

**TERMS OF REFERENCE
(Individual Contractor Agreement)**

Title:	Mid-term Evaluation Consultant
Project:	Sulu-Celebes Sea Sustainable Fisheries Management
Duty station:	Home-based with travel
Section/Unit:	EMO IWC
Contract/Level:	International Specialist ICA/ Level 4
Duration:	30 workdays
Supervisor:	UNDP RTA Asia/ UNOPS SPM IWC

1. General Background

The GEF financed Sulu-Celebes Sea Regional Fisheries Management project is implemented by UNDP and executed by UNOPS. The Sulu-Celebes Sea (SCS) is a Large Marine Ecosystem in the tropical seas of Asia bounded by three countries – Indonesia, Malaysia and the Philippines. Being at the heart of the most bio-diverse marine area in the world, the SCS is also a very rich fishing ground for large and small pelagic as well as bay and coral reef fishes, providing livelihoods to the coastal inhabitants and food for the entire region and beyond. The fishery resources, however, have declined due to various threats, including overexploitation, habitat and community modification and global climate change. The project aims to improve the condition of fisheries and their habitats in the Sulu-Celebes Sea (Sulu-Sulawesi Marine Ecoregion) through an integrated, collaborative and participatory management at the local, national and tri-national levels. The goal of the project is to have an economically and ecologically sustainable marine fisheries in the region for the benefit of communities who are dependent on these resources for livelihood and for the global community who benefit in the conservation of highly diverse marine ecosystems and its ecosystems services. The five expected outcomes of the Project are:

Achievement of a regional consensus on trans-boundary priorities and their immediate and root causes by updating an earlier Trans-boundary Diagnostic Analysis (TDA) for the region and focusing on unsustainable exploitation of fisheries.

1. Agreement on regional and national legal, policy and institutional reforms for improved fisheries management through the formulation of a Strategic Action Program (SAP), which will build on the existing Conservation Plan for the Sulu-Sulawesi Marine Ecoregion.
2. Strengthening of institutions and introduction of reforms to catalyze implementation of policies on reducing overfishing and improving fisheries management. The primary target for institutional strengthening is the Sulu-Sulawesi Marine Ecoregion Tri-National Committee and its Sub-Committees, in particular the Sub-Committee on Sustainable Fisheries.
3. Increased fish stocks of small pelagics through the implementation of best fisheries management practices in demonstration sites.
4. Capture, application and dissemination of knowledge, lessons and best practices within the region and other LMEs.

The project initiated its operations in 2010 and is now at mid-point of its implementation.

2. Purpose and Scope of Assignment

General Responsibilities:

The purpose of the Mid-Term Evaluation (MTE) is to examine the progress and performance of the project since the start of its implementation. The MTE will include the evaluation of both the progress in project implementation, measured against planned outputs and outcomes set forth in the Project Document, and the assessment of features related to the process involved in achieving those outcomes, and the progress towards project objective. The evaluation will also identify and address causes and issues that constrain the achievement of set targets.

The MTE is intended to identify weaknesses and strengths of the project design, and to develop recommendations for any necessary changes in the overall design and orientation of the project by evaluating the adequacy, efficiency and effectiveness of its implementation, as well as assessing Project outputs and outcomes to date. Consequently, the MTE mission is also expected to make detailed recommendations on the work plan for the remaining project period. It will also provide an opportunity to assess early signs of project success or failure and prompt necessary adjustments.

The evaluation will follow approaches adopted by GEF for the assessment of IW projects and UNDP M&E guidelines.

The MTE mission will also identify lessons learnt and best practices from the Project that could be applied to future and on-going projects.

Specific Duties

The scope of the MTE will cover all activities undertaken within the framework of the project. One evaluator with a combination of regional knowledge, evaluation experience, and in-depth knowledge of GEF IW projects will compare planned project outputs and outcomes to actual/achieved outputs and outcomes and assess the actual results to determine their contribution to the attainment of Project objectives.

The evaluation will extract lessons learned, diagnose and analyse issues of concern and formulate a concrete and viable set of recommendations. It will evaluate the efficiency of Project management, including the delivery of outputs and activities in terms of quality, quantity, timeliness and cost efficiency. The evaluation will also determine the likely outcomes and impact of the Project in relation to the specified Project goals and objectives.

The evaluation will comprise the following elements:

1. Assess whether the Project design is clear, logical and commensurate with the time and resources available;
2. A summary evaluation of the Project and all of its major components undertaken to date and a determination of progress toward achievement of its overall objectives;
3. An evaluation of Project performance in relation to the indicators, assumptions and risks specified in the logical framework matrix and the Project Document;
4. An assessment of the scope, quality and significance of Project outputs and outcomes produced to date in relation to expected results;
5. An assessment of the functionality of the institutional structure established and the role and effectiveness of the Project Board (PB);
6. Identification and, to the extent possible, quantification of any additional outputs and outcomes beyond those specified in the Project Document;
7. Identification of any programmatic and financial variance and/or adjustments made during the first 2.5 years of the Project and an assessment of their conformity with decisions of the PSC and their appropriateness in terms of the overall objectives of the Project;

8. Identification and to the extent possible the quantification of the co-financing commitments realized (those committed at the beginning of the project as well as those that emerged during the project implementation).
9. An evaluation of Project coordination, management and administration provided by the PCU. This evaluation should include specific reference to:
 - Organizational/institutional arrangements for collaboration among the various agencies and institutions involved in project arrangements and execution;
 - The effectiveness of the monitoring mechanisms currently employed by the PCU in monitoring on a day-to-day basis, progress in Project execution;
 - Administrative, operational and/or technical problems and constraints that influenced the effective implementation of the Project and present recommendations for any necessary operational changes; and
 - Financial management of the project, including the balance between expenditures on administrative and overhead charges in relation to those on the achievement of substantive outputs.
10. An evaluation of the effectiveness of UNOPS and the PMU in fulfilling their roles and responsibilities in their executing capacities and of UNDP, as implementing agency in its oversight responsibilities.
11. A prognosis of the degree to which the overall objectives and expected outputs of the Project are likely to be met;
12. An assessment of the M&E approach adopted by the Project;
13. Progress towards sustainability and replication of project activities;
14. Lessons learned and best practices during Project implementation which would benefit the GEF IW portfolio;
15. Recommendations regarding any necessary corrections and adjustments to the overall Project workplan and timetable for purposes of enhancing the achievement of Project objectives and outcomes.

3. Methodology

The Mid-term 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 a basis for improvement in the implementation and other decisions.

The evaluation will start with a desk review of project documentation and also include the following activities:

- Desk review of project document, outputs, monitoring reports (such as, among others, Project Inception Report, Minutes of Project Steering Committee meetings, other relevant meetings, Project Implementation Reports (PIRs/APRs), quarterly progress reports, and other internal documents including consultant and financial reports);
- Review of specific products including content of the Project web site, datasets, management and action plans, publications and other materials and reports;
- Interviews with the former Senior Project Manager and other project staff who used to work in the Project Management Unit, if available after their departure from the project, and interviews with consultants involved in Project implementation;
- Consultations and/or interviews with relevant stakeholders involved, including government representatives (Indonesia, Malaysia, Philippines), other related projects and programmes within the region, Conservation International as major project contractor, relevant UNDP Country Offices (Philippines, Asia Pacific Regional Center) and UNOPS personnel, and NGOs;
- Attend the Project Steering Committee foreseen for Mid-January 2013.

- Submission of a draft report by end Mid- March 2013.

The Project Management Unit will provide the consultant with support to obtain all the necessary and requested documentations and necessary logistical assistance to conduct the evaluation mission.

4. Evaluation Deliverables

The expected output from this evaluation will include the following:

- a) Inception report that will include the following:

- (i) Activities to be undertaken
- (ii) Draft outline of the full report

The inception report will be reviewed and endorsed by UNDP and UNOPS as applicable.

- b) Full evaluation report that would include:

- (i) An executive summary, including findings and recommendations and an overall rating of project performance;
- (ii) A detailed evaluation report covering items presented above in the Scope of the Mid-Term Evaluation of this TOR with special attention to lessons learned and recommendations;
- (iii) A table of planned vs. actual project financial disbursements, and planned co-financing vs. actual co-financing for the Project;
- (iv) A list of Annexes prepared by the evaluator, which includes TORs, Itineraries, List of Persons Interviewed, Summary of Field Visits, List of Documents reviewed, Questionnaire used and Summary of results, Identification of Co-financing and Leveraged Resources, etc.

Suggested Table of Contents of the Mid-Term Report will be shared with the consultant together with the UNDP MTE guidance note.

5. Indicative outline of the Mid-Term Evaluation report

The key product expected from this Mid-Term Evaluation is a comprehensive analytical report in English that should, at least, include the following contents:

- Executive summary (1-2 pages)
 - ✓ Brief description of the project
 - ✓ Context and purpose of the evaluation
 - ✓ Main conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned
- Introduction (2-3 pages)
 - ✓ Project background
 - ✓ Purpose of the evaluation
 - ✓ Key issues to be addressed
 - ✓ Methodology of the evaluation
 - ✓ Structure of the evaluation
- Project and its development context (3-4 pages)
 - ✓ Project start and its duration
 - ✓ Implementation status
 - ✓ Problems that the project seeks to address
 - ✓ Immediate and development objectives of the project

- ✓ Main stakeholders
- ✓ Results expected
- Findings and Conclusions (8-9 pages)
 - ✓ Project concept and formulation
 - Project relevance
 - Implementation approach
 - Countries ownership/Engagement
 - Stakeholders participation
 - Replication approach
 - Cost-effectiveness
 - UNDP comparative advantage
 - Linkages between the project and other interventions within the sector
 - Indicators
 - Management arrangements
 - ✓ Implementation
 - Financial management
 - Monitoring and evaluation
 - Execution and implementation modalities
 - Assistance by the UNDP (RCU)
 - Operational support by UNOPS
 - Coordination and operational issues by the PMU
 - Role and contributions of partners
 - Identification and management of risks (adaptive management)
 - ✓ Results
 - Attainment of objectives
 - Prospects of sustainability
 - ✓ Recommendations (4-6 pages)
 - Corrective actions for the design, duration, 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
 - Suggestions for strengthening ownership, management of potential risks
 - ✓ Lessons learned (3-5 pages)
 - Best and worst practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance and success
 - Significant lessons that can be drawn from the experience of the project and its results, particularly those elements that have worked well and those that have not
- ✓ Annexes

6. Monitoring and Progress Controls

The MTE will be conducted under the overall guidance of UNDP using a participatory approach under which UNOPS and UNDP will be kept informed and will provide administrative and logistical support.

The consultant would be expected to commence the evaluation assignment in Mid-January 2013 and finalize the evaluation by end-March 2013.

A detailed mission schedule will be drafted with the logistical assistance from UNOPS, in consultation with UNDP, and inputs from the consultant once the consultant is selected.

The report production schedule includes:

- Inception report – March 1st
- Document review – Beginning March 15th
- Draft evaluation report – May 15th
- Comment on Draft evaluation received – May 22nd
- Final Report – May 26th

7. Qualifications and Experience

The Evaluator is expected to have the following expertise and experience:

- Advanced University Degree in Natural Science and relevant demonstrated regional/international consulting experience in project evaluations, preferably in projects dealing with marine sciences or large marine ecosystems.
- A minimum of 15 years' relevant experience is required. Previous experience in the region advantageous;
- Substantive experience in reviewing and evaluating similar technical assistance projects, preferably those involving UNDP/GEF or other United Nations development agencies and/or other major donors;
- Excellent English writing and communication skills and demonstrated ability to assess complex situations in order to succinctly and clearly distil critical issues and draw well supported conclusions;
- An ability to assess policy and governance framework and institutional capacity;
- Understanding of governance, political, economic and institutional issues associated with transboundary water issues in Sulu Celebes seas; and
- Familiarity with GEF International Waters strategies and its portfolio.

Project Authority (Name/Title): Katrin LICHTENBERG, Senior Portfolio Manager, IWC		Contract holder (Name/Title):	
Signature	Date	Signature	Date