

Terms of Reference

UNDP-GEF Midterm Review of the GEF funded Seychelles' Protected Areas Finance Project

Location :	Mahe, Seychelles, and home-based
Application Deadline :	10 th April 2018
Type of Contract :	Individual Contract
Post Level :	International Consultant
Languages Required :	English
Starting Date : (date when the selected candidate is expected to start)	25 th April 2018
Expected Duration of Assignment :	26 working days (over 4 months), including 1 trip to Seychelles (10 working days)

1. INTRODUCTION

This is the Terms of Reference (ToR) for the UNDP-GEF Midterm Review (MTR) of the *full-sized* project titled **Seychelles' Protected Areas Finance Project** (PIMS 4656) implemented through the Ministry of Environment, Energy and Climate Change, GOS-UNDP-GEF Programme Coordination Unit, which is to be undertaken in *May – August 2018*. The project started on the 3rd March 2016 and at the time of the MTR will be commencing its *third* 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/guidance.shtml#>

2. PROJECT BACKGROUND INFORMATION

The project was designed to improve the financial sustainability and strategic cohesion of Seychelles protected area (PA) system, while also dealing with emerging threats and risks to

biodiversity in a shifting national economic environment. The project aims at securing the financing for PA more sustainably and it is organized into two components: The first component of the project is focused on enabling planning and legal framework for an improved use of existing and new PA finance. This component will support the Government of Seychelles, SNPA and other entities managing PAs in evaluating the financial performance of the PAS, determining financial gaps and identifying opportunities for improving overall functionality of both the current and the proposed expanded PA estate. It focuses on the delivery side of the conservation equation. Under this component GEF funding will be used to develop a national PA system Investment Plan and site-level PA Financing Plans. GEF resources will also be used in this component to strengthen the financial management capacities of the national PA managing entities in order to reduce cost-inefficiencies, improve revenues and develop mechanisms for revenue-sharing. The second component of the project is focused on increasing and securing revenue generation for PA management. The project will improve the financial sustainability of the PA system and the individual PAs to ensure that they have adequate financial resources to cover the full costs of their management at an optimal level. Among other things, GEF resources will be used to support the building and renovating infrastructures, introducing new cost-effective practices, systems and schemes, all aimed at making sites more attractive to visitors and increasing their own revenue generation capacity. Thorough site-level and PA finance assessments have been carried out in connection with the project. The project is for five years (2016-2020). It has a budget of US\$ 17,876,554 with a GEF grant of US\$ 2,776,900 and planned co-financing of US\$ 15,099,654. The project is managed by the GOS-UNDP-GEF Programme Coordination Unit (PCU) of the Ministry of Environment, Energy and Climate Change (MEECC), and implemented in association with a number of conservation organisations and other stakeholders.

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 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 must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The MTR 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, and any other materials that the considers useful for this evidence-based review). The MTR will review the baseline GEF focal area Tracking Tools submitted to the GEF at CEO endorsement,

and the midterm GEF focal area Tracking Tools that must be completed before the MTR field mission begins.

The MTR is expected to follow a collaborative and participatory approach¹ 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.² Stakeholder involvement should include interviews with stakeholders who have project responsibilities, including but not limited to: MEECC (executing agency), MEECC/PCU (implementing agency), Seychelles National Parks Authority, Seychelles Island Foundation, Green Island Foundation, Marine Conservation Society Seychelles, Nature Seychelles and the Seychelles Conservation and Climate Adaptation Trust (implementing partner organisations). If time allows additional meetings should be organized with North Island, Denis Island, Bayan Tree Seychelles and the Marine Spatial Planning initiative. The MTR will conduct field missions to selected project sites in the Inner Islands.

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 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 the country (or of participating countries in the case of multi-country projects)?

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

² 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.

- 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. 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 ³	Baseline Level ⁴	Level in 1 st PIR (self-reported)	Midterm Target ⁵	End-of-project Target	Midterm Level & Assessment ⁶	Achievement Rating ⁷	Justification for Rating
Objective :	Indicator 1-3:			n/a				
Outcome 1:	Indicator 4-12:							
	Etc.							
Outcome 2:	Indicator 13-17:							
	Etc.							

Indicator Assessment Key

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

In addition to the progress towards outcomes analysis:

- Compare and analyse the GEF Tracking Tools 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.
- Review the quality of support provided by the GEF Partner Agency (UNDP) and recommend areas for improvement.

³ Populate with data from the Logframe and scorecards

⁴ Populate with data from the Project Document

⁵ If available

⁶ Colour code this column only

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

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 x 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?
- 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 x 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)?

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 x on a continual basis and shared/ transferred to appropriate parties who could learn from the project and potentially replicate and/or scale it in the future?

Institutional Framework and Governance risks to sustainability:

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

Environmental risks to sustainability:

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

Conclusions & Recommendations

The MTR consultant will include a section of the report setting out the MTR's evidence-based conclusions, in light of the findings.⁸

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 report should make no more than 15 recommendations total.

Ratings

The MTR consultant 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 PA Finance project

Measure	MTR Rating	Achievement Description
Project Strategy	N/A	
Progress Towards Results	Objective Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale)	
	Outcome 1 Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale)	
	Outcome 2 Achievement	

⁸ Alternatively, MTR conclusions may be integrated into the body of the report.

	Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale)	
Project Implementation & Adaptive Management	(rate 6 pt. scale)	
Sustainability	(rate 4 pt. scale)	

6. TIMEFRAME

The total duration of the MTR will be approximately *26 days* over a time period of *fourteen weeks* starting no later than *01st May 2018*, and shall not exceed four months from when the consultant is hired. The tentative MTR timeframe is as follows:

TIMEFRAME	ACTIVITY
<i>10th April</i>	Application closes
<i>20th April</i>	Select MTR consultant/Issue of Contract
<i>25th-30th April</i>	Prep the MTR consultant (handover of Project Documents)
<i>1st May – 3rd May (3 days)</i>	Document review and preparing MTR Inception Report
<i>8th May (1 day)</i>	Finalization and Validation of MTR Inception Report-
<i>21st May -31st May (10 days)</i>	MTR mission: stakeholder meetings, interviews, field visits
<i>1st June (1 day)</i>	Mission wrap-up meeting & presentation of initial findings-earliest end of MTR mission
<i>10th - 20th June (8 days)</i>	Preparing draft report
<i>30th June (1 day)</i>	Incorporating audit trail from feedback on draft report/Finalization of MTR report
<i>03rd July – 31st July</i>	Preparation & Issue of Management Response
<i>10th August (2 days)</i>	Expected date of full MTR completion

Options for site visits within the inner islands should be noted in the Inception Report.

7. MIDTERM REVIEW DELIVERABLES

#	Deliverable	Tentative Timeline	Description	Responsibilities
1	Submission of Final MTR Inception Report	8 th May 2018	MTR Consultant clarifies objectives and methods of Midterm Review	Consultant submits to the Commissioning Unit and project management

2	Validation Workshop and submission of initial findings	1 st June 2018	Initial Findings	Consultant presents to project management, stakeholders and the Commissioning Unit
3	Submission Draft MTR Report	20 th June 2018	Full report (using guidelines on content outlined in Annex B) with annexes	Sent to the Commissioning Unit, reviewed by RTA, Program Coordination Unit, GEF OFP
4	Upon Submission and approval of Final Report*	10 th August **	Revised report with audit trail detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final MTR report	Sent to the Commissioning Unit

*The final MTR report must be in English.

** Could be earlier depending on approval by Commissioning Unit and is expected no later than 10th August.

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 Seychelles Country Office (under the UNDP Seychelles-Mauritius Country Office).

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

9. COMPOSITION

One international independent consultant will conduct the MTR - one Consultant with experience and exposure to projects and evaluations in other regions globally. The Consultant 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.

The selection of Consultant will be aimed at maximizing the qualifications in the below areas. 70% of points will be awarded for the technical qualifications and 30% for the financial bid.

- A Master's degree in Environment, economics, or other closely related field.
- At least 10 years of demonstrable experience working on topics related to protected areas, conservation finance and tourism at a national level;
- At least 8 years of experience with result-based management evaluation methodologies;
- Experience applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios;
- Competence in adaptive management, as applied to GEF BD or relevant Focal Area;
- Project evaluation/review experiences within United Nations system is necessary;
- Experience working with the GEF or GEF-evaluations; experience in gender sensitive evaluation and analysis
- Experience working in SIDS, preferably in the Western Indian Ocean;
- Demonstrated ability to work in diverse environments;
- Excellent communication skills; and,
- Demonstrable analytical skills.

10. PAYMENT MODALITIES AND SPECIFICATIONS

20% of payment upon approval of the final MTR Inception Report

20% upon submission of initial findings as presented in Validation workshop

20% upon submission of draft MTR report

40% upon submission and approval of final MTR report

Or, as otherwise agreed between the Commissioning Unit and the MTR Consultant

11. APPLICATION PROCESS⁹

Recommended Presentation of Proposal:

- Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability** using the [template](#)¹⁰ provided by UNDP;
- CV** and a **Personal History Form** ([P11 form](#)¹¹);
- Brief description of approach to work/technical proposal** of why the individual considers him/herself as the most suitable for the assignment, and a proposed methodology on how they will approach and complete the assignment; (max 1 page)
- Financial Proposal** that indicates the all-inclusive fixed total contract price and all other travel related costs (such as flight ticket, per diem, etc), supported by a breakdown of costs, as per template attached to the [Letter of Confirmation of Interest template](#). If an

⁹ Engagement of the consultants should be done in line with guidelines for hiring consultants in the POPP: <https://info.undp.org/global/popp/Pages/default.aspx>

¹⁰ <https://intranet.undp.org/unit/bom/pso/Support%20documents%20on%20IC%20Guidelines/Template%20for%20Confirmation%20of%20Interest%20and%20Submission%20of%20Financial%20Proposal.docx>

¹¹ http://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/corporate/Careers/P11_Personal_history_form.doc

applicant is employed by an organization/company/institution, and he/she expects his/her employer to charge a management fee in the process of releasing him/her to UNDP under Reimbursable Loan Agreement (RLA), the applicant must indicate at this point, and ensure that all such costs are duly incorporated in the financial proposal submitted to UNDP.

All application materials should be submitted using the UNPD Jobs site (https://jobs.undp.org/cj_view_jobs.cfm) by **20.00 hrs GMT on 10th April 2018**. Incomplete applications will be excluded from further consideration.

Criteria for Evaluation of Proposal: Only those applications which are responsive and compliant will be evaluated. Offers will be evaluated according to the Combined Scoring method – where the educational background and experience on similar assignments will be weighted at 70% and the price proposal will weigh as 30% of the total scoring. The applicant receiving the Highest Combined Score that has also accepted UNDP’s General Terms and Conditions will be awarded the contract.

Evaluation Criteria

All Applicants will be requested to submit a price offer indicating their proposed daily fee rate for the assignment. Following UNDP procurement rules, both technical competence (70%) and the consultant daily fee rate (30%) will be taken into account in the selection process. The Technical Evaluation will be based on the following Evaluation Criteria.

Education:	Technical Experience:	Evaluation Experience:	UNDP-GEF Experience:	Stakeholder Engagement:	Language and Communication
MA in Environment, Economics or related fields	At least 10 years of demonstrable experience working on topics related to protected areas, conservation finance and tourism at a national level	At least 8 years of evaluation experience with result-based management evaluation methodologies, including use of SMART tools. Competence in adaptive management.	Must have conducted at least 3 UNDP-GEF evaluations. Must have Knowledge of UNDP-GEF process. Experience in gender sensitive evaluation and analysis is an advantage. Experience in SIDS is an advantage.	Demonstrated ability to work in diverse environment	Demonstrated skills in report writing. Fluency in English. Familiarity with French/Creole is an advantage
10	20	25	25	10	10

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

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
8. Strategies and technical reports produced by the project and partners
9. Audit reports
10. Finalized GEF focal area Tracking Tools at CEO endorsement and midterm (METTs, Financial Sustainability Scorecard)
11. Oversight mission reports
12. All monitoring reports prepared by the project
13. Financial and Administration guidelines used by Project Team

The following documents will also be available:

14. Project operational guidelines, manuals and systems
15. UNDP country/countries programme document(s)
16. Minutes of the Project Steering Committee Meetings and other meetings (i.e. Local Project Appraisal Committee)
17. Project site location maps

ToR ANNEX B: Guidelines on Contents for the Midterm Review Report¹²

- 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 members
 - Acknowledgements
- ii. Table of Contents
- iii. Acronyms and Abbreviations

¹² The Report length should not exceed 40 pages in total (not including annexes).

1. Executive Summary (3-5 pages)
 - Project Information Table
 - Project Description (brief)
 - Project Progress Summary (between 200-500 words)
 - MTR Ratings & Achievement Summary Table
 - Concise summary of conclusions
 - Recommendation Summary Table
2. Introduction (2-3 pages)
 - Purpose of the MTR and objectives
 - Scope & Methodology: principles of design and execution of the MTR, MTR approach and data collection methods, limitations to the MTR
 - Structure of the MTR report
3. Project Description and Background Context (3-5 pages)
 - Development context: environmental, socio-economic, institutional, and policy factors relevant to the project objective and scope
 - Problems that the project sought to address: threats and barriers targeted
 - Project Description and Strategy: objective, outcomes and expected results, description of field sites (if any)
 - Project Implementation Arrangements: short description of the Project Board, key implementing partner arrangements, etc.
 - Project timing and milestones
 - Main stakeholders: summary list
4. Findings (12-14 pages)
 - 4.1 Project Strategy
 - Project Design
 - Results Framework/Logframe
 - 4.2 Progress Towards Results
 - Progress towards outcomes analysis
 - Remaining barriers to achieving the project objective
 - 4.3 Project Implementation and Adaptive Management
 - Management Arrangements
 - Work planning
 - Finance and co-finance
 - Project-level monitoring and evaluation systems
 - Stakeholder engagement
 - 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 (*METTs, Financial Sustainability Scorecard*)

ToR ANNEX C: Midterm Review Evaluative Matrix Template

This Midterm Review Evaluative Matrix must be fully completed/amended by the consultant and included in the MTR inception report and as an Annex to the MTR report.

Evaluative Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
Project Strategy: To what extent is the project strategy relevant to country priorities, country ownership, and the best route towards expected results?			
How well does the project align with evolving GEF focal area priorities through GEF 4 5 and 6?	Extent to which CBD and related GEF priorities and areas of work incorporated	Project documents National policies and strategies (NDS, Environment Sector Strategy, Blue Economy Road Map, marine spatial planning initiative, etc.) GEF6 NPFD Project partners Project beneficiaries	(i.e. document analysis, data analysis, interviews with project staff, interviews with stakeholders, etc.)
Is the project aligned with other donor and Government programmes and projects? Is the project country driven?	Degree of coherence between the project and national priorities, policies and strategies		
Does the project adequately take into account the national realities, both in terms of institutional and policy frameworks in its design and implementation?	Adequacy of project design and implementation to national realities and existing capacities		
Have implementation strategies been appropriate (is the logframe logical and complete)?	Degree to which the project supports objectives of Government.		
Did the project address the needs of target beneficiaries and other stakeholders? Is the approach inclusive? Are beneficiaries and other stakeholders effectively engaged in implementation?	Degree to which the project supports local aspirations Degree to which the project meets stakeholder expectations		
Progress Towards Results: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved thus far?			
How well has the project performed against its expected objectives and outcomes, and its indicators and targets?	Extent to which milestones and targets are achieved at mid-	Project reports	

Evaluative Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
	term, as laid out in the logframe and monitoring plan	Minutes of Project Steering Committee Meetings Local partners and beneficiaries Tracking tools	
Which have been the key factors leading to project achievements?	Achievement of milestones and targets as laid out in the logframe and monitoring plan		
To what extent can observed results be attributed to the project or not? In this respect have there been notable changes in the enabling environment for the project?	Extent of change to the enabling environment, particularly changes affecting operations of the national PA Agency		
Has the project failed in any respect? What changes could have been made (if any) to the design or implementation of the project in order to improve the achievement of the expected results?	Evidence of adaptive management and/or early application of lessons learned		
How has the project contributed to raising capacity of local stakeholders to address aims of the project or of Government?	Extent of support from local stakeholders		
What are the views of stakeholders on the implementation and activities of the project? Are there activities missing from the implementation?	Extent to which stakeholders are actively participating in the implementation and monitoring of the project		
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?			
Implementation efficiency (including monitoring): <ul style="list-style-type: none">Was the project implemented as planned, including the proportion of activities in work plans implemented?Have monitoring trips been conducted to project sites as per the M&E plan? Has	Extent to which project activities were conducted on time Extent to which project delivery matched the expectation of the ProDoc and the expectations of partners	Project work plans and reports Local partners Tracking tools	

Evaluative Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
<p>monitoring data been collected as planned, analyzed and used to inform project planning?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has project implementation been responsive to issues arising (e.g. from monitoring or from interactions with stakeholders)? • What learning processes have been put in place and who has benefitted (e.g. training, exchanges with related projects, overseas study visits) and how has this influenced project outcomes? • Were progress reports produced accurately and timely, and did they respond to reporting requirements including adaptive management changes? • Did the project experience any capacity gaps (e.g. staffing gaps)? • Has internal and external communication been effective and efficient? • How efficiently have resources and back-up been provided by donors, including quality assurance by UNDP? 	<p>Level of satisfaction expressed by partners in the responsiveness (adaptive management) of the project</p> <p>Level of satisfaction expressed by MEECC and PCU in regard to UNDP back-stopping</p>		
<p>Financial efficiency:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are the accounting and financial systems in place adequate for project management and producing accurate and timely financial information? • Have funds been available and transferred efficiently (from donor to project to 	<p>Extent to which funds have been converted into outcomes as per the expectations of the ProDoc</p> <p>Level of transparency in the use of funds</p> <p>Level of satisfaction of partners and beneficiaries in the use of funds</p>	<p>Project financial records</p> <p>Project audit reports</p> <p>Project work plans and reports</p>	

Evaluative Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
<p>contractors) to address the project purpose, outputs and planned activities?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are funds being used correctly? • Are financial resources being utilized efficiently (converted into outcomes)? Could financial resources be used more efficiently? • Have any issues been raised in audit reports and if so how efficiently were they addressed? • Was project implementation as cost effective as originally proposed (planned vs. actual) • Has the leveraging of funds (co-financing) proceeded as planned? 	<p>Timely delivery of funds, mitigation of bottlenecks (with attention to responsibilities of UNDP, MEECC and Ministry of Finance)</p> <p>Coordination and synergies of project funds and co-financing</p>		
<p>Efficiency of partnership arrangements for the project</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To what extent were partnerships/linkages between institutions/organizations/private sector realized as planned? • Which partnerships/linkages were facilitated? Which ones can be considered sustainable? • What was the level of efficiency of cooperation and collaboration arrangements? 	<p>Extent to which project partners committed time and resources to the project</p> <p>Extent of communication and collaboration between partners</p> <p>Extent of commitment of partners to take over project activities</p>	<p>Project work plans and reports</p> <p>Reports of local partners</p>	
<p>Is the project responsive to threats and opportunities emerging during the course of the project?</p>	<p>Level of adaptive management related to emerging trends</p>	<p>Project work plans and reports</p>	
<p>How well were risks, assumptions and impact drivers managed? What was the quality of risk mitigation strategies developed? Were these sufficient? Are there clear strategies for risk</p>	<p>Extent to which project has responded to identified and emerging risks</p>	<p>Risks log</p>	

Evaluative Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
mitigation related to long-term sustainability of the project?	Extent to which MEECC has supported risk mitigation Level of attention paid to updating risks log		
Is a communications strategy in place? How well is it implemented and how successful has it been in reaching intended audiences?	Extent to which project information has been disseminated Level of awareness of beneficiaries and the general public	Communications documents Press articles	
Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, socio-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?			
Is the social, legal and political environment conducive to sustainability?	Extent of supportive policies and strategies	Policy documents (e.g. Environment Sector Strategy, Blue Economy Road Map, SNPA Strategic Plan) Steering Committee minutes Local partners and beneficiaries	
Are there early signs of activities being taken up by project partners, and plans being developed to sustain them?	Extent to which partners are considering post-project actions		
Have partners and stakeholders successfully enhanced their capacities and do they have the required resources to make use of these capacities?	Extent to which partners and stakeholders are applying new ideas outside of the immediate project context		

ToR ANNEX D: UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluators/Midterm Review Consultants¹³

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: _____

¹³ <http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/100>

ToR ANNEX E: MTR Ratings

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

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

Ratings for Sustainability: (one overall rating)		
---	--	--

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

ToR ANNEX F: MTR Report Clearance Form

(to be completed 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: _____