



Empowered lives.  
Resilient nations.

## INDIVIDUAL CONSULTANT PROCUREMENT NOTICE

Reference: PN/FJI-017-17

**Consultancy Title:** UNDP-GEF Midterm Review (MTR)

**Project Name:** NAPA 2 Project \_Tuvalu

**Period of assignment:** 32 days over a 16 week period. **26 May, 2017** and completion by **August 15, 2017**

**Duty Station:** Tuvalu

Consultancy Proposal should be mailed to C/- UNDP Fiji MCO, Private Mail Bag, Suva, Fiji or sent via email to [procurement.fj@undp.org](mailto:procurement.fj@undp.org) no later than **12<sup>th</sup> May, 2017 (Fiji Time)** clearly stating the title of consultancy applied for. Any proposals received after this date/time will not be accepted. Any request for clarification must be sent in writing, or by standard electronic communication to the address or e-mail indicated above. UNDP will respond in writing or by standard electronic mail and will send written copies of the response, including an explanation of the query without identifying the source of inquiry, to all consultants. Incomplete, late and joint proposals will not be considered and only offers for which there is further interest will be contacted. **Failure to submit your application as stated as per the application submission guide (Procurement Notice) on the above link will be considered incomplete and therefore application will not be considered.**

### 1. BACKGROUND

The effective and responsive island-level governance to secure and diversify climate resilient marine-based coastal livelihoods and enhance climate hazard response capacity Project, commonly referred to as NAPA 2, is a 4 year Project implemented in Tuvalu. Funded through the Global Environment Facility (GEF) with an allocation of US 4.2 Million, the NAPA 2 Project is supported through an additional co –financing of USD17 Million.

In country, the Project is executed through the Department of Environment. However, Outcome 1 of the project is executed through the Department of Fisheries (Ministry of Natural Resources) whilst Outcome 3 is managed by the Department of Rural Development (Ministry of Home Affairs and Rural Development). Outcome 2 is executed by the Project Management Unit (PMU). The United Nations Development Program (UNDP) Pacific Office is the implementing entity.

The NAPA 2 Project objective is: resilience of island communities to climate change variability and risks is strengthened through participatory island-level planning, budgeting and execution and community-led investments .Refer to Annex 1 –[Terms of Reference](#) for details.

### 2. SCOPE OF WORK

#### Scope of work/Expected Output

The consultant will produce the following deliverables to UNDP:

**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 of the project, its objectives and processes. Was the project concept in line with the national sector development priorities and plans of the country including the Te Kakeega III: National Sustainable Development Strategy (or of participating countries in the case of multi-country projects)?
- Review decision-making processes: were perspectives of those who would be affected by project decisions, those who could affect the outcomes, and those who could contribute information or other resources to the process, taken into account during project design processes?
- Review the extent to which relevant gender issues were raised and analysed in the project design. See Annex 9 of *Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects* for further guidelines.

If there are major areas of concern, recommend areas for improvement. Refer to Annex 1 - [Terms of Reference](#) for details.

### 3. REQUIREMENTS FOR EXPERIENCE AND QUALIFICATION

**Qualifications:**

- A Master's degree in (*Natural Resource Management, Environmental Studies and/or Sustainable Development*), or other closely related field

**Experience:**

- Work experience in relevant technical areas for at least 10 years
- Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender and *Climate Change Adaptation and Sustainable Development*; experience in gender sensitive evaluation and analysis.
- Experience applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios
- Experience in adaptive management, as applied to *Climate Change Adaptation and Sustainable Development*)
- Recent experience with result-based management evaluation methodologies

**Competencies:**

- Experience working in South Pacific Region
- Project evaluation/review experiences
- Experience working with the GEF or GEF-evaluations

**Language Requirements:**

- Fluency in written and spoken English is essential

#### 4. EVALUATION CRITERIA

##### Evaluation

##### Cumulative analysis

The proposals will be evaluated using the cumulative analysis method with a split 70% technical and 30% financial scoring. The proposal with the highest cumulative scoring will be awarded the contract. Applications will be evaluated technically and points are attributed based on how well the proposal meets the requirements of the Terms of Reference using the guidelines detailed in the table below:

When using this weighted scoring method, the award of the contract may be made to the individual consultant whose offer has been evaluated and determined as:

- a) responsive/compliant/acceptable, and
- b) having received the highest score out of a pre-determined set of weighted technical and financial criteria specific to the solicitation.

\* Technical Criteria weighting; 70%

\* Financial Criteria weighting; 30%

Only candidates obtaining a minimum of 49 points in the Technical Evaluation would be considered for the Financial Evaluation. Interviews may be conducted as part of technical assessment for shortlisted proposals.

Criteria	Points	Percentage
<b>Qualification</b>		<b>55%</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A Master's degree in (<i>Natural Resource Management, Environmental Studies and/or Sustainable Development</i>), or other closely related field</li> </ul>	10	
<b>Experience</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Work experience in relevant technical areas for at least 10 years</li> </ul>	10	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender and (<i>Climate Change Adaptation and Sustainable Development</i>); experience in gender sensitive evaluation and analysis.</li> </ul>	10	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Experience applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios</li> </ul>	10	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Recent experience with result-based management evaluation methodologies</li> </ul>	10	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Experience in adaptive management, as applied to (<i>Climate Change Adaptation and Sustainable Development</i>)</li> </ul>	5	

<b>Competencies</b>		<b>15%</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Experience working with the GEF or GEF-evaluations</li> <li>• Project evaluation/review experiences</li> </ul>	10 5	
<b>Technical Criteria</b>		<b>70%</b>
**If necessary interviews shall also be conducted as part of the technical evaluation to ascertain best value for money.		
<b>Financial Criteria – Lowest Price</b>		<b>30%</b>
<b>Total</b>		<b>100%</b>

## 5. DOCUMENTS TO BE INCLUDED WHEN SUBMITTING CONSULTANCY PROPOSALS

Offerors must send the following documents.

- i) **Signed P11 form including names of at least 2 referees**
- ii) **Cover letter setting out:**
  - How the proposer meets the qualifications and experience required.
- iii) **Completed template for confirmation of Interest and Submission of Financial Proposal**

Consultant must send a financial proposal based on a **Lump Sum Amount**. The total amount quoted shall be all-inclusive and include all costs components required to perform the deliverables identified in the TOR, including professional fee, travel costs, living allowance (if any work is to be done outside the IC's duty station) and any other applicable cost to be incurred by the IC in completing the assignment. The contract price will be fixed output-based price regardless of extension of the herein specified duration. Payments will be done upon completion of the deliverables/outputs.

In general, UNDP shall not accept travel costs exceeding those of an economy class ticket. Should the IC wish to travel on a higher class he/she should do so using their own resources

In the event of unforeseeable travel not anticipated in this TOR, payment of travel costs including tickets, lodging and terminal expenses should be agreed upon, between the respective business unit and the Individual Consultant, prior to travel and will be reimbursed.

*The P11 form and Template for confirmation of interest and Submission of Financial Proposal is available under the procurement section of UNDP Fiji website ([www.pacific.undp.org](http://www.pacific.undp.org))*

# Annex 1- Terms of Reference

## 1. INTRODUCTION

This is the Terms of Reference (ToR) for the UNDP-GEF Midterm Review (MTR) of the *full* -sized project titled Effective and responsive island-level governance to secure and diversify climate resilient marine-based coastal livelihoods and enhance climate hazard response capacity (PIMS: 4571) implemented through the Department of the Environment, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Trade, Tourism, Environment and Labour which is to be undertaken in 2017. The project started on *the 30 August, 2013* and is in its *fourth* year of implementation. In line with the UNDP-GEF Guidance on MTRs, this MTR process was initiated before the submission of the second Project Implementation Report (PIR). This ToR sets out the expectations for this MTR. The MTR process must follow the guidance outlined in the document *Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects* ([http://web.undp.org/evaluation/documents/guidance/GEF/mid-term/Guidance\\_Midterm%20Review%20\\_EN\\_2014.pdf](http://web.undp.org/evaluation/documents/guidance/GEF/mid-term/Guidance_Midterm%20Review%20_EN_2014.pdf)).

## 2. PROJECT BACKGROUND INFORMATION

The effective and responsive island-level governance to secure and diversify climate resilient marine-based coastal livelihoods and enhance climate hazard response capacity Project, commonly referred to as NAPA 2, is a 4 year Project implemented in Tuvalu. Funded through the Global Environment Facility (GEF) with an allocation of US 4.2 Million, the NAPA 2 Project is supported through an additional co –financing of USD17 Million.

In country, the Project is executed through the Department of Environment. However, Outcome 1 of the project is executed through the Department of Fisheries (Ministry of Natural Resources) whilst Outcome 3 is managed by the Department of Rural Development (Ministry of Home Affairs and Rural Development). Outcome 2 is executed by the Project Management Unit (PMU). The United Nations Development Program (UNDP) Pacific Office is the implementing entity.

The NAPA 2 Project objective is: resilience of island communities to climate change variability and risks is strengthened through participatory island-level planning, budgeting and execution and community-led investments.

This project will focus on implementing three such priorities outlined in Tuvalu's National Adaptation Programme of Action, namely "strengthening of community based conservation programmes on highly vulnerable near-shore marine ecosystems," "adaptation to near-shore coastal shellfish fisheries resources and coral reef ecosystem productivity," and "strengthening community disaster preparedness and response potential." These priorities will be addressed through the following interlinked Components:

Component 1 includes activities for building resilience in marine-based livelihoods to climate impacts through an integrated package of measures that seek to enhance traditional fishing practices and food preservation techniques, facilitate a shift in fishing practices from vulnerable reef resources to more resilient pelagic resources, and strengthen community management of reef resources. These adaptation measures will be supported by targeted education, awareness raising and information exchange. Component 1 of the project is executed through the Department of Fisheries (Ministry of Natural Resources).

Component 2: Disaster risk management will focus on improving access to disaster early warning systems for people on outer islands. This will include establishing multiple communication channels, both at the national and outer island levels, to ensure reliable communications in the face of intensifying cyclone events in a changing climate, and building community capacity to take advantage of the improved communication systems. Component 2 of the project is executed through the NAPA II Project Management Unit.

Component 3 will focus on integrating locally-specific climate change concerns into existing outer Island Strategic Plans and building capacities of outer island administrations and communities to identify, budget, execute and monitor adaptation investments that are financed by domestic and external resources. This will be supplemented by enhanced awareness among the central government agencies about their existing

domestic expenditures on climate sensitive sectors and the adaptation gaps. It is expected that enhanced capacity to guide the future adaptation financing at the outer island level using the climate-smart Island Strategic Plans and to identify gaps and potential adaptation financing at the national level will enable the Government of Tuvalu to effectively combine and sequence available resources to reduce the vulnerability of the country to the impacts of climate change. Component 3 is executed through the Department of Rural Development (Ministry of Home Affairs and Rural Development).

### **3. OBJECTIVES OF THE MTR**

The MTR will assess progress towards the achievement of the project objectives and outcomes as specified in the Project Document and its effectiveness in building resilience of communities, 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. If there is any divergence from the Project Document, identify the reason for divergence and whether any interventions are needed to ensure the achievement of project objectives and outcomes. The MTR will also review the project's strategy and its risks to sustainability, including the level of ownership and engagement from executing agencies and other stakeholders in delivering the project.

### **4. MTR APPROACH & METHODOLOGY**

The MTR 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 Environmental & Social Safeguard Policy, the Project Document, project reports including Annual Project Review/PIRs, project budget revisions, lesson learned reports, national strategic and legal documents, NAPA2 Board minutes and supporting documents, reports and outputs published by NAPA2 staff and any other materials that the team considers useful for this evidence-based review). The MTR team will review the baseline GEF focal area Tracking Tool submitted to the GEF at CEO endorsement, and the midterm GEF focal area Tracking Tool that must be completed before the MTR field mission begins.

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

Engagement of stakeholders is vital to a successful MTR.<sup>2</sup> Stakeholder involvement should include interviews with stakeholders who have project responsibilities, including but not limited to : executing agencies, senior officials and task team/ component leaders, key experts and consultants in the subject area, Project Board, project stakeholders, academia, local government, CSOs and communities including:

- UNDP ( Resilience and Sustainable Development Unit,/UN Coordination Specialist)
- NAPA 2 Project Implementation Unit
- Former acting project coordinator, NAPA 1 Project
- NAPA 2 Project Board
- Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Trade, Labour and Environment – Acting Permanent Secretary
- NAPA2 Project Officers
- Members of the NACCC
- Tuvalu Red Cross – Climate Change and Disaster Officer
- Office of Kaupule ( Funafuti & 2 other islands visited)
- Community members on islands
- Fishermen Association/ reps on island
- Island Disaster Committees
- Ministry of Finance and Economic Development

---

<sup>1</sup> For ideas on innovative and participatory Monitoring and Evaluation strategies and techniques, see [UNDP Discussion Paper: Innovations in Monitoring & Evaluating Results](#), 05 Nov 2013.

<sup>2</sup> For more stakeholder engagement in the M&E process, see the [UNDP Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results](#), Chapter 3, pg. 93.

- Pepetua Latasi – Director of Climate Change Policy and Disaster Coordination Unit – Director of CCPDCU
- Sumeo Silu – Disaster Policy Coordinator under the CCPDCU
- Fafetai Namoto – Data and Information Officer, CCPDCU
- Kate Morioka – Climate Change and Disaster Risk Reduction Adviser
- Taula Katea – Director of Tuvalu Meteorological Service
- Secretariat of the Pacific Community
- Tomalu Talu – Tuvalu Telecom Representative
- Semese Alefaio – Principal Fisheries Officer (Coastal Section)
- Tupulaga Poulasi – Principal Fisheries Officer (Operation Section)
- Garry Preston – Fisheries Adviser
- Dr Uschi Kaly – Fisheries Adviser
- Sam Finikaso – Director of Fisheries Department
- Temetiu Maliga – Director of the Department of Rural Development
- Feue Tipu – Local Consultant working for LoCAL Project under the DRD (LoCAL activities and NAPA Activities under outcome 3 were amalgamated for ease implementation and monitoring)
- Moe Saitala – Ag. Director of Environment
- Mataio Tekinene – current R2R Project Coordinator (Former Director of Environment)
- Toomu Hauma – TANGO Coordinator
- Colin Schulz – EWS Expert
- Representatives from COMTECH
- Monifa Fiu – CTA Outcome 1
- All Island Representatives to the Project Board (Laisini Papamau, Isaia Taape, Penehuro Hauma, Tanentoa, Tutasu Toma, Mafalu Lotolua, Temetiu Maliga)

Additionally, the MTR team is expected to conduct field missions to 3 islands including the main island of Fongafale (where Funafuti is located) and two outer islands which are to be determined. The Project Implementation Unit will facilitate travel arrangements in country, including the following project sites. The final MTR report should describe the full MTR approach taken and the rationale for the approach making explicit the underlying assumptions, challenges, strengths and weaknesses about the methods and approach of the review. It will provide a detailed report on the progress of each objective and identify key findings, gaps, achievements, shortfalls and recommendations for moving forward.

## 5. DETAILED SCOPE OF THE MTR

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

### i. Project Strategy

#### Project design:

- 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 of the project, its objectives and processes. Was the project concept in line with the national sector development priorities and plans of the country including the Te Kakeega III: National Sustainable Development Strategy (or of participating countries in the case of multi-country projects)?

- Review decision-making processes: were perspectives of those who would be affected by project decisions, those who could affect the outcomes, and those who could contribute information or other resources to the process, taken into account during project design processes?
- Review the extent to which relevant gender issues were raised and analysed in the project design. See Annex 9 of *Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects* for further guidelines.
- If there are major areas of concern, recommend areas for improvement.

#### Results Framework/Logframe:

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

#### **ii. Progress Towards Results**

##### Progress Towards Outcomes Analysis:

- Review the logframe indicators against progress made towards the end-of-project targets using the Progress Towards Results Matrix and following the *Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects*; colour code progress in a "traffic light system" based on the level of progress achieved; assign a rating on progress for each outcome; make recommendations from the areas marked as "Not on target to be achieved" (red).

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

Project Strategy	Indicator <sup>3</sup>	Baseline Level <sup>4</sup>	Level in 1 <sup>st</sup> PIR (self-reported)	Midterm Target <sup>5</sup>	End-of-project Target	Midterm Level & Assessment <sup>6</sup>	Achievement Rating <sup>7</sup>	Justification for Rating
<b>Objective:</b>	Indicator (if applicable):							
<b>Outcome 1:</b>	Indicator 1:							
	Indicator 2:							
<b>Outcome 2:</b>	Indicator 3:							
	Indicator 4:							
	Etc.							
<b>Etc.</b>								

#### **Indicator Assessment Key**

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

<sup>3</sup> Populate with data from the Logframe and scorecards

<sup>4</sup> Populate with data from the Project Document

<sup>5</sup> If available

<sup>6</sup> Colour code this column only

<sup>7</sup> Use the 6 point Progress Towards Results Rating Scale: HS, S, MS, MU, U, HU



In addition to the progress towards outcomes analysis:

- Compare and analyse the GEF Tracking Tool at the Baseline with the one completed right before the Midterm Review.
- Identify remaining barriers to achieving the project objective in the remainder of the project.
- By reviewing the aspects of the project that have already been successful, identify ways in which the project can further expand these benefits.
- Appraise the performance of PMU and NAPA2 Officers in executing their tasks and responsibilities in accordance with Project Design Document, job descriptions and workplan. Identify any performance issues and gaps in capacity to fulfil their required tasks and to contribute to the achievement of project objectives and outcomes.
- Ascertain if Chief Technical Officers are still required for each of the three project outcomes as stated in the Project Design Document or if sufficient technical capacity exists within NAPA2 Officers to provide the required expertise towards the achievement of project objectives and outcomes.
- Review project governance: effectiveness and relevance of Project Board membership, function, allowances, regularity of meetings, minutes and reporting, information sharing and decision making processes in contributing to the achievement of project objectives and outcomes
- Review the financial performance of the project according to agreed budgets of each Outcomes and determine necessary measures to ensure all project activities can be fully implemented with the available funds.

### **iii. Project Implementation and Adaptive Management**

#### Management Arrangements:

- Review overall effectiveness of project management as outlined in the Project Document. Have changes been made and are they effective? Are responsibilities and reporting lines clear? Is decision-making transparent and undertaken in a timely manner? Recommend areas for improvement.
- Review the quality of execution of the Executing Agency/Implementing Partner(s) and recommend areas for improvement.
- Review the quality of support provided by the GEF Partner Agency (UNDP) and recommend areas for improvement.

#### Work Planning:

- Review any delays in project start-up and implementation, identify the causes and examine if they have been resolved. Determine whether delays were avoidable or beyond the control of the PMU, and suggest improvements to mitigate future delays.
- 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 and project work plan revisions, and assess the appropriateness and relevance of such revisions.
- Does the project have the appropriate financial controls, including reporting and planning, that allow management to make informed decisions regarding the budget and allow for timely flow of funds?
- Informed by the co-financing monitoring table to be filled out, provide commentary on co-financing: is co-financing being used strategically to help the objectives of the project? Is the Project Team meeting with all co-financing partners regularly in order to align financing priorities and annual work plans?
- Review the timing and level of financial information shared between GEF Partner Agency (UNDP) and PMU to enable complete and timely management and monitoring of project finances.

#### Project-level Monitoring and Evaluation Systems:

- Review the monitoring tools currently being used: Do they provide the necessary information? How is the information shared with stakeholders? 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?

#### 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?

#### Reporting:

- Has PMU provided sufficient reporting to the Project Board and stakeholders on the progress and status of the project implementation? Have the reports informed decision making in terms of improvements or courses of action needed to implement the project?
- Assess how adaptive management changes have been reported by the project management and shared with the Project Board.
- Assess how well the Project Team and partners undertake and fulfil GEF reporting requirements (i.e. how have they addressed poorly-rated PIRs, if applicable?)
- Assess how lessons derived from the adaptive management process have been documented, shared with key partners and internalized by partners.

#### Communications:

- 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.

#### **iv. Sustainability**

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

#### Financial risks to sustainability:

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

- What measures have been put in place thus far to ensure the Implementing Partners are able to financially sustain the assets and activities beyond the life of the project? (This includes the ongoing operation and maintenance of the vessel and early warning equipment purchased by the project)

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?
- Have the identified risks been avoided, mitigated and managed by the project? What processes were followed and by whom, and were the relevant national laws and regulations followed?
- Has there been any reporting of environmental and social impacts reported by the public? How have they been registered, managed and resolved?

## Conclusions & Recommendations

The MTR team will include a section of the report setting out the MTR's evidence-based conclusions, in light of the findings.<sup>8</sup>

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

The MTR 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 Annex E for ratings scales. No rating on Project Strategy and no overall project rating is required.

**Table. MTR Ratings & Achievement Summary Table for (NAPA 2 Project)**

Measure	MTR Rating	Achievement Description
<b>Project Strategy</b>	N/A	
<b>Progress Towards Results</b>	Objective Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale)	

<sup>8</sup> Alternatively, MTR conclusions may be integrated into the body of the report.

	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.	
<b>Project Implementation &amp; Adaptive Management</b>	(rate 6 pt. scale)	
<b>Sustainability</b>	(rate 4 pt. scale)	

## 6. TIMEFRAME

- The total duration of the MTR will be approximately **(32 days)** over a time period of **(16 of weeks)** starting **( 26 May )**, and shall not exceed five months from when the consultant(s) are hired. The tentative MTR timeframe is as follows:

TIMEFRAME	ACTIVITY
May 12	Application closes
May 15 – May 26	Selection of MTR Team
May – June 24	Prep the MTR Team (handover of Project Documents)
May – June10	Document review and preparing MTR Inception Report
June 20	Finalization and Validation of MTR Inception Report- latest start of MTR mission
June 26 – July 11	MTR mission: stakeholder meetings, interviews, field visits
July 10 -11	Mission wrap-up meeting & presentation of initial findings- earliest end of MTR mission
July 12 – 30	Preparing draft report
July 31	Submission of draft report
August 7	Feedback from UNDP and Government submitted to consultant
August 8 – 14	Incorporating audit trail from feedback on draft report/Finalization of MTR report (note: accommodate time delay in dates for circulation and review of the draft report)
August 15	Submission of Final MTR Report

Options for site visits should be provided in the Inception Report.

## 7. MIDTERM REVIEW DELIVERABLES

#	Deliverable	Description	Timing	Responsibilities
1	<b>MTR Inception Report</b>	MTR team clarifies objectives and methods of Midterm Review	No later than 2 weeks before the MTR mission: (June 12)	MTR team submits to the Commissioning Unit and project management
2	<b>Presentation</b>	Initial Findings	End of MTR mission: (July 11 in Tuvalu &	MTR Team presents to project management and

			July 12 in Suva)	the Commissioning Unit
<b>3</b>	<b>Draft Final Report</b>	Full report (using guidelines on content outlined in Annex B) with annexes	Within 3 weeks of the MTR mission: (July 31)	Sent to the Commissioning Unit, reviewed by RTA, Project Coordinating Unit, GEF OFP
<b>4</b>	<b>Final Report*</b>	Revised report with audit trail detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final MTR report	Within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft: (August 15)	Sent to the Commissioning Unit

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

## **8. MTR ARRANGEMENTS**

The principal responsibility for managing this MTR resides with the Commissioning Unit. The Commissioning Unit for this project's MTR is *the UNDP Pacific Office, based in Suva, Fiji*.

The commissioning unit will contract the consultants and ensure the timely provision of per diems and travel arrangements within the Tuvalu for the MTR team. The Project Team will be responsible for liaising with the MTR team to provide all relevant documents, set up stakeholder interviews, and arrange field visits.

## **9. TEAM COMPOSITION**

A team of two independent consultants will conduct the MTR - one team leader (with experience and exposure to projects and evaluations in other regions globally) and one national consultant, usually from the country of the project. The consultants cannot have participated in the project preparation, formulation, and/or implementation (including the writing of the Project Document) and should not have a conflict of interest with project's related activities.

## **10. PAYMENT MODALITIES AND SPECIFICATIONS**

- 20 % of payment upon signing of contract and acceptance of work plan by June 6
- 20 % of payment upon submission and acceptance of approval of Pre- Mission ( includes schedule, methodologies, anticipated results) by June 16
- 30% upon submission of the draft MTR report by July 31
- 30% upon finalization of the MTR report by August 15

## **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 Environmental and Social Screening results
5. Project Inception Report
6. All Project Implementation Reports (PIR's)
7. Quarterly progress reports and work plans of the various implementation task teams
8. Audit reports
9. Finalized GEF focal area Tracking Tools at CEO endorsement and midterm (Tracking Tool for Climate Change Adaptation Projects)
10. Oversight mission reports
11. All monitoring reports prepared by the project
12. Financial and Administration guidelines used by Project Team

The following documents will also be available:

13. Project operational guidelines, manuals and systems
14. UNDP country/countries programme document(s)
15. Minutes of the NAPA 2 project's Board Meetings and other meetings (i.e. Project Appraisal Committee meetings)
16. Project site location maps

## **ToR ANNEX B: Guidelines on Contents for the Midterm Review Report<sup>9</sup>**

- 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

---

<sup>9</sup> The Report length should not exceed 40 pages in total (not including annexes). The number of pages for each section should be used as a guidance, not a requirement.

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
    - Reporting
    - Communications
  - 4.4 Sustainability
    - Financial risks to sustainability
    - Socio-economic to sustainability
    - Institutional framework and governance risks to sustainability
    - Environmental risks to sustainability
5. Conclusions and Recommendations (4-6 pages)
  - 5.1 Conclusions
    - Comprehensive and balanced statements (that are evidence-based and connected to the MTR's findings) which highlight the strengths, weaknesses and results of the project
  - 5.2 Recommendations
    - Corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project
    - Actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the project
    - Proposals for future directions underlining main objectives
6. Annexes
  - MTR ToR (excluding ToR annexes)
  - MTR evaluative matrix (evaluation criteria with key questions, indicators, sources of data, and methodology)
  - Example Questionnaire or Interview Guide used for data collection
  - Ratings Scales
  - MTR mission itinerary
  - List of persons interviewed
  - List of documents reviewed
  - Co-financing table (if not previously included in the body of the report)
  - Signed UNEG Code of Conduct form
  - Signed MTR final report clearance form
  - *Annexed in a separate file:* Audit trail from received comments on draft MTR report

- *Annexed in a separate file:* Relevant midterm tracking tools (*METT, FSC, Capacity scorecard, etc.*)

**ToR ANNEX C: Midterm Review Evaluative Matrix Template**  
*(Questions to be filled out by the Commissioning Unit)*

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
<b>Project Strategy: To what extent is the project strategy relevant to country priorities, country ownership, and the best route towards expected results?</b>			
(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.)  Project strategy and decision regards to geographical and political context in Tuvalu	(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.)
<b>Progress Towards Results: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved thus far?</b>			
		Quarterly Progress Reports	
		Project Implementation Review	
<b>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?</b>			
	Decision making of executing and implementing agency in relation to geographical and political context in Tuvalu	Quarterly Progress Reports Project Implementation Review	



	What impacts of projects are obvious?		
	What is the level of communication and collaboration between Department of Environment, Department of Fishery and Department of Rural Development?		
	What is the level of ownership at island level/demonstration activities?		
	To what extent has the procurement of a project vessel benefitted the project? How has the vessel been maintained?		
	Were there any major unanticipated expenses? If so, what were the implications and how were these addressed?		
<b>Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, socio-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?</b>			
	Level and extent of decision making/strategies in response to risk management?		

**Evaluators/Consultants:**

1. Must present information that is complete and fair in its assessment of strengths and weaknesses so that decisions or actions taken are well founded.
2. Must disclose the full set of evaluation findings along with information on their limitations and have this accessible to all affected by the evaluation with expressed legal rights to receive results.
3. Should protect the anonymity and confidentiality of individual informants. They should provide maximum notice, minimize demands on time, and respect people's right not to engage. Evaluators must respect people's right to provide information in confidence, and must ensure that sensitive information cannot be traced to its source. Evaluators are not expected to evaluate individuals, and must balance an evaluation of management functions with this general principle.
4. Sometimes uncover evidence of wrongdoing while conducting evaluations. Such cases must be reported discreetly to the appropriate investigative body. Evaluators should consult with other relevant oversight entities when there is any doubt about if and how issues should be reported.
5. Should be sensitive to beliefs, manners and customs and act with integrity and honesty in their relations with all stakeholders. In line with the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights, evaluators must be sensitive to and address issues of discrimination and gender equality. They should avoid offending the dignity and self-respect of those persons with whom they come in contact in the course of the evaluation. Knowing that evaluation might negatively affect the interests of some stakeholders, evaluators should conduct the evaluation and communicate its purpose and results in a way that clearly respects the stakeholders' dignity and self-worth.
6. Are responsible for their performance and their product(s). They are responsible for the clear, accurate and fair written and/or oral presentation of study limitations, findings and recommendations.
7. Should reflect sound accounting procedures and be prudent in using the resources of the evaluation.

**MTR Consultant Agreement Form**

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

Name of Consultant: \_\_\_\_\_

Name of Consultancy Organization (where relevant): \_\_\_\_\_

**I confirm that I have received and understood and will abide by the United Nations Code of Conduct for Evaluation.**

Signed at \_\_\_\_\_ (Place) on \_\_\_\_\_ (Date)

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_

<sup>10</sup> <http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/100>

<b>Ratings for Progress Towards Results: (one rating for each outcome and for the objective)</b>		
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.

<b>Ratings for Project Implementation &amp; Adaptive Management: (one overall rating)</b>		
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.

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

#### ToR ANNEX F: MTR Report Clearance Form

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

**Midterm Review Report Reviewed and Cleared By:**

**Commissioning Unit**

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

**UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Advisor**

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

## 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 *(NAPA 2 Project)* (UNDP Project ID-4571)

*The following comments were provided in track changes to the draft Midterm Review report; they are referenced by institution ("Author" column) and track change comment number ("#" column):*

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