**TERMS OF REFERENCE**

**(Individual Contractor Agreement)**

**Title:** Consultant for Final Independent Review Mission

**Project:**  West Pacific East Asia Oceanic Fisheries Management (WPEA) 71967

**Duty station:** Kolonia, Federated States of Micronesia

**Section/Unit:** EMO - IWC

**Contract/Level:** IICA – 4

**Duration:** 01/06/2012 **through** 31/08/2012

**Supervisor:** WPEA-FM Project Manager, Mr. SungKwon Soh

**1. General Background**

|  |
| --- |
| The project will build capacity in Indonesia, the Philippines and Vietnam to fully engage in regional initiatives to conserve and manage fisheries for highly migratory fish stocks. This will be achieved by enhancing national capacity within these countries to contribute to the objective of the *Convention for the Conservation and Management of Highly Migratory Fish Stocks in the Western and Central Pacific Ocean* which is to effectively manage, support long term conservation and sustainably use shared highly migratory oceanic fish stocks of global significance in the western Pacific and east Asia. Project interventions will address threats to local food security and economic and social development opportunities offered by these shared resources arising as a result of poor information concerning current harvests, over-exploitation resulting from incomplete and inadequate collaborative arrangements for conservation and management, both nationally and regionally, and illegal, unreported and unregulated (IUU) fishing. The *Convention* provides the basis for the institutional framework for international collaboration for conservation and management of oceanic highly migratory fish stocks in this region. Indonesia and the Philippines participated in the negotiations to develop the Convention during the 1990s and Philippines has since ratified it. Vietnam has not yet engaged in the Commission's work and Philippines and Indonesia require considerable support in order to fully participate.  The activities to be carried out under this project will contribute towards the following objective: “*To strengthen national capacities and international cooperation on priority transboundary concerns relating to the conservation and management of highly migratory fish stocks in the west Pacific Ocean and east Asia (Indonesia, Philippines and Vietnam)*”. The project will, *inter alia*, (i) strengthen national capacities in fishery monitoring and assessment (ii) improve knowledge of oceanic fish stocks and reduce uncertainties in stock assessments (iii) strengthen national capacities in oceanic fishery management, with participant countries contributing to the management of shared migratory fish stocks (iv) strengthen national laws, policies and institutions, to implement applicable global and regional instruments. The Project will also strengthen WCPFC as the appropriate regional fisheries management organization responsible for the conservation and management of highly migratory fish stocks in this oceanic region by building the capacity of Philippines, Indonesia and Vietnam to participate in the work of the Commission. It will contribute to improved scientific information supporting an ecosystems approach to management of shared target and non-target oceanic stocks and strengthened monitoring, regulation and control nationally and regionally. Global environmental benefits will be achieved by strengthened international cooperation on priority trans-boundary concerns relating to the conservation and management of highly migratory fish stocks in the west Pacific Ocean and east Asia. In addition, as a nationally-driven initiative of Philippines, Indonesia and Vietnam, an improved contribution to sustainable development will be achieved through enhanced information for decision-making in respect of necessary national economic, financial, regulatory and institutional reform and full participation in an existing regional fisheries management arrangement. |

**2. Purpose and Scope of Assignment**

(Concise and detailed description of activities, tasks and responsibilities to be undertaken, including expected travel, if applicable)

1. OBJECTIVES OF THE CONSULTANCY

The objective of the final evaluation is to enable the GEF, UNDP and UNOPS assess the relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability of WPEA FM Project. The evaluation will assess achievements of the project against its objectives, including a re-examination of the relevance of the objectives and project design. It will also identify factors that have facilitated or impeded the achievement of the objectives. While a thorough review of the past is in itself very important, the in-depth evaluation is expected to lead to detailed overview and lessons learned for the future.

In addition, it is expected that the Consultant will conduct formative project evaluations, examining the delivery of the program, the quality of its implementation, and an assessment of the organizational context, personnel, procedures, inputs, etc.

1. SCOPE OF SERVICES / REVIEW METHODOLOGY

The evaluation will be conducted in a participatory manner working on the basis that its essential objective is to assess the project implementation and impacts in order to provide basis for improvement in the implementation and other decisions.

During the evaluation it shall be the responsibility of the Consultant to notify the relevant government bodies, and obtain required permits, permissions and visas. The Western and Central Pacific Fisheries Commission (WCPFC) will aid in facilitating communication with the relevant national government representatives to streamline obtaining the required documents.

* 1. Inception Phase

The Consultant will prepare an Inception Report for discussion with WCPFC, UNOPS and UNDP. This will outline the proposed approach to the assignment and will include, but not be limited to, a detailed work plan of activities, and methodologies of approach. It is anticipated that the Consultant will look at the entire evaluation and its activities in a holistic manner to maximizes efficiencies and minimize number of field trips. It is also envisioned that several of the activities can be run concurrently.

The Inception Report should be produced before field interviews are undertaken to ensure that methods are aligned with the GEF guidelines for final evaluation (available at <http://www.thegef.org/gef/sites/thegef.org/files/documents/Policies-TEguidelines7-31.pdf> ) and the UNDP(<http://www.undp.org/evaluation/documents/Evaluation-Policy.pdf>).

2.2 Expected Outputs

The following are the expected outputs:

1. Inception Report within 2 weeks after start the evaluation process describing the methodology, work plan, draft outline of the evaluation report to be reviewed and approved by UNDP/GEF and Project management unit prior to commencement of the evaluation activities.
2. Draft Final Evaluation Report within 5 weeks after start the evaluation process in the format attached as Annex 1 (or as proposed and approved by UNDP), with copies furnished to UNDP and UNOPS; and
3. Final Evaluation Report addressing the comments and recommendations of UNDP/GEF within 3 weeks from receipt thereof.
   1. Methodology for Review Mission

It is envisaged the evaluation mission will start with a desk review of project documentation and also take the following process:

1. Desk review of project documents, outputs, monitoring reports;
2. Review of specific products including datasets, management and action plans, publications and other material and reports;
3. Interviews with the WCPFC Secretariat, UNOPS and UNDP
4. Interviews with the Project Manager and other project staff; and
5. Consultations and/or interviews with relevant stakeholders involved, including government representatives of WPEA FM project.
   * 1. Assessment of Project Results

The evaluation will assess the achievement of outputs and outcomes and provide ratings for targeted objectives and outcomes. The assessment of project results seeks to determine the extent to which the project objectives were achieved, or are expected to be achieved, and determine if the project has led to any other short- or long-term and positive or negative consequences. In assessing project results, the Consultant will seek to determine the extent of achievement and shortcomings in reaching project objectives as stated in the project appraisal document, and indicate if there were any changes and whether those changes were approved. In assessing project performance, the Consultant can focus on achievements in terms of outputs, outcomes, or impacts. Although the GEF is more interested in assessing impacts, these may take a long time to manifest. On the other end, output achievement is easy to assess but tells very little about whether GEF investments were effective in delivering global environmental benefits. Focus on outcomes is, therefore, an appropriate compromise. It captures project efficacy in terms of delivering medium-term expected results, thus assessment of project outcomes should be a priority.

Three criteria will be used in the evaluation to assess level of achievement of project outcomes and objectives:

* Relevance. Were the project’s outcomes consistent with the focal areas/operational program strategies and country priorities?
* Effectiveness. Are the actual project outcomes commensurate with the original or modified project objectives? If the original or modified expected results are merely outputs/inputs, the evaluators should assess if there were any real outcomes of the project and, if there were, determine whether these are commensurate with realistic expectations from such projects,
* Efficiency. Was the project cost effective? Was the project the least cost option? Was project implementation delayed, and, if it was, did that affect cost effectiveness? Wherever possible, the evaluator should also compare the costs incurred and the time taken to achieve outcomes with that for similar projects.

The evaluation of relevance, effectiveness, and efficiency will be as objective as possible and will include sufficient and convincing empirical evidence. Ideally, the project monitoring system should deliver quantifiable information that can lead to a robust assessment of project effectiveness and efficiency. Since projects have different objectives, assessed results are not comparable and cannot be aggregated. Outcomes will be rated as follows for relevance, effectiveness, and efficiency:

* 1. Highly satisfactory (HS). The project had no shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives in terms of relevance, effectiveness, or efficiency.
  2. Satisfactory (S). The project had minor shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives in terms of relevance, effectiveness, or efficiency.
  3. Moderately satisfactory (MS). The project had moderate shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives in terms of relevance, effectiveness, or efficiency.
  4. Moderately unsatisfactory (MU). The project had significant shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives in terms of relevance, effectiveness, or efficiency.
  5. Unsatisfactory (U). The project had major shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives in terms of relevance, effectiveness, or efficiency.
  6. Highly unsatisfactory (HU). The project had severe shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives in terms of relevance, effectiveness, or efficiency.

When rating the project’s outcomes, relevance and effectiveness should be considered to be critical criteria. Criticality in this context implies that satisfactory performance on a specific criterion is essential to satisfactory performance overall. Thus, lack of performance on such criteria is not compensated by better performance on other criteria. Thus, to have an overall satisfactory rating for outcomes, the project must have at least satisfactory ratings on both relevance and effectiveness. The consultant will assess other results of the project, including positive and negative actual (or anticipated) impacts or emerging long-term effects. Given the long-term nature of impacts, it might not be possible for the evaluators to identify or fully assess these. Nonetheless, they will indicate the steps taken to assess long-term project impacts, especially impacts on local populations, global environment, replication effects, and other local effects.

* + 1. Assessment of Risks to Sustainability of Project Outcomes

Theevaluation will assess, at minimum, the “likelihood of sustainability of outcomes at project termination, and provide a rating for this.” Sustainability is understood as the likelihood of continued benefits after the GEF project ends. Given the uncertainties involved, it may be difficult to have a realistic a priori assessment of sustainability of outcomes. Therefore, assessment of sustainability of outcomes will give special attention to analysis of the risks that are likely to affect the persistence of project outcomes. This assessment should explain how the risks to project outcomes will affect continuation of benefits after the GEF project ends. It will include both exogenous and endogenous risks. The following four dimensions or aspects of risks to sustainability will be addressed:

1. Financial risks. Are there any financial risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project outcomes? What is the likelihood of financial and economic resources not being available once GEF assistance ends? (Such resources can be from multiple sources, such as the public and private sectors or income-generating activities; these can also include trends that indicate the likelihood that, in future, there will be adequate financial resources for sustaining project outcomes.)
2. Sociopolitical risks. 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 project benefits continue to flow? Is there sufficient public/stakeholder awareness in support of the project’s long-term objectives?
3. Institutional framework and governance risks. Do the legal frameworks, policies, and governance structures and processes within which the project operates pose risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project benefits? Are requisite systems for accountability and transparency, and required technical know-how, in place?
4. Environmental risks. Are there any environmental risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project outcomes? The evaluation should assess whether certain activities will pose a threat to the sustainability of the project outcomes.

Each of the above dimensions of risks to sustainability of project outcomes will be rated based on an overall assessment of the likelihood and magnitude of the potential effect of the risks considered within that dimension. The following ratings will be provided:

* + 1. Likely (L). There are no or negligible risks that affect this dimension of sustainability.
    2. Moderately likely (ML). There are moderate risks that affect this dimension of sustainability.
    3. Moderately unlikely (MU). There are significant risks that affect this dimension of sustainability.
    4. Unlikely (U). There are severe risks that affect this dimension of sustainability.

All the risk dimensions of sustainability are critical. Therefore, overall rating for sustainability will not be higher than the lowest rated dimension. For example, if a project has an “unlikely” rating in any dimension, its overall rating cannot be higher than “unlikely.”

* + 1. Catalytic Role

The consultant will describe any catalytic or replication effect of the project. If no effects are identified, the evaluation will describe the catalytic or replication actions that the project carried out. No ratings are requested for the project’s catalytic role.

* + 1. Assessment of M&E Systems

The evaluation will assess whether the project met the minimum requirements for project design of M&E and the implementation of the project M&E plan.

M&E design. Projects should have a sound M&E plan to monitor results and track progress toward achieving project objectives. An M&E plan should include a baseline (including data, methodology, and so on), SMART (specific, measurable, achievable, realistic, and timely) indicators and data analysis systems, and evaluation studies at specific times to assess results and adequate funding for M&E activities. The time frame for various M&E activities and standards for outputs should have been specified.

M&E plan implementation. The evaluation should verify that an M&E system was in place and facilitated timely tracking of progress toward project objectives by collecting information on chosen indicators continually throughout the project implementation period; annual project reports were complete and accurate, with well-justified ratings; the information provided by the M&E system was used during the project to improve performance and to adapt to changing needs; and projects had an M&E system in place with proper training for parties responsible for M&E activities to ensure that data will continue to be collected and used after project closure.

Budgeting and funding for M&E activities. In addition to incorporating information on funding for M&E while assessing M&E design, the evaluators will determine whether M&E was sufficiently budgeted for at the project planning stage and whether M&E was funded adequately and in a timely manner during implementation.

Project M&E systems will be rated as follows on quality of M&E design and quality of M&E implementation:

* + 1. Highly satisfactory (HS). There were no shortcomings in the project M&E system.
    2. Satisfactory (S). There were minor shortcomings in the project M&E system.
    3. Moderately satisfactory (MS). There were moderate shortcomings in the project M&E system.
    4. Moderately unsatisfactory (MU). There were significant shortcomings in the project M&E system.
    5. Unsatisfactory (U). There were major shortcomings in the project M&E system.
    6. Highly unsatisfactory (HU). The project had no M&E system.

The overall rating of M&E during project implementation will be based solely on the quality of M&E plan implementation. The ratings on quality at entry of M&E design and sufficiency of funding during planning and implementation will be used as explanatory variables.

* + 1. Monitoring of Long-Term Changes

The M&E of long-term changes is often incorporated in GEF-supported projects as a separate component and may include determination of environmental baselines; specification of indicators; and provisioning of equipment and capacity building for data gathering, analysis, and use. This section of the evaluation report will describe project actions and accomplishments toward establishing a long-term monitoring system. The review will address the following questions:

* + 1. Did this project contribute to the establishment of a long-term monitoring system? If it did not, should the project have included such a component?
    2. What were the accomplishments and shortcomings in establishment of this system?
    3. Is the system sustainable that is, is it embedded in a proper institutional structure and does it have financing?
    4. Is the information generated by this system being used as originally intended?
    5. Assessment of Processes Affecting Attainment of Project Results

When relevant, the Consultant should consider the following issues affecting project implementation and attainment of project results. The Consultant is not expected to provide ratings or separate assessments on these issues, but these could be considered in the performance and results sections of the report:

* + 1. Preparation and readiness. Were the project’s objectives and components clear, practicable, and feasible within its time frame? Were the capacities of the executing institution(s) and its counterparts properly considered when the project was designed? Were lessons from other relevant projects properly incorporated in the project design? Were the partnership arrangements properly identified and roles and responsibilities negotiated prior to project approval? Were counterpart resources (funding, staff, and facilities), enabling adequate project management arrangements in place at project entry?
    2. Ownership/drivenness. Was the project concept in line with the sectoral and development priorities and plans of the countries involved (Indonesia, the Philippines and the Vietnam)? Are project outcomes contributing to the countries’ development priorities and plans? Were the relevant country representatives from government and civil society involved in the project? Has the countries approved policies or regulatory frameworks in line with the project’s objectives?
    3. Stakeholder involvement. Did the project involve the relevant stakeholders through information sharing and consultation and by seeking their participation in project design, implementation, and M&E? For example, did the project implement appropriate outreach and public awareness campaigns? Did the project consult with and make use of the skills, experience, and knowledge of the appropriate government entities, nongovernmental organizations, community groups, private sector entities, local governments, and academic institutions in the design, implementation, and evaluation of project activities? 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 while taking decisions? Were the relevant vulnerable groups and powerful supporters and opponents of the processes properly involved?
    4. Financial planning. Did the project have the appropriate financial controls, including reporting and planning, that allowed management to make informed decisions regarding the budget and allowed for timely flow of funds? Was there due diligence in the management of funds and financial audits? Did promised cofinancing materialize?
    5. An evaluation of the effectiveness of UNDP and UNOPS in fulfilling their roles and responsibilities in terms of their respective implementing and executing capacities in the project implementation
    6. Cofinancing and project outcomes and sustainability. If there was a difference in the level of expected cofinancing and the cofinancing actually realized, what were the reasons for the variance? Did the extent of materialization of cofinancing affect project outcomes and/or sustainability, and, if so, in what ways and through what causal linkages?
    7. Delays and project outcomes and sustainability. If there were delays in project implementation and completion, what were the reasons? Did the delays affect project outcomes and/or sustainability, and, if so, in what ways and through what causal linkages?
    8. Lessons and Recommendations

The Consultant will present lessons and recommendations in the Final Evaluation Report on all aspects of the project that they consider relevant. Special attention to analyzing lessons and proposing recommendations on aspects related to factors that contributed to or hindered attainment of project objectives, sustainability of project benefits, innovation, catalytic effect and replication, and project M&E is expected.

The consultant should refrain from providing recommendations to improve the project. Instead, they should seek to provide a few well-formulated lessons applicable to the type of project at hand or to the GEF’s overall portfolio. This evaluation should not be undertaken with the motive of appraisal, preparation, or justification for a follow-up phase. Wherever possible, evaluation report should include examples of good practices for other projects in a focal area, country, or region.

The incumbent is responsible to abide by security policies, administrative instructions, plans and procedures of the UN Security Management System and that of UNOPS.

**3. Monitoring and Progress Controls**

The Evaluation mission will produce the following deliverables to WCPFC:

1. An Inception Report;
2. An executive summary, jointly prepared by the consultants, including findings and recommendations;
3. A detailed Final Evaluation Report, with attention to lessons learned and recommendations; and
4. List of Annexes prepared by the consultants, which includes TORs, Itinerary, List of Persons Interviewed, Summary of Field Visits, List of Documents reviewed, Questionnaire used and Summary of results, Co-financing & Leveraged Resources etc.

The report together with the annexes shall be written in English and shall be presented in electronic form in MS Word format.

**4. Qualifications and Experience**

**a. Education**

* A Master degree in natural resources management, biological sciences or a related field is required as a minimum qualification

**b. Work Experience**

* A minimum of 15 years’ relevant experience is required and extensive experience in fisheries research, development and policy, especially tuna fisheries, would be an asset.
* Substantive experience in reviewing and evaluating similar technical assistance projects, preferably those involving GEF or United Nations development agencies and major donors;

**c. Key Competencies**

* 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;
* An ability to assess the institutional capacity and incentives required;
* Understanding of political, economic and institutional issues associated with transboundary waters and groundwater in the region;
* Experience in working with multi-disciplinary and multi-national teams to deliver quality products in high stress an short deadline situations;
* Experience working in diplomatic environments;
* Excellent in human relations, coordination, planning and teamwork;

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Project Authority (Name/Title): | | Contract holder (Name/Title): | |
|  |  |  |  |
| Signature | Date | Signature | Date |

**ANNEX I**

**TERMINAL EVALUATION REPORT PROPOSED[[1]](#footnote-1) FORMAT**

**No. of Pages:** No more than 50 pages, excluding Executive Summary and Annexes

**Type of Paper:** 81/2 by 11

**Font style**: Arial

**Font size:** 11

**Date of** Draft Mid-Term Evaluation Report – August 30, 2011

**Submission:** Final Mid-Term Evaluation Report - 20 days from receipt of comments

**Structure:** Title Page

Table of Contents

Foreword

Acronyms and Terms

1. Executive summary – (no more than 4 pages); should briefly explain how the evaluation was conducted and provide the summary of contents of the report and its findings.
2. Introduction - the project and its development context; approaches and activities
3. Project Concept and Design Summary - This section should begin with the context of the problem that the project is addressing. It should describe how effectively the project concept and design can deal with the situation
4. Project Results Progress towards attaining the project’s regional and global environmental objectives and achievement of project outcomes. It should also try to answer the question: What has happened and why? The performance indicators in the logframe matrix are crucial to completing this section.
5. Project Management- This section covers the assessment of the project’s adaptive management, partnerships, involvement of stakeholders, public participation, roles and responsibilities, monitoring plans, assistance from UNDP and UNOPS etc
6. Findings and Conclusions - Project formulation Implementation Results
7. Recommendations- The evaluators should be as specific as possible. To whom are the recommendations addressed and what exactly should that party do? Recommendations might include sets of options and alternatives.
8. Lessons learned This is a list of project experiences and practices that may be useful for the completion of the project and may also be useful to other projects

1. Consultants are welcome to improve on this minimum required information in the MTE report and also indicating annexes and attachments. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)