor-Leste component.

The Commissioning Units will contract the consultants and ensure the timely provision of the travel arrangements within the country for the MTR team, if the travel is permitted. The Project Team (RPMU and NCUs) will be responsible for liaising with the MTR team members to provide all relevant documents, set up stakeholder interviews, and arrange field visits if possible. In particular, the Regional Project Management Unit (RPMU) and NCU PNG will provide necessary logistical support to the IC, while the National Coordinating Units (NCUs) in Indonesia and Timor-Leste will provide logistical support to the respective NCs.

The Commissioning Units and Project Team will provide logistic support in the implementation of remote/virtual meetings if travel to project site is restricted. An updated stakeholder list with contact details (phone and email) will be provided by the Commissioning Unit to the MTR team.

If travel is possible, the national in-country consultant shall conduct a field visit to the following project sites in Indonesia:

| **No** | **Location** |
| --- | --- |
| 1 | Kabupaten Aru Islands (District) |
| 2 | Kabupaten Merauke (District) |
| 3 | Kabupaten Rote Ndao (District) |

**H. Duration of the Work**

The total duration of the MTR will be approximately 30 days over a period of 9 weeks starting April 1, 2022,and shall not exceed five months from when the consultant(s) are hired. The tentative MTR timeframe is as follows:

* *(18 March 2022):* Application closes
* *(30 March 2022):* Selection of MTR Team
* *(1 April 2022):* Prep the MTR Team (handover of project documents)
* *(4 April 2022) 3 days:* Document review and preparing MTR Inception Report
* *(8 April 2022) 2 days:* Finalization andValidation of MTR Inception Report- latest start of MTR mission
* *(10-25 April 2022) 13 days:* MTR mission: stakeholder meetings, interviews, field visits
* *(30 April 2022):* Mission wrap-up meeting & presentation of initial findings- earliest end of MTR mission
* *(15 May 2022) 10 days:* Preparing draft report
* *(30 May 2022) 2 days (r: 1-2):* Incorporating audit trail on draft report/Finalization of MTR report (note: accommodate time delay in dates for circulation and review of the draft report)
* *(1-10 June 2022):* Preparation & Issue of Management Response
* *(17 June 2022):* Expected date of full MTR completion

The date start of contract is 1 April 2022.

**I. Duty Station**

The MTR Team will be composed of three consultants, one International Consultant (IC), one National In-Country Consultant (NC) for Indonesia, and one National In-Country Consultant (NC) for Timor-Leste.

The IC will be home based and will be working remotely in coordination with the NCs. Possible field visits may be arranged for the NCs in accordance with travel and safety restrictions in the sites due to COVID-19.

The IC will serve as the team leader and will be tasked to provide guidance to the NCs, and undertake the overall design and writing of the MTR Report for the project with its annexes as required in the [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). Apart from producing the overall consolidated MTR report, the IC will also undertake an in-depth review of the regional and PNG component. The IC will be supported by NCs from the other two project participating countries (Indonesia and Timor-Leste). The NCs will act as a focal point for coordinating and working with relevant stakeholders in their respective countries and will be responsible in preparing a more in-depth evaluation of the in-country activities and progress.

The IC, in collaboration with the NCs, is expected to deliver the following key outputs:

1. Consolidated MTR Inception Report
2. National Report on PNG
3. Full/consolidated MTR Report with annexes (which includes the key findings, conclusions and recommendations from the National Reports from PNG, Indonesia, and Timor-Leste)

The NCs, in coordination with the IC, are expected to deliver the following key outputs:

1. National Reports of their respective countries
2. Ensure that key inputs from national reports are covered in the consolidated MTR Report to be prepared by the IC.

**Travel:**

* Local travel may be possible to be undertaken by the NCs in respective project sites in their respective country of assignments during the MTR mission, subject to COVID-19 travel and safety restrictions in the concerned sites;
* The BSAFE training course must be successfully completed prior to commencement of travel; Herewith is the link to access this training: [https://training.dss.un.org/courses/login/index.php](https://eur03.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Ftraining.dss.un.org%2Fcourses%2Flogin%2Findex.php&data=02%7C01%7Cmargarita.arguelles%40undp.org%7Cf844bcc8bed44b9d964e08d81439040f%7Cb3e5db5e2944483799f57488ace54319%7C0%7C0%7C637281583941862242&sdata=rxpJarejT1BkWC%2FDUq2F4MmAZf43mbRMl5fFqWWBTyY%3D&reserved=0) . These training modules at this secure internet site is accessible to Consultants, which allows for registration with private email.
* Individual Consultants are responsible for ensuring they have vaccinations/inoculations when travelling to certain countries, as designated by the UN Medical Director.
* Consultants are required to comply with the UN security directives set forth under <https://dss.un.org/dssweb/>
* All related travel expenses will be covered and will be reimbursed as per UNDP rules and regulations upon submission of an F-10 claim form and supporting documents.

**REQUIRED SKILLS AND EXPERIENCE FOR**

**NATIONAL IN-COUNTRY CONSULTANT (NC)**

**J. Qualifications of the Successful Applicant**

The National Consultant (NC) should have prior experience and exposure to similar projects and evaluations in other regions globally. The selected applicant cannot have participated in the project preparation and/or implementation and should not have conflict of interest with project related activities.

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

Education:

* Master’s Degree on sociology, development studies/ management, environmental science, environment & natural resources management, social anthropology, or any related course (20%)

Experience:

* Minimum five (5) years of relevant professional experience especially on results‐based monitoring and evaluation methodologies and applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios (20%);
* Experience in the evaluation of technical assistance projects, preferably UN agencies and major donors (20%);
* Minimum 2 years work experience with institutions, programmes and local and national governments in the ATS region, experience working with Indonesian government agencies, NGOs. government process is an asset (10%)
* Demonstrated understanding of issues related to sustainable fisheries, coastal and marine habitats and biodiversity, climate change, marine and land-based pollution, including experience in gender sensitive evaluation and analysis, and experience working on application of EAFM, ICM, EbA approaches (20%)
* Excellent English writing and communication skills. Demonstrated ability to assess complex situations in order to succinctly and clearly distill critical issues and draw forward looking conclusions (5%)
* Experience leading multi-disciplinary, multi-national teams to deliver quality products in high stress, short deadline situations (5%)
* Experience with implementing evaluations remotely will be considered an asset.

Language

* Fluency in written and spoken English. Knowledge of Bahasa would be an advantage.

**K. Ethics**

The MTR International Consultant (IC) and entire 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.

**L. Schedule of Payments**

* 20% payment upon satisfactory delivery of the final MTR Inception Report and approval by the Commissioning Unit (UNDP Indonesia)
* 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 MTR Report Clearance Form- ToR Annex F) and delivery of completed MTR Audit Trail

Criteria for issuing the final payment of 40%[[12]](#footnote-11):

* 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.

Due to the current COVID-19 situation and its implications, a partial payment may be considered if the consultant invested time towards the deliverable but was unable to complete to circumstances beyond his/her control**.**

**APPLICATION PROCESS**

**M. Recommended Presentation of Offer**

1. **Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability** using the [template](https://intranet.undp.org/unit/bom/pso/Support%20documents%20on%20IC%20Guidelines/Template%20for%20Confirmation%20of%20Interest%20and%20Submission%20of%20Financial%20Proposal.docx)[[13]](#footnote-12) provided by UNDP;
2. **CV** and a **Personal History Form** ([P11 form](http://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/corporate/Careers/P11_Personal_history_form.doc)[[14]](#footnote-13));
3. **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)
4. **Financial Proposal** that indicates the all-inclusive fixed total contract price and all other travel related costs (such as flight ticket, per diem, etc), supported by a breakdown of costs, as per template attached to the [Letter of Confirmation of Interest template](https://popp.undp.org/_layouts/15/WopiFrame.aspx?sourcedoc=/UNDP_POPP_DOCUMENT_LIBRARY/Public/PSU_%20Individual%20Contract_Offerors%20Letter%20to%20UNDP%20Confirming%20Interest%20and%20Availability.docx&action=default). 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 to the address UNDP Indonesia Procurement Unit Menara Thamrin 7-9th Floor Jl. MH Thamrin Kav. 3 Jakarta 10250 in a sealed envelope indicating the following reference “Consultant for Implementation of the Arafura and Timor Seas Regional and National Strategic Action Programs (ATSEA-2) Midterm Review” or by email at the following address ONLY: (bids.id@undp.org) by **(23:59 PM GMT +7 on 18 March 2022)*.*** Incomplete applications will be excluded from further consideration.

**N. Criteria for Selection of the Best Offer**

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.

**O. Annexes to the MTR ToR**

Annexes include: (reference ToR Annexes in Annex 3 of *Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects*)

* List of documents to be reviewed by the MTR Team
* Guidelines on Contents for the Midterm Review Report
* Midterm Review Evaluative Matrix Template
* UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluators/Midterm Review Consultants
* MTR Required Ratings Table and Ratings Scales
* MTR Report Clearance Form
* Audit Trail Template
* Progress Towards Results Matrix and MTR Ratings & Achievement Summary Tables (in Word)
* [GEF co-financing template](https://eur03.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fpims.undp.org%2Fworkspace%2Ffile%2Fdownload%3Fid%3D210&data=04%7C01%7Cnittaya.saengow%40undp.org%7C6e54cb7e61454d1402cd08d9fb22bf1e%7Cb3e5db5e2944483799f57488ace54319%7C0%7C0%7C637816948917218737%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWIjoiMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzIiLCJBTiI6Ik1haWwiLCJXVCI6Mn0%3D%7C3000&sdata=307FVqRDOtPu7gHmaTDFgLo3VxdvzpcPZt4WW%2FijD9g%3D&reserved=0) (in Word)

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

1. PIF
2. UNDP Initiation Plan
3. UNDP Project Document
4. UNDP Social and Environmental Screening Procedure (SESP)
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/Core Indicators at CEO endorsement and midterm (International Waters and Biodiversity Tracking Tools)
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:

1. Project operational guidelines, manuals and systems
2. UNDP country/countries programme document(s)
3. Minutes of the *ATSEA2* Project Board Meetings and other meetings (i.e. Project Appraisal Committee meetings)
4. Project site location maps
5. Any additional documents, as relevant.

**ToR ANNEX B: Guidelines on Contents for the Midterm Review Report**[[15]](#footnote-14)

| **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)
* 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
* Social and Environmental Standards (Safeguards)
* Reporting
* Communications & Knowledge Management
 |
|  | **4.4** | Sustainability* Financial risks to sustainability
* Socio-economic to sustainability
* Institutional framework and governance risks to sustainability
* Environmental risks to sustainability
 |
| **5.** | Conclusions and Recommendations *(4-6 pages)* |
|  |  **5.1**   | Conclusions * Comprehensive and balanced statements (that are evidence-based and connected to the MTR’s findings) which highlight the strengths, weaknesses and results of the project
 |
|  **5.2** | Recommendations * Corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project
* Actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the project
* Proposals for future directions underlining main objectives
 |
| **6.**  | Annexes* MTR ToR (excluding ToR annexes)
* MTR evaluative matrix (evaluation criteria with key questions, indicators, sources of data, and methodology)
* Example Questionnaire or Interview Guide used for data collection
* Ratings Scales
* MTR mission itinerary
* List of persons interviewed
* List of documents reviewed
* Co-financing table (if not previously included in the body of the report)
* Signed UNEG Code of Conduct form
* Signed MTR final report clearance form
* *Annexed in a separate file:* Audit trail from received comments on draft MTR report
* *Annexed in a separate file:* Relevant midterm tracking tools (*METT, FSC, Capacity scorecard, etc.) or* [GEF Core Indicators](https://eur03.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.thegef.org%2Fdocuments%2Fcore-indicators-worksheet-march-2019&data=04%7C01%7Cnittaya.saengow%40undp.org%7C6e54cb7e61454d1402cd08d9fb22bf1e%7Cb3e5db5e2944483799f57488ace54319%7C0%7C0%7C637816948917218737%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWIjoiMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzIiLCJBTiI6Ik1haWwiLCJXVCI6Mn0%3D%7C3000&sdata=49C%2Fo9AVWXejFGMk0tozvjY1vfeQ15nMs%2FnxISeINMo%3D&reserved=0)
* *Annexed in a separate file:* [GEF co-financing template](https://eur03.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fpims.undp.org%2Fworkspace%2Ffile%2Fdownload%3Fid%3D210&data=04%7C01%7Cnittaya.saengow%40undp.org%7C6e54cb7e61454d1402cd08d9fb22bf1e%7Cb3e5db5e2944483799f57488ace54319%7C0%7C0%7C637816948917218737%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWIjoiMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzIiLCJBTiI6Ik1haWwiLCJXVCI6Mn0%3D%7C3000&sdata=307FVqRDOtPu7gHmaTDFgLo3VxdvzpcPZt4WW%2FijD9g%3D&reserved=0) *(categorizing co-financing amounts by source as ‘investment mobilized’ or ‘recurrent expenditure’)*
 |

## **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 country priorities, country ownership, and the best route towards expected results?**  |
| (include evaluative question(s)) | (i.e. relationships established, level of coherence between project design and implementation approach, specific activities conducted, quality of risk mitigation strategies, etc.) | (i.e. project documents, national policies or strategies, websites, project staff, project partners, data collected throughout the MTR mission, etc.) | (i.e. document analysis, data analysis, interviews with project staff, interviews with stakeholders, etc.) |
| To what extent were the project objectives and outputs aligned with member States’ and other project stakeholders’ development strategies/priorities? |  |  |  |
| To what extent is the project in line with GEF operational programs? |  |  |  |
| Were lessons from other relevant projects properly incorporated into the project design? |  |  |  |
| 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? |  |  |  |
| Were the project’s expected accomplishments and indicators of achievements properly designed, timebound and achievable? |  |  |  |
| Does the project design remain relevant in generating global environmental benefits?  |  |  |  |
| Were relevant gender issues raised in the project design/strategy? |  |  |  |
| How are broader development objectives represented in the project design?  |  |  |  |
| Does the strategic results framework fulfil SMART criteria and sufficiently captures the added value of the project? |  |  |  |
| **Progress Towards Results: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved thus far?** |
| To what extent are key stakeholders engaged in establishing a long-term regional and national cooperation mechanisms in support of the region’s SAP? |  |  |  |
| How effective was the project in building knowledge and capacities on integrated approaches to marine and coastal management and in application of tools/mechanisms developed under the project? |  |  |  |
| To what extent has the project provided science-based information in support of policy/decision-making? |  |  |  |
| Has the project already demonstrated/shown contribution to improved management of natural resources, increased resilience and improved livelihoods? |  |  |  |
| Do the project-related activities give the participants adequate access to the benefits and implications of the project, particularly to women and other vulnerable groups? |  |  |  |
| What were the risks involved and to what extent were they managed?  |  |  |  |
| What lessons have been learned from the project regarding achievement of outcomes?  |  |  |  |
| To what has the project addressed the barriers identified (i.e., lack of strong regional mechanism; weak intersectoral coordination and law enforcement; lack of access to environmental planning tools, technologies and approaches; insufficient baseline data)? |  |  |  |
| **Project Implementation and Adaptive Management: Has the project been implemented efficiently, cost-effectively, and been able to adapt to any changing conditions thus far? To what extent are project-level monitoring and evaluation systems, reporting, and project communications supporting the project’s implementation? To what extent has progress been made in the implementation of social and environmental management measures? Have there been changes to the overall project risk rating and/or the identified types of risks as outlined at the CEO Endorsement stage?**  |
| How were lessons learned on other projects incorporated into project implementation?  |  |  |  |
| How effective has adaptive management been, e.g., in response to recommendations raised by project steering committee? Have changes been made and are they effective? |  |  |  |
| How timely and effective has implementation of adaptive management measures been (i.e., relating to COVID19 challenges)?  |  |  |  |
| Are milestones within annual work plans consistent with indicators in strategic results framework? |  |  |  |
| Are responsibilities and reporting lines clear? Is decision-making transparent and undertaken in a timely manner? |  |  |  |
| How efficient has financial delivery been?  |  |  |  |
| How cost-effective have the project interventions been?  |  |  |  |
| How inclusive and proactive has stakeholder involvement been? What is the gender balance of project staff, RSC, NPBs, NIMCs? What steps have been taken to ensure gender balance? Does the project have a gender action plan and is it implemented? |  |  |  |
| How effective have partnership/collaborative arrangements been?  |  |  |  |
| Were the Executing Agency/Implementing Partner(s) responsive to support needs of the project team/project? |  |  |  |
| Has the project efficiently utilized local capacity in implementation?  |  |  |  |
| Has the project information been effectively managed and disseminated?  |  |  |  |
| What were the major factors influencing the achievement or non -achievement of the project objectives? |  |  |  |
| **Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, socio-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?** |
| What lessons can be drawn regarding sustainability of project results, and what changes could be made (if any) to the design of the project in order to improve sustainability of project results?  |  |  |  |
| What evidence is available that demonstrates budget allocations have been or will be made to sustain project results?  |  |  |  |
| What evidence is available that demonstrates capacities and resilience of local communities have been strengthened?  |  |  |  |
| How have management plans and other approaches promoted by the project been integrated into institutional frameworks? What is the level of ownership of approaches promoted by the project? What policies are in place that enhance the likelihood that project results will 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? |  |  |  |
| What evidence is available that demonstrate reduction of key threats to biodiversity and ecosystems? Have any new environmental threats emerged?  |  |  |  |

## **ToR ANNEX D: UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluators/Midterm Review Consultants[[16]](#footnote-15)**



**ToR ANNEX E: MTR Ratings & Achievement Summary Table + Ratings Scale**

| **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 and signed by the Commissioning Unit and RTA and included in the final document)* 

## **ToR ANNEX G: Audit Trail Template**

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

**To the comments received on (*date*) from the Midterm Review of Implementation of the Arafura and Timor Seas Regional and National Strategic Programs (ATSEA-2): Second Phase of the Arafura Timor Seas Ecosystem Action (ATSEA) Program (UNDP Project ID-*PIMS5439)***

*The following comments were provided in track changes to the draft Midterm Review report; they are referenced by institution (“Author” column) and not by the person’s name, and track change comment number (“#” column):*

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

**ToR ANNEX H: Progress Towards Results Matrix**

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

| **Project Strategy** | **Indicator[[17]](#footnote-16)** | **Baseline Level[[18]](#footnote-17)** | **Level in 2nd PIR (self- reported) (2019 to July 2021)** | **Midterm Target[[19]](#footnote-18)** | **End-of-project Target** | **Midterm Level & Assessment[[20]](#footnote-19)** | **Achievement Rating[[21]](#footnote-20)** | **Justification for Rating**  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Objective: To enhance sustainable development of the Arafura-Timor Seas (ATS) region to protect biodiversity and improve the quality of life of its inhabitants through conservation and sustainable management of marine-coastal ecosystems (as indicated in the SAP)** | Indicator: Number of women and men as direct beneficiaries of project activities | 0 | Cumulative status of direct beneficiaries of project activities at regional and national levels (September 2019 to June 2021):A. 11% vis-à-vis end of project target on women beneficiariesB. 17% vis-à-vis end of project target on men beneficiariesDetails: 17,117 total number individuals, consist of:>9,975 Men Beneficiaries (58%);>6,048 Women Beneficiaries (35%);>1,091 non-aggregated data or 7%;>3 Prefer Not to Say/OtherBenefited from project activities such as trainings, learning sessions, technical workshops, Focus Group Discussions (FGDs), stakeholder webinars, community orientations.  | *(not set/not applicable)* | Cumulative total of direct beneficiaries:55,000 women60,000 men |  |  |  |
|  | Indicator: Globally over-exploited fisheries (by volume) moved to more sustainable levels | *(not set or not applicable)* | Information/data (x%) on globally over-exploited fisheries and ATS fisheries contribution is yet to be derived as part of the ongoing regional EAFM baseline assessment for red snapper.To date, the key progress/ efforts in support of promotion of sustainable fisheries focused on establishing baseline assessments and profiles, and development of EAFM plans, completion of regional assessments (covering 4 ATS countries) related to IUU fishing though still mainly limited to illegal fishing, review of IUU related policies and regulations, report on efforts in developing tools for FAO Global Record Initiative (GRI), and report on community-based surveillance practices against IUU; as well as conduct of several capacity and awareness building initiatives. | *(not set or not applicable)* | Up to 25% (by volume) for the ATS region, representing approximately 0.25% of global levels |  |  |  |
|  | Indicator: Landscapes and seascapes under improved biodiversity management. | *(not set or not applicable)* | To date, 44% of target has been achieved vis-à-vis end of project target. The project supported the establishment of a 350,000 ha of new MPA in Kolepom Island, Papua Indonesia, which was established through Governor Decree Papua (No.188.4/295/2019) signed on Sept. 26, 2019 and ratified on Dec. 30, 2020. The establishment of MPA in Kolepom extent the existing Dolok Island Wildlife Reserve (terrestrial protected area) in support of improved biodiversity management from ridge to reef. | *(not set or not applicable)* | 800,000 ha |  |  |  |
| **Updated transboundary diagnostic analysis (TDA), strategic action program (SAP), and national action program (NAPs)** | Proportion of countries that are implementing specific measures from the SAP (i.e. adopted national policies, laws, budgeted plans) | *(not set or not applicable)* | In line with ATSEA-2 Project implementation, activities in support of NAPs (Indonesia and Timor-Leste) and SAP have initiated since the commencement of the project in 2019. In PNG, baseline assessments have been completed and will serve as basis in development of PNG’s 1st NAP (to be conducted after the completion of the updated TDA and SAP). In support of the target updating of TDA (beginning Q4 of 2021 up to 2022), recently completed regional thematic assessments as well as completed assessments from country level will feed into the updated TDA. | *(not set or not applicable)* | • Indonesia: Priority actions under ATS NAP mainstreamed into national development programs and budgets• Timor-Leste: Priority actions under ATS NAP mainstreamed into national development programs and budgets• Papua New Guinea: Priority actions under ATS NAP mainstreamed into national development programs and budgets |  |  |  |
| **Outcome 1: Regional and national mechanisms for cooperation in place and operational** | Indicator: Regional governance mechanism | Informal cooperation under ATSEF, and conceptualization of ATS governance mechanism outlined in Ministerial Declaration | the regional governance mechanism assessment has been completed and will undergo further country consultations in 2021 as part of consensus building process on most viable regional mechanism for ATS region. In relation to this, the Stakeholder Partnership Forum (SPF) draft TOR and Guidelines have also been completed and will also undergo further country consultations (Q3-Q4 of 2021); identification of SPF members at country level have also been initiated. Formal SPF is expected to convene before end of 2021. | *(not set or not applicable)* | Regional governance mechanism established and functioning with at least 2 of 4 countries contributing dues |  |  |  |
|  | National Inter-Ministerial Committees (NIMCs) | NIMCs loosely formed, with no clear mandate for ATS priority concerns | 40% of the target has been achieved (2 out of 3 NIMCs established) and legalization/formalization ongoing.NIMCs established in Timor-Leste and Papua New Guinea. While NIMC institutional mapping and assessment, and FGD for NIMC establishment in Indonesia has been conducted, formal adoption of NIMC in Indonesia targeted within 2021. | *(not set or not applicable)* | NIMCs established, functioning and formalized thru legal and/or institutional arrangements in each of the three beneficiary countries |  |  |  |
|  | SAP implementation finance secured by governments and development partners | *not set or not applicable)* | review of various related regional entities and their financial mechanisms developed in support of the ongoing regional Financial Landscape Assessment. The full assessment is targeted for review at 3rd RSC Meeting by end of 2021 and will feed to subsequent development of 5-year cost estimate and financial plan for the updated SAP. | *not set or not applicable)* | 25% |  |  |  |
| **Outcome 2: Strengthened institutional and human resource capacity towards integrated approaches in natural resource management and biodiversity conservation** | Indicator: Number of local regulations issued to support implementation of NAP that reflect regional harmonization of national and subnational policies | Priority actions in the NAPs are not mainstreamed in national and local policy and programming frameworks | 35% of target has been achieved.At regional level political economy of regionalism assessment completed, and gender equity and social inclusion initiatives and learning activities conducted. At the country level, policy assessments were carried out in Indonesia and PNG in relation mainly to fisheries and biodiversity, while assessment is scheduled in Timor-Leste in 2021. On local regulations, in Indonesia the Governor decree on establishment of new MPA in Kolepom ratified, and legalization of Marine Pollution Task Force in NTT underway. In Timor-Leste, an Official Order issued by the Municipal Administrator of Manatuto Municipality formally launched the ICM Sub Task Team in PA Barique. | *(not set or not applicable)* | * Indonesia: Draft of three local regulations (PERDA) developed and submitted to the provincial government to support implementation of NAP

•Timor-Leste: Two local regulations issued to support implementation of NAP* Papua New Guinea: District Sustainable Marine Resource Plan for South Fly District approved
 |  |  |  |
| Indicator: Knowledge transferred from capacitated trainers to resource beneficiaries | Limited local knowledge on integrated approaches | 100% of target achieved in Indonesia, 100% in Timor-Leste, and 80% in PNG.Data on recorded project resource beneficiaries that have been capacitated under various capacity building initiatives: 193 in Indonesia (exceeded end of project target); 148 in Timor-Leste (exceeded end of project target); and 8 in PNG (close to meeting end of project target). From regional-led activities, a total of 165 beneficiaries (146 if numbers of E-EAFM training participants reflected in 3 countries are deducted). More capacity building activities are lined-up to end of project. | *(not set or not applicable)* | • Indonesia: 100 resource beneficiaries receive training on integrated approaches from the capacitated trainers• Timor-Leste: 60 resource beneficiaries receive training on integrated approaches from the capacitated trainers• Papua New Guinea: 10 resource beneficiaries receive training on integrated approaches from the capacitated trainers |  |
| **Outcome 3:****Better understanding of climate change impacts on marine and coastal ecosystems lead to regional actions** | Regional climate change predictive capacity strengthened | There are no coordinated regional climate change assessment efforts addressing regional coastal and marine concerns in the ATS region | 50% of the target has been achieved. The regional climate change vulnerability assessment report has been completed, and a draft Decision-making Guidance Toolkit has been developed and will be applied in development of case studies in selected sites related to climate change change impacts on fisheries. | *(not set or not applicable)* | ATS regional CC guidance toolkit endorsed by RCC |  |  |  |
| **Outcome 4:****Improved management of fisheries and other coastal resources for livelihoods, nutrition and ecosystem health in Indonesia, Timor-Leste, and Papua New Guinea** | Number of management plans and appropriate measures implemented for rebuilding or protecting fish stocks including alternative management approaches | *(not set or not applicable)* | 35% of target has been achieved (focused on the development of plans so far; implementation aspect of the plan to be initiated).ATSEA-2 supported the development and completion of management plan for FMA718; and for specific commodities, the Project also supported the completion of: 1 EAFM on Red Snapper Strategy and Action Plan, 1 EAFM for shrimp, and 1 EAFM for barramundi. In support of development of management plans, the following were undertaken in 2019-2021: at the regional level: a draft EAFM baseline report is available and development of regional EAFM Plan to be completed by end of 2021. At country level, in Indonesia the final EAFM pre-assessments and assessments done, and FIPs (with value chain) for red snapper in Aru, shrimp in Aru, and barramundi in Merauke done. In Timor-Leste, stock assessment and value chain assessment of red snapper done in 4 municipalities done (Viqueque, Lautem, Manatuto and Manufahi) done and undergoing consolidation. For PNG, biophysical and socio-economic characteristics assessments done in PNG ATS areas, and the development of artisanal fishery management plan for South Fly to be initiated in Q3 of 2021. | *(not set or not applicable)* | **5** |  |  |  |
|  | Number of targeted communities of fishers have adopted an ecosystem approach to fisheries management | *(not set or not applicable)* | 35% of target achieved (this is linked to the development of EAFM plans and FIPs as reported in previous section).Building on the developed EAFM Action Plan for red snapper, shrimp and barramundi, and FIP Action plan for red snapper in Indonesia, adoption of the plans are underway and undergoing socialization in targeted communities. Following the EAFM & FIP action plan is the identification of how many relevant communities (coastal villages, fishermen forum/group, etc) that would need to adopt the approach.Related to previous section, the focus from 2019-2021 was on the conduct of EAFM assessments and profiling and drafting of EAFM plans. EAFM plans at regional level, and other sites (Timor-Leste) are still being developed. | *(not set or not applicable)* | **5** |  |  |  |
|  | Reduced fishing pressure | * Aru, Indonesia: Approx. 775 registered fishing vessels in Aru operating in the red snapper and shrimp fisheries (combined).

•South Fly, PNG: 2 tons per year dried fish maw (bladder) produced. | at the regional level IUU assessment reports related to baseline estimates, policies and regulations, supporting efforts in developing tools for FAO GRI and co-surveillance best practices and lessons learned have been completed in support of RPOA-IUU. At the country level, in Indonesia key findings on fisheries vessels were covered as part of snapper fisheries and shrimp fisheries profiles; several related coordination activities also undertaken. In Timor-Leste, training on IUU fishing vessel identification and methods have been carried out. In PNG, data collection methods on dried fish maw have yet to be conducted. | *(not set or not applicable)* | • Aru, Indonesia: 25% reduction in fleet size within the shrimp and red snapper fisheries.• South Fly, PNG: 1 ton per year dried fish maw (bladder) produced. |  |  |  |
|  | Improved use of fish gear/techniques | • Aru, Indonesia: Approx. 775 registered fishing vessels in Aru operating in the shrimp and red snapper fisheries; 775 vessels (<30 GT) which do not have VMS; 1400 vessels using gillnet gear.• Merauke, Indonesia: Approx. 500 registered fishing vessels operating in the barramundi fishery in Merauke.• South Coast, Timor-Leste: Approx. 150 registered vessels in the south coast municipalities.• South Fly, PNG: Approx. 2700 households involved in small-scale fishing | INDONESIA:>EAFM Plan and FIPs developed (presented in previous sections) are also geared to provide guidance on improved use of fish gears and techniques. From 2019-2021, the key activities focused first on profiling and assessments. Thus, data pertaining to improved use of fish gear/techniques will be reflected in subsequent reporting in line with implementation of EAFM plan and FIPs.TIMOR-LESTE:> Training for Fisheries on IUU Fishing Vessel Identification Method and other surveillance measure and safety at sea conducted for Municipalities of Viqueque, Manufahi and Covalima (Dec. 2020)> MAF is also implementing a program to improve fish gear/techniques (which includes specification of maximum number of people per group per small fishing vessels) | *(not set/not applicable*) | • Aru, Indonesia: 50% of vessels within the shrimp and red snapper fisheries using improved gear; 50% vessels using VMS; 25% vessels applying improved gear to reduce turtle bycatch.• Merauke, Indonesia: 50% barramundi fishers using improved gear.• South Coast, Timor-Leste: 50% vessels within the mackerel fishery using improved gear/techniques.• South Fly: PNG: 25% artisanal fishers using improved gear/techniques. |  |  |  |
| **Outcome 5:****Reduced marine pollution improves ecosystem health in coastal/ marine hotspots in the Arafura and Timor Seas** | Strengthened oil spill oil response systems and capacities | • Oil and gas development is expanding in the ATS region, but local communities lack awareness and capacity to respond to marine pollution incidents | 20% of target has been achieved.The ATSEA-2 focuses on 2 areas (a) marine debris, and (b) oil spill. To date, at the regional level, the regional assessment on marine and land-based pollution and hotspot analysis has been completed, including the conduct of a Regional Webinar on Marine and Land-based Pollution. At the country level, in Indonesia the Pollution Assessment Report for Rote Ndao has been completed, and a Marine Pollution Task Team in East Nusa Tenggara has been established. In Timor-Leste, the Marine and Land-based Pollution Assessment in South Coast (covering 4 municipalities) has been completed with final validation ongoing; Beach clean-up activities also undertaken combined with awareness building workshops. | *(not set or not applicable)* | • Oil spill early response systems and procedures are included in the ICM plans of Rote Ndao in Indonesia and Município Manatuto in Timor-Leste |  |  |  |
| **Outcome 6:****Coastal and Marine Biodiversity Conserved through Protection of Habitats and Species** | Protected area management effectiveness score | • Indonesia: Southeast Aru MPAMETT: 39• Timor-Leste: NKS NPMETT: 24 | NOTE: METT scores to be reported in next PIRs, focus for 2019-2021 was mainly on baseline assessment and profiling.In line with the ATSEA-2 targets on biodiversity conservation, this section covers the following key accomplishments: completion of updated baseline data/profile of key marine ecosystems in ATS and ecosystem valuation; completed MPA Network Design and proposed roadmap for new MPAs; establishment of Kolepom as new MPA in Indonesia, updated draft biodiversity atlas in Indonesia, and support to enhanced management of existing MPA in Maluku. In Timor-Leste, the conduct of stakeholder coordination meeting on the planned establishment of new MPA in Manufahi.Support to existing MPAs have just been initiated and as such, specific reporting on METT improvement in 2 existing MPAs in Indonesia and Timor-Leste is targeted in next PIR reporting | *(not set or not applicable)* | • Indonesia: Southeast Aru MPAMETT: 92• Timor-Leste: NKS NPMETT: 50 |  |  |  |
|  | Number of threatened species under enhanced protection | *(not set or not applicable)* | 60% of the target achieved with the completion of a Draft Regional Plan of Action for the Enhanced Protection of Sea Turtles. A regional and consultations have been conducted and inputs accommodated.At the regional level the regional status report on sea turtles have been completed and a draft RPOA for enhanced protection of sea turtles developed and will undergo further country consultation. Some baseline data on sea turtles were also covered in Indonesia’s assessment. Whereas, Timor-Leste is in the process of engaging consultant for target pilot project on community-based turtle conservation project. | *(not set or not applicable)* | **1 (marine turtles)** |  |  |  |
| **Outcome 7:****Integrated Coastal Management, incorporating climate change adaptation considerations, implemented at the local level towards more sustainable use and conservation of ecosystem goods and services** | Adoption and implementation of ICM plans and reforms to protect coastal zones in LMEs – Number of beneficiary countries adopting and applying ICM within ATS region | • No coastal areas are currently under ICM; Timor-Leste is currently preparing ICM plans with support of PEMSEA | ICM initiatives in both Indonesia and Timor-Leste have been initiated. In particular, in Indonesia an ICM kick off meeting in Rote Ndao has been conducted; and a related effort is the establishment of Marine Pollution. Task Force in East Nusa Tenggara. In Timor-Leste, the ICM Sub Task Team in PA Barique has been established and ongoing assessment is being undertaken for the development of the ICM Plan. | *(not set or not applicable)* | **2** |  |  |  |
|  | Number of women and men supported with alternative likelihoods that contribute to improved management of natural resources and increased resilience of their local communities with respect to the impacts of climate change | *(not set or not applicable)* | This target is also linked with the above target on ICM. Part of ICM Plan (once completed and adopted) is the conduct of key sustainable initiatives. Initiatives related to alternative livelihoods have just started as provided below, and as such number of men and women supported will be part of subsequent PIR reporting in line with the roll-out of ICM plan and livelihood activities. | *(not set or not applicable)* | • Total: 1500, including 850 women and 650 men |  |  |  |
| **Outcome 8:****Improved monitoring of the status of the ATS and dissemination of information** | Mechanism in place to produce a monitoring report on stress reduction measures | • There are some indicators included in the ATS SAP, but there is no unified monitoring and reporting system | A review of GEF/UNDP and other regional reporting mechanisms and indicators have been conducted and a Project and SAP Theory of Change drafted to support the subsequent development of an ATS SAP Monitoring System.  | *(not set or not applicable)* | Monitoring mechanisms in place for some of the project related indicators |  |  |  |
|  | Dissemination of project results and ATS information | • Since the end of the first phase of the ATSEA program, there has been limited dissemination of SAP/NAP implementation | 50% of the target has been achieved. The ATSEA-2 Project has developed and continue to roll out its Communications and Stakeholder Engagement plan, which covers various stakeholders from the global, regional, national, and local level. Key communications platforms in place and regularly updated (website, social media sites, Dropbox, data portal, contacts database). Key publications (quarterly newsletters, press releases, meeting/technical/webinar reports) and videos produced; linked with PEMSEA and IWLearn bulletins. Integration of ATSEA-2 information in PEMSEA’s SEA Knowledge Bank ongoing. Participation and representation of ATSEA-2 in various international, regional and national events. | **(not set/not applicable)** | • Participation in one GEF IW Conference; submission of at least one Results and one Experience Note; and integration of ATS knowledge management onto the existing CTI knowledge management platform |  |  |  |

**Indicator Assessment Key**

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

**ToR ANNEX I:** [**GEF co-financing template**](https://eur03.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fpims.undp.org%2Fworkspace%2Ffile%2Fdownload%3Fid%3D210&data=04%7C01%7Cnittaya.saengow%40undp.org%7C6e54cb7e61454d1402cd08d9fb22bf1e%7Cb3e5db5e2944483799f57488ace54319%7C0%7C0%7C637816948917218737%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWIjoiMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzIiLCJBTiI6Ik1haWwiLCJXVCI6Mn0%3D%7C3000&sdata=307FVqRDOtPu7gHmaTDFgLo3VxdvzpcPZt4WW%2FijD9g%3D&reserved=0) **(provided as a separate file)**

1. Under ATSEA-1, the countries of Indonesia and Timor-Leste have developed and adopted their respective National Action Programs (NAPs). PNG was an observer country during ATSEA-1. [↑](#footnote-ref-0)
2. [Guidelines on Core Indicators and Sub-Indicators](https://eur03.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.thegef.org%2Fdocuments%2Fresults-framework&data=04%7C01%7Cnittaya.saengow%40undp.org%7C6e54cb7e61454d1402cd08d9fb22bf1e%7Cb3e5db5e2944483799f57488ace54319%7C0%7C0%7C637816948917218737%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWIjoiMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzIiLCJBTiI6Ik1haWwiLCJXVCI6Mn0%3D%7C3000&sdata=MMc8dsXu5DbAAznkQwl39pBWaAkzupjrq4yxItE3Tqw%3D&reserved=0) [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
3. For ideas on innovative and participatory Monitoring and Evaluation strategies and techniques, see [UNDP Discussion Paper: Innovations in Monitoring & Evaluating Results](http://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/librarypage/capacity-building/discussion-paper--innovations-in-monitoring---evaluating-results/), 05 Nov 2013. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
4. For more stakeholder engagement in the M&E process, see the [UNDP Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results](http://www.undg.org/docs/11653/UNDP-PME-Handbook-%282009%29.pdf), Chapter 3, pg. 93. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
5. COVID19 Evaluation Guidance : http://web.undp.org/evaluation/guideline/documents/covid19/update/June2021/UNDP%20DE%20Guidance%20Planning%20and%20Implementation%20during%20COVID19%203%20June%202021.pdf [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
6. Populate with data from the Logframe and scorecards [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
7. Populate with data from the Project Document [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
8. If available [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
9. Colour code this column only [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
10. Use the 6 point Progress Towards Results Rating Scale: HS, S, MS, MU, U, HU [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
11. 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. [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
12. The Commissioning Unit is obligated to issue payments to the MTR 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 MTR 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 consultant, 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> [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
13. <https://intranet.undp.org/unit/bom/pso/Support%20documents%20on%20IC%20Guidelines/Template%20for%20Confirmation%20of%20Interest%20and%20Submission%20of%20Financial%20Proposal.docx> [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
14. <http://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/corporate/Careers/P11_Personal_history_form.doc> [↑](#footnote-ref-13)
15. The Report length should not exceed *40* pages in total (not including annexes). [↑](#footnote-ref-14)
16. <http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/100> [↑](#footnote-ref-15)
17. Populate with data from the Logframe and scorecards [↑](#footnote-ref-16)
18. Populate with data from the Project Document [↑](#footnote-ref-17)
19. If available [↑](#footnote-ref-18)
20. Colour code this column only [↑](#footnote-ref-19)
21. Use the 6 point Progress Towards Results Rating Scale: HS, S, MS, MU, U, HU [↑](#footnote-ref-20)