

UNDP-GEF Midterm Review

Terms of Reference

Standard Template 1: Formatted for attachment to [UNDP Procurement Website](#)

1. INTRODUCTION

This is the Terms of Reference (ToR) for the UNDP-GEF Midterm Review (MTR) of the *full* -sized project, titled, *Improving Ocean Governance and Integrated Management in the BCLME (PIMS 5313)* implemented through the *United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)/Benguela Current Convention (BCC)*, which is to be undertaken in *February 2020*. The project started in *January 2017* and is in its *third* year of implementation. In line with the UNDP-GEF Guidance on MTRs, this MTR process was initiated before the submission of the third Project Implementation Report (PIR). This ToR sets out the expectations for this MTR. The MTR process must follow the guidance outlined in the document *Guidance for Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects* (http://web.undp.org/evaluation/documents/guidance/GEF/mid-term/Guidance_Midterm%20Review%20_EN_2014.pdf).

2. PROJECT BACKGROUND INFORMATION

The project was designed to contribute to the realization of a coordinated regional approach to the long-term conservation, protection, rehabilitation, enhancement and sustainable use of the Benguela Current Large Marine Ecosystem (BCLME) in order to provide economic, environmental and social benefits and well-being to the region. This is to be achieved through the domestication and implementation of the Benguela Current Convention (BCC) and accompanying Strategic Action Programme (SAP). The project puts strong emphasis on supporting the BCC countries (Angola, Namibia and South Africa) in strengthening and integrating policy, institutional, and management structures and protocols in order to realise transboundary benefits. Furthermore, the project aims to mainstream transboundary priorities into national policy framework, while linking them to national development plans and strategies, and to catalyze private sector finance into the BCC implementation and stress reduction activities in the region. The project builds on the earlier GEF support to the BCC which assisted the three countries in delivering a tripartite Commission for integrated ecosystem management, a regional LME Convention and a wealth of foundational science upon which to base long-term monitoring for change. The project aims to consolidate this process to deliver real and sustainable stress reduction activities across all sectors and with a strong emphasis on inter-sectoral cooperation and partnerships.

Project overall objective: To realize a coordinated regional approach to the long-term conservation, protection, rehabilitation, enhancement and sustainable use of the Benguela Current Large Marine Ecosystem in order to provide economic, environmental and social benefits and wellbeing to the region through the implementation of the Benguela Current Convention and accompanying Strategic Action Programme.

Outcomes:

1. Improved Ocean and Coastal Governance through SAP Implementation and Delivery at Regional, National and Local levels;
2. Stakeholder Engagement and Partnership Collaboration to realize sustainable SAP Implementation and Delivery strengthened;

3. Capacity Building and Training to support sustainable SAP implementation and Convention domestication; and
4. Marketing and Resource Mobilization and Fiscal Sustainability.

The project duration is 5 years and 3 months (January 2017 to March 2022), total budget is 10,900,000 USD and planned co-financing of 135,000,000 USD.

Brief overview of the institutional structure of the Benguela Current Commission

Implementation of the project is coordinated by the BCC Secretariat through the PMU. Since the project is supporting implementation of the Convention and SAP, all the BCC structures, briefly presented below, have a role on the implementation of the project.

The Ministerial Conference

The Ministerial Conference consists of BCC sector ministers. One Minister from each Contracting Party is delegated to represent the Party on issues pertaining to the four most relevant sectors to the BCC, which are environment, fisheries, maritime transport, and tourism (in an alphabetical order). It is the highest decision-making body of the BCC. The primary functions of the Ministerial Conference are to evaluate the implementation of the Convention and approve any changes to the Strategic Action Programme (SAP). The Ministerial Conference also mandates the taking of any actions necessary to facilitate the effective implementation of the SAP. It further approves the workplan and budget of the Secretariat for the period between the ordinary conferences.

The Commission

The Commission is composed of Commissioners – one from each Contracting Party – accompanied by sector representatives from participating ministries. The primary functions of the Commission are, inter alia:

- Coordinating the implementation of the SAP and providing strategic direction, coordination and evaluation for the implementation of the work plans and budget;
- Agreeing on, where necessary, conservation and management measures concerning transboundary marine resources and the environment;
- Agreeing, as appropriate, on participatory rights, such as harvest levels and sharing arrangements for transboundary fishery resources;
- Promoting and supporting research programmes related to transboundary marine resources and the environment; and
- Ensuring adequate funding and resources to sustain the long-term operations of the Convention.

The Commission is supported by the following technical Committees and by the Secretariat.

Ecosystem Advisory Committee (EAC)

The Ecosystem Advisory Committee (EAC) provides to the Commission the best scientific advice and relevant information available and, a. Establishes and manages a science programme; and b. Recommends conservation and management measures.

The Compliance Committee (CC)

The Compliance Committee (CC) is mandated to provide the Commission with information, advice and recommendations on the implementation of, and compliance with, the measures adopted to give effect to the objectives of the Convention. The Committee contributes to the implementation of project outputs related to ballast water management, Illegal unreported and unregulated (IUU) fishing, oil spills responses amongst others.

Finance and Administration Committee (FAC)

The Finance and Administration Committee provides financial and administrative advice to the Commission and, inter alia: a. Monitors the implementation of the Secretariat budget and reviews the audited financial reports; and b. Reviews and recommends the projected budget for approval.

Other than the BCC, other key stakeholders for the project include: coastal communities, artisanal and subsistence fishermen, academia, school children and the youth, commercial fishers, small scale coastal and marine entrepreneurs, oil and gas explorers and producers, diamond and other extractive minerals explorers and producers, coastal and marine tourism operators, coastal infrastructure developers, port and harbour operators, shipping and marine transporters, conservation NGOs (national, regional and international), and associations of NGOs, IGOs and, national governments.

Each Committee above is authorized to establish Working Groups to support the Committee on any specific subject matters or technical issues.

Secretariat

The BCC Secretariat is led by the Executive Secretary, appointed by the Commission and supported by a number of technical and general support staff, as per the approved organizational structure. The Secretariat handles the day-to-day activities of the BCC and carry out necessary procurement and recruitment duties within its authorization limit delegated by the Commission.

Institutional arrangements of the project, relevant partners and stakeholders:

The project is implemented by UNDP and executed by BCC, an Inter-Governmental Organization (IGO) established by the three countries, on behalf of the three participating countries.

The Project Management Unit (PMU) is hosted in the BCC Secretariat. The PMU is comprised of a Project Manager, Project Assistant and three National Project Officers (one in each of the BCC countries, based in the respective countries). In addition, the project provides financial support to fill some of the BCC's posts included in its approved organizational structure, as part of organizational capacity development; namely, the Finance and Administration Manager, Compliance Manager and a Translator, who contribute to the project implementation as part of their duties.

For the project implementation to follow as closely as possible to the BCC's institutional structure presented above, and avoid the creation of project-specific implementation structures, the following project governance structure has been established:

The **Project Steering Committee** (PSC) consists of the representatives of the participating countries, BCC (GEF EA) and UNDP (GEF IA). Countries are represented by those who represent the countries in the BCC EAC. BCC is represented by the Secretariat. UNDP is represented by UNDP Namibia (Principle Project Representative) and the UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Advisor for Water and Ocean Governance for Eastern and Southern Africa. PSC is chaired by the chair of the EAC. The PSC is the highest decision-making body for the project. As such, it reviews and approves project's work-plans and budgets as well as any adaptive management decisions necessary to ensure that the project remains highly relevant to the implementation of BCC and SAP and to the broader context that it is implemented.

PSC decisions are included in a set of recommendations to be tabled from the EAC to the Commission, then subsequently in the recommendations from the Commission to the Ministerial Conference.

The project will follow rules and procedures of BCC for its recruitment, procurement and all contracts, finance and admin related matters. The project benefits from inputs from BCC Commission and Committees and its subsequent Working Groups in the implementation of key project outputs. By working

through the BCC structure and with regional expertise as much as possible, the project ensures the high sense of ownership by the participating countries.

There are other donor-funded projects (co-financing projects) supporting the BCC. BCC, mainly through the ECA and the Secretariat, leads the coordination of multiple project implementation for the effective implementation of SAP and the BCC.

In addition to the national governments of the three participating countries and BCC, members of coastal communities, academia and private sectors active in the BCLME region are considered as important stakeholders for the implementation of BCC, SAP and the project.

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 within the available resources (time and finance). Its overall objective is to increase the chance of the project success at the project completion. The MTR will also review the project's strategy and its risks regarding sustainability.

4. MTR APPROACH & METHODOLOGY

The MTR must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The MTR consultant 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 MTR consultant considers useful for this evidence-based review). The MTR consultant 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 consultant is expected to follow a collaborative and participatory approach¹ ensuring close engagement with the Project Team, government counterparts (including the GEF Operational Focal Points), 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; executing agencies, senior officials and task team/ component leaders, key experts and consultants in the subject area, Project Steering Committee, project stakeholders, academia, local government and CSOs, etc. Additionally, the MTR consultant is expected to conduct field missions to BCC Secretariat at Swakopmund, the government offices of the three governments most relevant to the BCC (Ministry of Fisheries and Sea in Luanda for the Angola, Ministry of Fisheries and Marine Resources in Windhoek for Namibia, and Department of Environment, Fisheries and Forestry in Cape Town for South Africa) and project demonstration sites in the field, as appropriate. PMU, together with the BCC Secretariat, will support the MTR consultant to develop its field mission itinerary in consultation with relevant stakeholders.

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.

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 consultant 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)?
- 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 1. 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 (if applicable):							
Outcome 1:	Indicator 1:							
	Indicator 2:							
Outcome 2:	Indicator 3:							
	Indicator 4:							
	Etc.							
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 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.
- Review the quality of support provided by the GEF Partner Agency (UNDP) and recommend areas for improvement.

Work Planning:

- Review any delays in project start-up and implementation, identify the causes and examine if they have been resolved.
- 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.

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

- 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?
- 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.

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 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 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 interventions 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 consultant 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.

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

Table 2. MTR Ratings & Achievement Summary Table for the *Improving Ocean Governance and Integrated Management (BCLME III) 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 Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale)	
	Outcome 3 Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale)	
	Etc.	
Project Implementation & Adaptive Management	(rate 6 pt. scale)	
Sustainability	(rate 4 pt. scale)	

6. TIMEFRAME

The total duration of the MTR will be approximately 35 days over a time period of 8 weeks starting 1 November 2019, and shall not exceed five months from when the consultant(s) are hired. The tentative MTR timeframe is as follows:

TIMEFRAME	ACTIVITY
20 October 2019	Application closes
21 - 25 October 2019	Select MTR consultant
28 – 31 October 2019	Contract issued and signed between UNDP and the MTR consultant
1 November 2019	Prep the MTR consultant (handover of Documents relevant to MTR)
4 – 8 November 2019 (5 days)	Document review and preparing MTR Inception Report, including the proposed mission itinerary)
11-15 November 2019 (2 days)	Finalization and Validation of MTR Inception Report- latest start of MTR mission
13 - 30 January 2020 (18 days, including travel)	MTR mission: stakeholder meetings, interviews, field visits
31 January 2020 (1 day)	Mission wrap-up meeting & presentation of initial findings- earliest end of MTR mission
3 – 7 February 2020 (5 days)	Preparing draft report (Draft report for review and comments between 10-21 February 2020)
24&25 February 2020 (2 days)	Incorporating comments on draft report, developing an audit trail, and finalization of MTR report
by 6 March 2020	Preparation & Issue of Management Response (no involvement by the MTR consultant)
TBD (2 day, including travel - optional)	Concluding Stakeholder Workshop (Optional, organized by UNDP)
by end March 2020	Expected date of full MTR completion (including the Management Response approved by the PSC)

The Inception Report must include the proposed field mission itinerary. The field mission is expected in January 2020. The proposed field mission itinerary must be developed in close consultation with PMU.

7. MIDTERM REVIEW DELIVERABLES

#	Deliverable	Description	Timing	Responsibilities
1	MTR Inception Report	The inception report will help establish the common understanding on the MTR methodology and process as per MTR Guidance and TOR. It will include the detailed field mission itinerary developed in close consultation with the PMU.	No later than 11 November 2019	MTR consultant submits the inception report to the Commissioning Unit and PMU
2	Presentation	Initial Findings	31 January 2020 (End of MTR field mission)	MTR consultant presents to the Commissioning Unit and others the Commissioning Unit will invite (e.g. PMU, Govt reps, OFPs)
3	Draft Final Report	Full report (using guidelines on content outlined in Annex B) with annexes	10 February 2020 (Within 10 days of the MTR field mission)	Sent to the Commissioning Unit, reviewed by RTA, PMU, Govt reps, GEF OFPs, and all other relevant stakeholders for comments.
4	Final Report*	Revised report with audit trail detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final MTR report	28 February 2020 (Within 1 week of receiving comments on draft)	Sent to the Commissioning Unit

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

8. MTR ARRANGEMENTS

The principal responsibility for managing this MTR resides with the Commissioning Unit. The Commissioning Unit for this project's MTR is *the UNDP Namibia Country Office*.

The commissioning unit will contract the consultants and ensure the timely provision of per diems and travel arrangements within the country for the MTR 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. MTR Consultant

An independent consultant will conduct the MTR. The consultant cannot have participated in the project preparation, formulation, and/or implementation and should not have a conflict of interest with project's related activities.

The qualification, experience, and technical expertise and competencies of the applicants will be evaluated using the following criteria; thus, it is important that the relevant expertise and experience are highlighted in the applications. The overall assessment rating is out of 100.

- Education (5):
 - A Master's degree in marine sciences, or other closely related field (5 points)
- Past relevant experience (50):
 - Recent experience with result-based management evaluation methodologies and competency in adaptive management; (10 points)
 - Experience applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios; (5 points)
 - Experience working with the GEF or GEF-evaluations is considered as an asset; (5 points)
 - Project evaluation/review experiences within United Nations system will be considered an asset; (5 points)
 - Demonstrated experience in gender sensitive evaluation and analysis; (5 points)
 - Demonstrated experience in the (re-)construction of Theory of Change (5 points)
 - Experience working in Southern Africa; (15 points)
- Relevant expertise and knowledge (30):
 - Demonstrated knowledge of, and/or experience in, GEF International Waters Focal Area Strategies (10 points)
 - Demonstrated expertise in the ecosystem-based management, ideally the management of large marine ecosystems, and/or coastal and marine ecosystem management; (10 points)
 - Demonstrated competency in institutional and governance assessment and analysis in a transboundary (multi-country) setting (10 points)
- Other key competencies (15):
 - Excellent communication skills with stakeholders at all levels; (10 points)
 - Demonstrable analytical skills; (5 points)

10. PAYMENT MODALITIES AND SPECIFICATIONS

10% of payment upon approval of the final MTR Inception Report

30% upon submission of the draft MTR report

60% upon finalization of the MTR report

11. APPLICATION PROCESS⁹

Recommended Presentation of Proposal:

- a) **Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability** using the [template](#)¹⁰ provided by UNDP;
- b) **CV** and a **Personal History Form** ([P11 form](#)¹¹);
- c) **Brief description of approach to work/technical proposal** of why the individual considers him/herself as the most suitable for the assignment (max 1 page), and a proposed methodology on how they will approach and complete the assignment; (max 1 page)

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/psa/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

- d) **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 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 by email to toivo.shikongo@undp.org by **23h59 of Sunday 20 October 2019 (in Namibia time)** with the subject “Consultant for the *Improving Ocean Governance and Integrated Management (BCLME III) Project* Midterm Review.” Only email applications are accepted. Incomplete applications will be excluded from further consideration.

Criteria for Evaluation of Proposal:

Consultants will be evaluated based on Cumulative Analysis as per the following scenario:

- Responsive/compliant/acceptable, and
- Having received the highest score out of a pre-determined set of weighted technical and financial criteria specific to the solicitation. In this regard, the respective weight of the proposals are:
 - a. Technical Criteria weight is **70%**
 - b. Financial Criteria weight is **30%**
- All proposals submitted must be clearly expressed as a lump sum amount and must be all inclusive.
- The contract price is a fixed sum to be agreed, regardless of changes in the cost of components

Criteria	Weight	Max. Point
Technical Competence (the review of CV, Proposal and interview (if required), using the evaluation criteria under Section 9 above.)	70%	100
Financial (Lower Offer/Offer*100)	30%	100
Total Score	Technical Score * 70% + Financial Score * 30%	

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

1. PIF
2. UNDP Initiation Plan
3. UNDP Project Document
4. CEO Endorsement Document
5. UNDP Environmental and Social Screening results
6. Project Inception Report
7. All Project Implementation Reports (PIR's)
8. Quarterly progress reports and work plans of the various implementation task teams
9. Audit reports
10. Finalized GEF focal area Tracking Tools at CEO endorsement and midterm (IW TT)
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 *BCLME III* Project Steering Committee Meetings and other meetings (i.e. Project Appraisal Committee meetings)
17. Project site location maps

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 team members
 - Acknowledgements
- ii. Table of Contents
- iii. Acronyms and Abbreviations
1. Executive Summary (*3-5 pages*)
 - Project Information Table
 - Project Description (brief)
 - Project Progress Summary (between 200-500 words)
 - MTR Ratings & Achievement Summary Table
 - Concise summary of conclusions
 - Recommendation Summary Table
2. Introduction (*2-3 pages*)
 - Purpose of the MTR and objectives
 - Scope & Methodology: principles of design and execution of the MTR, MTR approach and data collection methods, limitations to the MTR
 - Structure of the MTR report

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

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 (IW TT)

ANNEX C: Midterm Review Evaluative Matrix Template

1. Is the project design clear, logical and commensurate with the time and resources available?
2. How is the scope, quality and significance of project outputs and outcomes produced to date?
3. Is the project performance well linked to the indicators, assumptions and risks specified in the Project Document and subsequent documentation?
4. Has any significant progress made towards achieving the Project's overall objectives?
5. How do you identify, and to the extent possible, quantify any additional outputs and outcomes beyond those specified in the Project Document?
6. What is government's and other partners/stakeholders' (including UNDP) contributions to the BCLME III Project (kindly quantify)?
7. How is the overall project coordination, management and administration?
8. How effectiveness is the PSC?
9. How is the progress towards sustainability and replication of project activities?

Mid-Term Ratings

Criterion	Evaluator's Summary Comments	Reviewer's Rating
Attainment of project objectives and results (overall rating) Sub criteria (below)		
Achievement of outputs and activities		
Effectiveness		
Relevance		
Efficiency		
Sustainability of Project outcomes (overall rating) sub criteria (below)		
Financial		
Social political		
Institutional framework and governance		
Environmental		
Catalytic Role		
Monitoring and Evaluation (overall rating) Sub criteria (below)		
M&E Design		
M&E plan Implementation		
Budgeting and Funding for M&E activities		
Long-term Monitoring		

Assessment of process that affected attainment of project results		
Preparation and readiness		
Country ownership/ driveness		
Implementation approach and adaptive management		
Stakeholder involvement		
Financial planning and management		
UNDP Supervision and backstopping		
Overall rating		

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?			
(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.)
Progress Towards Results: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved thus far?			
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?			
Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, socio-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?			

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>

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

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: _____

ANNEX G: MTR Project Quality Assurance During Implementation

The UNDP quality standards for programming

Strategic

Programming priorities and results contribute to the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), are consistent with the UNDP Strategic Plan and are aligned with UNDAFs. Programmes and projects are based on clear analysis backed by evidence and theories of change. The latter justify why the defined approach is most appropriate and will most likely achieve, or contribute to, desired development results along with partner contributions. The role of UNDP vis-à-vis partners is deliberately considered. New opportunities and changes in the development context are regularly reassessed, with any relevant adjustments made as appropriate.

Relevant

Programming objectives and results are consistent with national needs and priorities, as well as with feedback obtained through engaging excluded and/or marginalized groups as relevant. Programming strategies consider interconnections between development challenges and results. A gender analysis is integrated to fully consider the different needs, roles and access to/control over resources of women and men; appropriate measures are taken to address these when relevant. Programmes and projects regularly capture, and review knowledge and lessons learned to inform design, adapt and change plans and actions as appropriate, and plan for scaling up.

Principled

All programming applies the core principles of human rights, gender equality, resilience, sustainability and leaving no one behind. Social and environmental sustainability are systematically integrated. Potential harm to people and the environment is avoided wherever possible, and otherwise minimized, mitigated and managed. The complete Social and Environmental Standards can be found here.

Management and monitoring

Outcomes and outputs are defined at an appropriate level, are consistent with the theory of change, and have SMART, results-oriented indicators, with specified baselines and targets and identified data sources. Gender-responsive, sex-disaggregated indicators are used when appropriate. Relevant indicators from the Strategic Plan's integrated results and resources framework have been adopted in the programme or project results framework. Comprehensive, costed M&E plans are in place and implemented to support evidence-based management, monitoring and evaluation. Risks, in terms of both threats and opportunities, are identified with appropriate plans and actions taken to manage them. Governance of programmes and projects is defined with clear roles and responsibilities and provides active and regular oversight to inform decision-making.

Efficient

Programming budgets are justifiable and valid and programming design and implementation includes measures to ensure efficient use of resources. The size and scope of programmes and projects are consistent with available resources and resource mobilization efforts. Plans include consideration of scaling up and links with other relevant initiatives to achieve greater impact. Procurement planning is done early and regularly reviewed. Monitoring and management include analysis of and actions to improve efficiency in delivering desired outputs with the required quality and timeliness, such as country office support to national implementation modalities. Costs are fully recovered (see the cost-recovery policy).

Effective

Programming design and implementation are informed by relevant knowledge, evaluation and lessons learned to develop strategy and inform course corrections. Targeted groups are systematically identified and engaged, prioritizing the marginalized and excluded. Results consistently respond to gender analysis and are accurately rated by the gender marker. Managers use monitoring data for making decisions that maximize achievement of desired results. South-South and triangular cooperation are used when relevant and captured in the results framework. Required implementing partner assessments have been conducted and the implementation modality is consistent with the results.

Sustainability and national ownership

Programming is accomplished in consultation with relevant stakeholders and national partners, who are engaged throughout the programming cycle in decision-making, implementation and monitoring. Programming includes assessing and strengthening the capacity and sustainability of national institutions. A strategy for use of national systems is defined and implemented, if relevant. Monitoring includes use of relevant national data sources, where possible. Sustainability of results is accomplished through tracking capacity indicators and implementing transition and scale-up plans.