



Empowered lives.  
Resilient nations.

## INDIVIDUAL CONSULTANT PROCUREMENT NOTICE

Reference: PN/FJI-026-17

**Consultancy Title:** Midterm Review Consultant – Team Leader/Fisheries Specialist

**Project Name:** Midterm Review of Implementation of Global and Regional Oceanic Fisheries Conventions and Related Instruments in the Pacific Small Island Developing States

**Period of assignment:** 24 days within 15 weeks period

**Duty Station:** Home-based and selected duty station

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 **26<sup>th</sup> June, 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 waters in the Pacific Island region covers an area of around 40 million square km or about 8% of the Earth's surface and provides around a third of the world's catches of tuna and related species, and over half of the world's supplies for canned tuna. The water divides Pacific Island communities across huge distances however it unites them by sustainable dependence on a shared marine environment and shared marine resources.

The Pacific water holds the world's largest stock of tuna and related pelagic species. It also contains globally importance stocks of sharks, billfish and other large pelagic species, whales and other marine mammals and turtles and therefore the sustainable use of the transboundary oceanic fish stocks within the Pacific has become a potential contributor to each Pacific Island country's sustainable development.

The Pacific Island OFMP-II is being implemented to support Pacific SIDS in meeting their obligations to implement and effectively enforce global, regional and sub-regional arrangements for the conservation and management of transboundary oceanic fisheries thereby increasing sustainable benefits derived from these fisheries. The project at a global scale will provide the following environmental benefits such as: creating a multi-state cooperation to reduce threats to international waters; restore and sustain marine ecosystems goods and services, including globally relevant biodiversity; reduce vulnerability to climate variability and climate-related risks.

To achieve the objective and global environmental benefits identified, the project was designed into three technical components to address at different three levels – regional, sub-regional, and national, plus a component designed to provide for stakeholder’s participation and knowledge management. Through this mechanism, the project will be able to: a) support Pacific SIDS as the major bloc at the WCPFC to adopt regional conservation and management measures; b) support innovative approaches being developed by Pacific SIDS at sub-regional level as they collaborate in fisheries of common interest; and c) assists SIDS to apply measures nationally in their own waters and to their fleets, a major component of the Project and improve understanding and awareness generally of the challenges and opportunities facing Pacific SIDS in oceanic fisheries management. *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. Was the project concept in line with the national sector development priorities and plans of participating countries?
- Review decision-making processes: were perspectives of those who would be affected by project decisions, those who could affect the outcomes, and those who could contribute information or other resources to the process, taken into account during project design processes?
- Review the extent to which relevant gender issues were raised in the project design. Make suggestions for how relevant gender issues can be better incorporated and monitored in the project. 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 (MA or MSc. or higher) in natural resource governance, fisheries socio-economic or management or other closely related field

### **Experience:**

- Work experience in relevant technical areas for at least 7 years
- Recent experience with result-based management evaluation methodologies.

- Experience applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios
- Experience working with the GEF or GEF-evaluations
- Experience working in Asia and the Pacific and has a good understanding of the fisheries sector in the Pacific

**Competencies:**

- Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender and climate change adaptation projects and ecosystems management; experience in gender sensitive evaluation and analysis Project evaluation/review experiences
- Competence in adaptive management, as applied to climate change adaptation projects and ecosystems management;
- Excellent communication skills;
- Demonstrable analytical skills;
- Project evaluation/review experiences within United Nations system will be considered an asset;

**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>60%</b>
A Master's degree (MA or MSc. or higher) in natural resource governance, fisheries socio-economic or management or other closely related field	10	

<b>Experience</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Work experience in relevant technical areas for at least 7 years</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 applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios</li> </ul>	10	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Experience working with the GEF or GEF-evaluations</li> </ul>	10	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Experience working in Asia and the Pacific and has a good understanding of the fisheries sector in the Pacific</li> </ul>	10	
<b>Competencies</b>		<b>10%</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender and climate change adaptation projects and ecosystems management; experience in gender sensitive evaluation and analysis Project evaluation/review experiences</li> </ul>	5	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Competence in adaptive management, as applied to climate change adaptation projects and ecosystems management;</li> </ul>	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>

**Amend**

## 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 *Implementation of Global and Regional Oceanic Fisheries Conventions and Related Instruments in the Pacific Small Island Developing States – PIOFM II* (PIMS# 5219) (Atlas#78204) implemented through Pacific Islands Forum Fisheries Agency (FFA) which is to be undertaken in July 2017. The project started on the 12 May, 2015 and is in its 2<sup>nd</sup> year of implementation. This ToR follows the UNDP-GEF Guidance on MTRs. 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/midterm/Guidance_Midterm%20Review%20EN_2014.pdf)

([http://web.undp.org/evaluation/documents/guidance/GEF/midterm/Guidance\\_Midterm%20Review%20EN\\_2014.pdf](http://web.undp.org/evaluation/documents/guidance/GEF/midterm/Guidance_Midterm%20Review%20EN_2014.pdf)).

### 2. PROJECT BACKGROUND INFORMATION

The waters in the Pacific Island region covers an area of around 40 million square km or about 8% of the Earth's surface and provides around a third of the world's catches of tuna and related species, and over half of the world's supplies for canned tuna. The water divides Pacific Island communities across huge distances however it unites them by sustainable dependence on a shared marine environment and shared marine resources.

The Pacific water holds the world's largest stock of tuna and related pelagic species. It also contains globally importance stocks of sharks, billfish and other large pelagic species, whales and other marine mammals and turtles and therefore the sustainable use of the transboundary oceanic fish stocks within the Pacific has become a potential contributor to each Pacific Island country's sustainable development.

The Pacific Island OFMP-II is being implemented to support Pacific SIDS in meeting their obligations to implement and effectively enforce global, regional and sub-regional arrangements for the conservation and management of transboundary oceanic fisheries thereby increasing sustainable benefits derived from these fisheries. The project at a global scale will provide the following environmental benefits such as: creating a multi-state cooperation to reduce threats to international waters; restore and sustain marine ecosystems goods and services, including globally relevant biodiversity; reduce vulnerability to climate variability and climate-related risks.

To achieve the objective and global environmental benefits identified, the project was designed into three technical components to address at different three levels – regional, sub-regional, and national, plus a component designed to provide for stakeholder's participation and knowledge management. Through this mechanism, the project will be able to: a) support Pacific SIDS as the major bloc at the WCPFC to adopt regional conservation and management measures; b) support innovative approaches being developed by Pacific SIDS at sub-regional level as they collaborate in fisheries of common interest; and c) assists SIDS to apply measures nationally in their own waters and to their fleets, a major component of the Project and improve understanding and awareness generally of the challenges and opportunities facing Pacific SIDS in oceanic fisheries management.

Below in summary is the objective and outcome; the progress towards these is measured through the following indicators:

Objective/Outcomes	Indicators	Target by end of project relative to the baseline (unless specified otherwise)
<p>Project Objective:</p> <p>To support Pacific SIDS in meeting their obligations to implement &amp; effectively enforce global, regional &amp; sub-regional arrangements for the conservation &amp; management of transboundary oceanic fisheries thereby increasing sustainable benefits derived from these fisheries</p>	<p>Number of Pacific SIDS meeting WCPFC obligations</p> <p>Level of benefits to Pacific SIDS, including:</p> <p>a) access fee revenue &amp;</p> <p>b) employment by gender</p>	<p>All Pacific SIDS' subsidiary legislation, policy instruments and license conditions aligned with WCPFC requirements &amp; systematic processes in place in all Pacific SIDS for adoption of new measures.</p> <p>Employment in SIDS growing by up to 5% per year. with increasing proportion of women</p> <p>Access fees increasing by up to 10% per year</p>
<p><b>Outcome 1.1</b></p> <p>Comprehensive set of innovative on-the-water conservation &amp; management measures (CMMs) adopted and applied by the Western &amp; Central Pacific Fisheries Commission (WCPFC) for stocks of the Western Tropical Pacific Warm Pool (WTPWP) LME, incorporating rights-based and ecosystem-based approaches in decision-making &amp; informed by sound scientific advice &amp; information</p>	<p>Number of key target stocks to which comprehensive WCPFC CMMs are applied in EEZs</p> <p>Number of key non-target species impacted by WCPO tuna fisheries to which WCPFC CMMs are being applied</p>	<p>Comprehensive CMMs applied to all four key target stocks in EEZs by 2017</p> <p>CMMs reflecting Scientific Committee advice &amp; best practice among tuna RFMOs in place for protection of all key non-target species</p>
<p><b>Outcome 1.2:</b></p> <p>Adaptive management of oceanic fisheries in the Western Tropical Pacific Warm Pool (WTPWP) LME is put in place through better understanding of the impacts of climate change (CC).</p>	<p>Extent to which understanding of impacts of CC is reflected in management arrangements, including impacts on jurisdiction</p>	<p>Management arrangements including jurisdictional arrangements have been reviewed to take into account effects of CC</p>
<p><b>Outcome 2.1</b></p> <p>Sub-regional conservation &amp; management arrangements are operationalized &amp; enforced, including rights-based cap &amp; trade arrangements for in-zone tuna fisheries, enhancing ecosystem sustainability &amp; incentivized by sustainable fishery certifications</p>	<p>Status of Sub-regional conservation &amp; management arrangements</p>	<p>Sub-regional arrangements, including cap &amp; trade arrangements in purse seine &amp; longline fisheries &amp; eco-certification arrangements are in operation &amp; contributing to fishery sustainability</p>
<p><b>Outcome 3.1</b></p> <p>Innovative ecosystem-based on-the-water CMMs being effectively applied by Pacific SIDS in accordance with national plans &amp;</p>	<p>Number of Pacific SIDS applying ecosystem-based CMMs in accordance with new or revised management</p>	<p>At least 11 Pacific SIDS applying ecosystem-based CMMs in accordance with new or revised management</p>

policies & with international, regional & sub-regional commitments & other relevant instruments	plans, fisheries policies, MCS plans & laws/regulations	plans, fisheries policies, MCS plans & laws/regulations
<b>Outcome 3.2</b> Integrated data & information systems & scientific analysis being used nationally for reporting, policy-making, monitoring & compliance	Use of oceanic fisheries data and scientific analysis by Pacific SIDS	Enhanced oceanic fisheries data and scientific analysis being used by all 14 Pacific SIDS, reflecting upgraded data & information systems in at least 10 Pacific SIDS, and newly integrated systems in at least 4 SIDS.
<b>Outcome 4.1</b> Greater multi-stakeholder participation in the work of the national & regional institutions with respect to oceanic fisheries management, including greater fisheries industry engagement & participation in Project, FFA, WCPFC & sub-regional activities	Percentage of participation by industry & other civil society stakeholders in Project, FFA, WCPFC & sub-regional activities, including INGO & ENGO participation  Number of national consultative or advisory processes/committees created or strengthened & operational	Greater understanding of the need for management & the issues involved with proactive contributions from industry & other elements of civil society to the conservation effort  Formal advisory committees established & operational in at least 10 SIDS
<b>Outcome 4.2</b> Increased awareness of oceanic fisheries resource & ecosystems management & impacts of climate change	Level of media coverage of relevant issues  No. of communiques from relevant regional fora, including Pacific Island Leaders' meetings covering oceanic fisheries  Continuing donor interest in funding oceanic fisheries agencies & projects	Widespread, well informed coverage in Pacific Islands media of issues associated with conservation management of target & non-target species, & CC impacts  Oceanic fisheries management regularly addressed in Leaders' communiques  Success in this Project & related activities encourages increased donor interest in Pacific Islands oceanic fisheries, attracted by the scope for increasing value through better management,

### 3. OBJECTIVES OF THE MTR

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

### 4. MTR APPROACH & METHODOLOGY

The MTR should provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The MTR reviewer will review 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, The FAO Execution Agreement, project reports including Annual Project Review/PIRs, project budget revisions, FAO



six-month progress report, lesson learned reports, national strategic and legal documents, the project website and any other materials that the reviewer considers useful for this evidence-based review). The MTR reviewer 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 reviewer 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, FAO-GEF technical advisers/Budget Holder 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 Annex 1 list provided; executing agencies, senior officials and task team/ component leaders, key experts and consultants in the subject area, Project Board, project stakeholders, academia, local government and CSOs, etc. Additionally, the MTR reviewer is expected to conduct field missions to different government agencies in the 3 selected Pacific Island countries currently implementing the project (Solomon, Marshall and Cook Islands). While visiting these countries, the following implementing partners will also be visited FFA, PNAO and SPC. Moreover, at least 10 other PICs will be covered by teleconferences. The PICs will be determined jointly by UNDP, FAO and FFA. Key partners include FFA, SPC, PNA Secretariat, among others.

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.

## 5. DETAILED SCOPE OF THE MTR

The MTR reviewer 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. Was the project concept in line with the national sector development priorities and plans of participating countries?
- Review decision-making processes: were perspectives of those who would be affected by project decisions, those who could affect the outcomes, and those who could contribute information or other resources to the process, taken into account during project design processes?
- Review the extent to which relevant gender issues were raised in the project design. Make suggestions for how relevant gender issues can be better incorporated and monitored in the project. 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?

---

<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.

- 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 and Output 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
-----------------	----------------------------------	-----------------------------------

In addition to the progress towards outcomes analysis:

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

## iii. Project Implementation and Adaptive Management

### Management Arrangements:

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

<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

- Review the quality of support provided by the Co-Implementing Agencies/GEF Partner Agencies (UNDP, FAO) 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.
- Are work-planning processes results-based? If not, suggest ways to re-orientate work planning to focus on results?
- Examine the use of the project's results framework/logframe as a management tool and review any changes made to it since project start.

#### Finance and co-finance:

- Consider the financial management of the project, with specific reference to the cost-effectiveness of interventions.
- Review the changes to fund allocations as a result of budget revisions and assess the appropriateness and relevance of such revisions.
- Does the project have the appropriate financial controls, including reporting and planning, that allow management to make informed decisions regarding the budget and allow for timely flow of funds?
- Informed by the co-financing monitoring table to be filled out, 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?

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

- Review the monitoring tools currently being used: Do they provide the necessary information? Do they involve key partners? Are they aligned or mainstreamed with national systems? Do they use existing information? Are they efficient? Are they cost-effective? Are additional tools required? How could they be made more participatory and inclusive?
- Examine the financial management of the project monitoring and evaluation budget. Are sufficient resources being allocated to monitoring and evaluation? Are these resources being allocated effectively?

#### 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? Do stakeholders have appropriate capacity developed to properly manage the project?
- Participation and public awareness: To what extent has stakeholder involvement and public awareness contributed to the progress towards achievement of project objectives?

#### Reporting:

- Assess how adaptive management changes have been reported by the project management and shared with the Project Board.
- Assess how well the Project Team and partners undertake and fulfil GEF reporting requirements (i.e. how have they addressed poorly-rated PIRs, if applicable?)
- Assess how lessons derived from the adaptive management process have been documented, shared with key partners and internalized by partners.
- Assess the visibility of the project through the project website content

#### 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 sustainable development benefits, as well as global environmental benefits.

#### **iv. Sustainability**

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

##### Financial risks to sustainability:

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

##### Socio-economic risks to sustainability:

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

##### Institutional Framework and Governance risks to sustainability:

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

##### Environmental risks to sustainability:

- Are there any environmental risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project outcomes?

#### **Conclusions & Recommendations**

The MTR reviewer 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 reviewer should make no more than 15 recommendations total. Recommendations should outline corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project and should focus on actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the project.

#### **Ratings**

---

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

The MTR reviewer 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 Implementation of Global and Regional Oceanic Fisheries Conventions and Related Instruments in the Pacific Small Island Developing States.

Measure	MTR Rating	Achievement Description
<b>Project Strategy</b>	N/A	
<b>Progress Towards Results</b>	Objective Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale)	
	Outcome 1 Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale)	
	Outcome 2 Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale)	
	Outcome 3 Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale)	
	Etc.	
<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 (24) *days* over a time of *approximately 11 weeks* starting (June, 2017), and shall not exceed five months from when the reviewer is contracted. The tentative MTR timeframe is as follows:

TIMEFRAME	ACTIVITY
26 June 2017	Application closure
10 days after application closure	Select MTR Team
13 July 2017	Contract signing
13-20 July 2017	Preparation of the MTR Team (handover of Project Documents)
25 July 2017	<i>Inception Meeting with UNDP and FAO via Skype</i>
Within first two weeks of inception meeting	Document review and preparing a joint MTR Inception Report
8 August 2017	Submission of joint Inception Report
10 -25 August 2017	MTR mission (12 days): stakeholder meetings, interviews, field visits
30 August 2017	Presentation of initial findings to UNDP, FAO and FFA
10 September 2017	Submission of joint Draft MTR Report
20 September 2017	Finalization of joint MTR report incorporating audit trail from feedback on draft report. Draft 2 to be submitted in October Board Meeting in Solomon Island before finalization
30 October 2017	Submission of joint Final MTR Report
15 November 2017	End of Contract

## 7. MIDTERM REVIEW DELIVERABLES

#	Deliverable	Description	Timing	Responsibilities
1	MTR Inception Report	MTR team clarifies objectives and methods of Midterm Review	No later than 2 weeks before the MTR mission (8 August 2017)	MTR team submits to the Commissioning Unit and project management
2	Presentation	Initial Findings	End of MTR mission (25 August 2017)	MTR reviewer presents to project management and the Commissioning Unit
3	Draft Final Report	Full report (using guidelines on content outlined in Annex B) with annexes	Within 3 weeks of the MTR mission (20 <sup>th</sup> September 2017)	Sent to the Commissioning Unit, reviewed by RTA, Project Coordinating Unit, GEF OFP
4	Final Report*	Revised report with audit trail detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final MTR report	Within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft (30 <sup>th</sup> October 2017)	Sent to the Commissioning Unit

## 8. MTR ARRANGEMENTS

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

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

## 9. TEAM COMPOSITION

The evaluation team will consist of 2 consultants – Governance and Fisheries Specialist. The Fisheries Specialist will be the team leader and will be required to work with the Governance Specialist in submitting one MTR report. The Fisheries Specialist will be expected to travel to the Cook Islands while the Governance Specialist will travel to Solomon and Marshall depending on what will be agreed between the team members.

The consultant shall have prior experience in evaluating similar projects. Experience with GEF financed projects is an advantage. (The international evaluator will be designated as the team leader and will be responsible for finalizing the report). The evaluators selected should not have participated in the project preparation and/or implementation and should not have conflict of interest with project related activities.

## 10. PAYMENT MODALITIES AND SPECIFICATIONS

%	Milestone
20%	On submission of Inception Report
20%	On completion of Mission and presentation of initial findings to stakeholders
30%	On submission and acceptance (by UNDP-CO and UNDP RTA) of the 1 <sup>st</sup> draft mid-term review report
30%	On submission and acceptance (by UNDP-CO and UNDP RTA) of the final mid-term review report



## ANNEX A: List of Documents to be reviewed by the MTR Reviewer

1. PIF
2. UNDP Initiation Plan
3. UNDP Project Document
4. UNDP Environmental and Social Screening results
5. Project Inception Report
6. All annual Project Implementation Reports (PIRs)
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 (*fill in specific TTs for this project's focal area*)
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 Project Board Meetings and other meetings (i.e. Project Appraisal Committee meetings)
16. Project site location maps

## 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 reviewer name
  - Acknowledgements
- ii. Table of Contents
- iii. Acronyms and Abbreviations
1. Executive Summary (*3-5 pages*)
  - Project Information Table
  - Project Description (brief)
  - Project Progress Summary (between 200-500 words)
  - MTR Ratings & Achievement Summary Table
  - Concise summary of conclusions
  - Recommendation Summary Table
2. Introduction (*2-3 pages*)
  - Purpose of the MTR and objectives
  - Scope & Methodology: principles of design and execution of the MTR, MTR approach and data collection methods, limitations to the MTR
  - Structure of the MTR report
3. Project Description and Background Context (*3-5 pages*)
  - Development context: environmental, socio-economic, institutional, and policy factors relevant to the project objective and scope
  - Problems that the project sought to address: threats and barriers targeted
  - Project Description and Strategy: objective, outcomes and expected results, description of field sites

---

<sup>9</sup> The Report length should not exceed 40 pages in total (not including annexes).



- (if any)
  - Project Implementation Arrangements: short description of the Project Board, key implementing partner arrangements, etc.
  - Project timing and milestones
  - Main stakeholders: summary list with their roles
- 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
- 6. Annexes
  - MTR Scope of Work (excluding 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

### ANNEX C: Midterm Review Evaluative Matrix Template

This Midterm Review Evaluative Matrix must be fully completed/amended by the consultant and included 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.)	(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>			
<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>			
<b>Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, socio-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?</b>			

## ANNEX D: UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluators/Midterm Review Consultants<sup>10</sup>

### 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: \_\_\_\_\_

## ANNEX E: MTR Ratings

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

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

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

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

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

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

<b>Midterm Review Report Reviewed and Cleared By:</b>	
<b>Commissioning Unit</b>	
Name: _____	
Signature: _____	Date: _____
<b>UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Advisor</b>	
Name: _____	
Signature: _____	Date: _____

UNDP-GEF Modified MTR Scope of Work

## ANNEX G: Audit Trail Template

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

**To the comments received on (date) from the Midterm Review of Implementation of Global and Regional Oceanic Fisheries Conventions and Related Instruments in the Pacific Small Island Developing States (00083575-PIMS #)**

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

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

