



TERMS OF REFERENCE

Mid-term Evaluation of UNDP-GEF's Pacific Islands Oceanic Fisheries Management Project – PIMS 2992

1. Background and Context

The Pacific Islands Oceanic Fisheries Management Project (OFM Project) is a multi-governmental five year initiative by 14 independent islands nations and one territory¹ to address the sustainable management of regional fish stocks in the Pacific region. The project is implemented by the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) through its Fiji country office and executed by the Pacific Islands Forum Fisheries Agency (FFA). The project document was signed by UNDP on 30 September 2005 and by the FFA on 13 July 2005. The execution start date was not until November of the last quarter of 2005 which resulted in the first Regional Steering Committee agreeing to adjust the 5 year period of project implementation across 2005 to completion in 2010 and a post evaluation phase in 2012. A Project Coordination Unit (PCU) based at the FFA administers the project.

The OFM Project fits within the overarching Strategic Action Programme (SAP) for the International Waters of the Pacific Island Developing States (RAS/98/G32) which contained at the time, two complementary linked consultative sub programmes: Integrated Coastal and Watershed Management (SPREP Funded IWP Programme) and Oceanic Fisheries Management. The delivery of actions of the full OFM Project is now undertaken directly by the FFA. The mid-term evaluation (MTE) is confined to the OFM Project executed by the FFA.

The OFM Project has two objectives that address (a) the threats to the sustainability of the use of the region's oceanic fish resources identified in the SAP, principally the lack of understanding and the weaknesses in governance relating to oceanic fisheries in the International Waters in the region, and (b) the need for improved the understanding of transboundary oceanic fisheries resources and create new regional institutional arrangements as well as realigning, reforming and strengthening national arrangements for the conservation and management of transboundary oceanic fishery resources.

The origins of the project, its preparation, its objectives and structure address the concerns that Pacific Islands small developing States (Pacific SIDS) have for the unsustainable use of transboundary oceanic fish stocks of the Pacific region and unsustainable levels and patterns of exploitation in the fisheries that target those stocks.

At the centre of these concerns is the transboundary nature of the stocks. The stocks are dominantly highly migratory, with their range extending through waters under the jurisdiction of around 20 countries and into large areas of high seas. Each of the countries within whose waters the stocks occur has responsibilities under international law to adopt measures for the conservation and management of these stocks. But without a coherent and legally binding framework to establish and apply measures throughout the range of the stocks, including the high seas, the efforts made by individual countries in their own waters can be undermined by

¹ The 14 Pacific Island States and territory that qualify for GEF support under the OFM Project are: Cook Islands, Federated States of Micronesia, Fiji, Kiribati, Marshall Islands, Nauru, Niue, Palau, Papua New Guinea, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Tokelau, Tonga, Tuvalu and Vanuatu.



unregulated fishing on the high seas and by inconsistencies in measures in different national zones.

These are global concerns. They were important issues in the preparation of the UN Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS) during the 1970s, particularly in the provisions relating to management of fishing on the high seas and management of fishing for highly migratory species. In 1992 they found expression in the call from the United Nations Conference on the Environment and Development (UNCED) within Agenda 21 for a UN intergovernmental conference on high seas fishing and they are also the key concerns addressed in the UN Fish Stocks Agreement.

The PIOFM project implementation has progressed satisfactorily. A significant activity that has not been implemented in accordance with the approved work plan is the work under sub-component of Ecosystem Analysis. This sub-component is to be undertaken by IUCN and issues beyond their control have hampered implementation. Discussions continue on the approach to sea mount analysis, and will be subject to review under the MTE.

2. Objective and Purpose of the Mid-term Evaluation

The Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) policy at the project level in UNDP/GEF has four objectives: i) to monitor and evaluate results and impacts; ii) to provide a basis for decision making on necessary amendments and improvements; iii) to promote accountability for resource use; and iii) to document, provide feedback on, and disseminate lessons learned. A mix of tools is used to ensure effective project M&E. These might be applied continuously throughout the lifetime of the project – e.g. periodic monitoring of indicators -, or as specific time-bound exercises such as mid-term reviews, audit reports and independent evaluations.

In accordance with UNDP/GEF M&E policies and procedures, all projects with long implementation periods (e.g. over 5 or 6 years) are strongly encouraged to conduct mid-term evaluations. In addition to providing an independent in-depth review of implementation progress, this type of evaluation is responsive to GEF Council decisions on transparency and better access of information during implementation.

Mid-term evaluations are intended to identify potential project design problems, assess progress towards the achievement of objectives, identify and document lessons learned (including lessons that might improve design and implementation of other UNDP/GEF projects), and to make recommendations regarding specific actions that might be taken to improve the project. It is expected to serve as a means of validating or filling the gaps in the initial assessment of relevance, effectiveness and efficiency obtained from monitoring. The mid-term evaluation provides the opportunity to assess early signs of project success or failure and prompt necessary adjustments².

The objective of the PIOFM MTE is to provide an assessment of the progress made towards the OFM project's objectives and outputs. It should also identify strengths and weaknesses and provide an evaluation of the implementation and management of the project by identifying factors that have facilitated or impeded the achievements of the project objectives and outputs. In addition, the MTE should also provide recommendations and lessons learned to assist on defining future directions for the project.

3. Targeted beneficiaries

² “UNDP Guidance on Terms of References for Mid-Term Evaluation Missions” Annex 1 – Standard Introduction for Mid-Term Evaluations.



The key beneficiaries for the MTE include the Global Environment Facility (and the global community), UNDP, Pacific SIDS, Pacific regional organizations, relevant donor organizations and industry and environment non-government organizations. The Report of the MTE will be a stand-alone document that substantiates its recommendations and conclusions and will be targeted at meeting the evaluation needs of all key stakeholders.

4. Scope of the Evaluation

This section should be read in conjunction with the objectives of the MTE. The scope of the MTE will critically assess issues pertaining to the relevance, performance (based on indicators identified in the logframe matrix) and success of the project including the sustainability of results. The evaluation will also result in the formulation of recommendations and identification of lessons learned to assist determining future directions of the project.

4.1 Project Impact (Results)

The Evaluation will examine the relevance, efficiency, effectiveness and sustainability of operational activities and results achieved by the project to-date, by showing how the component(s) processes and outcomes have contributed (or have the potential to contribute) to the achievement of project goals and objectives. Specifically the MTE will:

- assess, quantitatively and qualitatively, the achievements and impact in terms of outputs and their contribution to outcomes as defined in the project document;
- Assess progress towards attaining the Programme's regional and global environmental objectives as described in GEF operational focal areas 9;
- assess to what extent the project has or will contribute to the establishment of regional arrangements for sustainable oceanic fisheries management;
- assess to what extent the project has made impacts on the promotion of Pacific SIDS participation in decision-making and realignment and strength of local governance;
- how the project contributed to improved governance at national levels, and examine how governance issues have impacted on the achievement of project goals and outputs;
- Review and evaluate the extent to which OFM Project impacts have reached the intended beneficiaries, both within and outside project sites;
- determine lessons learned and assess the sustainability of project results;
- provide recommendations for how the project implementation can be strengthened and can most effectively support regional and national priorities, management of transboundary oceanic fishery resources and strengthen and achieve project objectives.

4.2 Project Design

The MTE will assess:

- the extent to which the overall project design remains valid;
- review the project's concept, strategy and approach within the context of effective capacity development and sustainability;
- assess the approach used in design and whether the selected intervention strategy addresses the root causes and principal threats in the project area;



- the effectiveness and the methodology of the overall project structure, how effectively the project addresses responsibilities especially towards capacity building and challenges; and
- assess plans and potential for replication.

4.3 Project Management and Administration

- The MTE will assess the extent to which project management has been effective, efficient and responsive. This includes the oversight role by UNDP as GEF Implementing Agency, project execution role of FFA agency, the PCU and the project focal points, project implementing role of SPC and IUCN, multipartite review processes via the Regional Steering Committee (RSC) and the national consultative committees.
- This will also review the clarity of roles and responsibilities of the various institutional arrangements for project implementation and the level of coordination between relevant players;

4.4. Project Implementation

The Evaluation will assess the extent to which project management and implementation has been effective, efficient and responsive, and in particular will review the following:

- the OFM Project management structure and implementation arrangements at all levels, in order to provide an opinion on its efficiency and cost effectiveness;
- assess the use of logical framework as a management tool during implementation;
- assess the quality and relevance of project reporting;
- the mechanisms for information dissemination of project implementation;
- risk management by identifying any problems or constraints which may impact, or are impacting on the successful delivery of the OFM Project, whether they have been, or are being appropriately dealt with and if they are likely to be repeated in future phases;
- Describe the project's adaptive management processes – how have project activities changed in response to new conditions, and have the changes been appropriate;
- Review any partnership arrangements with other donors and comment on their strengths and weaknesses, as well as collaboration between governments, intergovernmental and NGOs, national level involvement and perceptions and the involvement of other stakeholders;
- assess the extent to which programme design, implementation and monitoring have taken the following cross cutting issues into consideration: Gender, Human rights, Equity, Institutional strengthening and Innovation or added value to national development; and
- the effectiveness of coordinating mechanisms by evaluating the appropriateness and efficiency of coordinating mechanisms between UNDP, the FFA (including internal coordination), with SPC & IUCN and GEF

4.5. Project Finances

The evaluation will critically analyze the project finance elements including:



- budget procedures including the review of audits; and the subsequent adjustments to accommodate audit recommendations; and any changes to fund allocations as a result of budget revisions providing an opinion on the appropriateness and relevance of such revisions;
- the appropriateness of and efficiency of disbursements and actual spending;
- by providing an overview of actual spending versus budget expectations;
- assessing how the project has materialized/leveraged co-financing for various components; and
- assessing the financial effectiveness of the PCU as a regional approach in support of in-country conservation and sustainable oceanic fisheries resource management initiatives in the Pacific, and if so how can this approach be improved;

4.6. Lessons learned

The Evaluation will also highlight lessons learned and best and worst practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance and success. In describing all lessons learned, an explicit distinction needs to be made between those lessons applicable only to this project, and lessons that may be of value more broadly, including to other, similar projects in the UNDP/GEF pipeline and portfolio.

This section will also describe the main lessons that have emerged in terms of:

- country ownership/driveness;
- regional cooperation and inter-governmental cooperation;
- stakeholder participation;
- adaptive management processes;
- efforts to secure sustainability; and
- the role of M&E in project implementation.

5. Expected Outputs

The main product of the MTE will be a Mid-term Evaluation Report based on an agreed format (**Annex A**) and will include

- Findings and conclusions in relation to issues to be addressed under sections B and C of these TORs; and
- Assessments of gaps and/or additional measures needed to justify future GEF investment in the Pacific Islands region in relation to International Waters issues and sustainable oceanic fisheries resource management.

The draft and final Mid-Term Evaluation Report will be:

- written in the format outlined in Annex A and be no more than 40 A4 pages (excluding an Executive Summary and annexes);
- (**draft report**) submitted to UNDP by **16 June 2008** and will be circulated to stakeholders for comment. The draft report will be further reviewed by the evaluators taking into



account comments from the stakeholders³. The evaluators shall annex to the final report a record of all comments made on the draft report, responses to these comments and detail how they were dealt with in the report.

- A **final** mid-term evaluation report will be submitted to UNDP for circulation to stakeholders allowing for a period of review before the Regional Steering Committee/Multipartite Review meeting scheduled for **early October 2008** in Honiara, Solomon Islands. Submission of final report is due **16 July 2008**.

6. Evaluation Approach

The MTE will be undertaken through a combination of processes including desk research, selected site visits, questionnaires and interviews - involving all stakeholders, including, but not restricted to: UNDP (Suva, Bangkok, New York), GEF, FFA, SPC, IUCN, SPREP, participating Governments, regional ENGOs and industry, communities, resource users and local governments.

The methodology for the study is envisaged to cover the following areas:

- Desk study review of all relevant OFM Project documentation, including but not confined to those listed at **Annex B**;
- Fiji-based consultations with UNDP, SPC, IUCN, WWF South Pacific Programme, University of the South Pacific Marine Programme (USP), Pacific Islands Tuna Industry Association (PITIA, including Pacific Islands Private Sector Organisation (PIPSO) based at the Forum Secretariat and PITIA Fiji based officials) national project related stakeholders, other Fiji-based agencies;
- Solomon Islands-based consultations with UNDP, FFA, national project-related stakeholders, other Fiji-based agencies;
- Selected visits to Fiji, Solomon Islands, New Caledonia, Cook Islands, Federated States of Micronesia, Nauru and Samoa;
- Participation in the Regional Steering Committee/Multipartite Review Meeting scheduled for early October 2008 at Honiara, Solomon Islands.

A total of approximately 45 days (including in-country travel, meeting participation, research, write-up and presentation) has been budgeted to support the Evaluation. The number of days for consultancy will vary and dependent on (i.) engagement of team leader in the Regional Steering Committee meeting for MTE presentation (ii.) flight schedules in and out of countries.

7. Evaluation Team

The evaluation team will comprise two consultants with the appropriate expertise, a Team Leader and a Regional Resource Specialist. The team leader will be responsible for the overall evaluation exercise and take lead in preparation of the expected outputs. The Regional resource specialist will assist the Team leader in the above, with specific focus on country consultations, facilitation of stakeholder meetings and creation of required documents.

³ The evaluators shall accept changes related to factual errors, but should retain the independence to draw their own conclusions from the findings.



The consultants will conduct a participatory evaluation for improved understanding of the results of the PIOFM and provide recommendations for future project focus. On completion of the evaluation, the team leader will circulate draft outputs to key stakeholders for comments before completing a final evaluation report. Principles of gender equity will and selection will be subject to the UNDP Ethical Code of Conduct appended at **Annex C**. The following attributes are requirements for the selection of the review team:

7.1 Team Leader

- Academic and/or professional background in the institutional aspects of resource management with a minimum of 15 years experience;
- In depth knowledge of the international sustainable development agenda, particularly with emphasis on the regional priorities of Pacific region and SIDS, regional groupings, structures and operations;
- Experience in the evaluation of technical assistance projects, preferably with UNDP or other United Nations development agencies and major donors;
- Experience in the evaluation of GEF funded projects, preferably those under the International Waters portfolio;
- Proven capacity in working across the levels of institutions from policy, to legislation and organisations;
- Excellent leading multi-disciplinary teams to deliver quality products in high stress or short deadline situations;
- An ability to assess institutional capacity and incentives;
- Excellent written and English communication skills with a demonstrated ability to assess complex situations in order to succinctly and clearly distil critical issues and draw forward looking conclusions; and
- Excellent facilitation skills.

7.2 Regional Resource Specialist

- Academic / professional background in oceanic fisheries management/fisheries science with extensive experience in sustainable development and conservation – preferably in Pacific Islands environments with a minimum of 15 years of working experience;
- An understanding of GEF principles and the expected impacts in terms of global benefits;
- Experience in implementation or evaluation of technical assistance projects;
- An understanding of UNDP, the FFA, SPREP and IUCN activities and extensive knowledge of operational programmes in the Pacific region;
- Skills and experience in oceanic fisheries management regimes, preferably the development and establishment of the Western and Central Pacific Fisheries Convention;
- Excellent written and English communication skills; and
- Excellent facilitation skills.

8. Application requirements

Expressions of interest should include:

- A short (maximum three page) covering letter addressing the evaluation criteria;



- Curriculum vitae, including references;
- Cost estimates for services rendered including:
 - a) daily consultancy fees, travel costs, communication costs, publishing and stationary costs and other logistical costs as relevant; and
 - b) airfares, anticipated accommodation and living costs are to be included in overall fee charged

Applications for team leader and Regional resource specialist can be applied separately or as a team. To ensure adequate representation of women in OFM project and fisheries issues, applications from women are highly encouraged for the consultancy. All costs, including international and domestic airfares and expected accommodation and living costs incurred at the duty stations will need to be included in the overall fee charged by the consultants or consultancy firm. Assistance can be provided by the UNDP-Fiji for the purposes of calculating the subscribers travel costs on the basis of the authorized itinerary and the routing and travel time.

9. Implementation Arrangements

The overall supervision of the MTR will rest with the UNDP-Fiji Deputy Resident Representative and UNDP Regional Technical Adviser (IWP) in the Regional Bureau for Asia and Pacific (RBAP).

A contract will be signed by the evaluators upon commencement of the evaluation which will detail aspects on inputs and deliverables. The consultants will be bound by the terms and conditions of UNDP Procurement rules and guidelines.

10. Timeline

An indicative schedule for the completion of the MTE is as follows:

Dates	Schedule
February 10	Call for expressions of Interests
March 10	Application submission deadline
March 7 – April 17	Selection process, contract
April 28	Evaluators commence evaluation
April 28 - 30	Evaluators assemble in Suva, Fiji for briefing by UNDP and undertake Fiji based consultations
May 1 - 7	Evaluators assemble in Honiara, Solomon Islands for consultations
May 12 – June 6	Travel to New Caledonia, Cook Islands, Federated States of Micronesia, Nauru and Kiribati
16 June*	Draft Report completed
16 July*	Final report completed
October (early)	Report presentation at RSC4, Solomon Islands by Evaluation Team Leader

*Between 16 June and 16 July, 2008, the evaluators will be engaged for a period of 5 working days for revision of the evaluation report. As such this activity, will not anticipate any travel to duty station.



11. Applications

Expressions of interest should be addressed to:

The Resident Representative
United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)
Private Mail Bag
Suva
FIJI

Re: Pacific Islands Oceanic Fisheries Management Project
Email: registry.fj@undp.org

Applications submission deadline: **10 March 2008**.



ANNEX A

Evaluation Report: Sample Outline

The following is a brief outline of the evaluation format, but must follow closely the scope of the MTE:

Executive summary

- Brief description of project
- Context and purpose of the evaluation
- Main conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned

Introduction

- Purpose of the evaluation
- Key issues addressed
- Methodology of the evaluation
- Structure of the evaluation

The project(s) and its development context

- Project start and its duration
- Problems that the project seek to address
- Immediate and development objectives of the project
- Main stakeholders
- Results expected

Findings and Conclusions

- Project Design
 - Country ownership/Drivenness
 - Concept, strategy and approach
 - Stakeholder participation
 - Replication approach
 - Cost-effectiveness
 - UNDP comparative advantage
 - Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector
 - Indicators
 - Management arrangements
- Implementation
 - Financial Planning
 - Monitoring and evaluation
 - Execution and implementation modalities
 - Management by the UNDP country office
 - Coordination and operational issues
- Results
 - Attainment of objectives
 - Sustainability



- Contribution to upgrading skills of the national staff

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

Lessons learned

- Best and worst practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance and success

Annexes

- TOR
- Itinerary
- List of persons interviewed
- Summary of country visits
- List of documents reviewed
- Questionnaire used and summary of results
- Co-financing and Leveraged Resources (see Table 1 attached)
- Summary of Evaluation Findings (see Table 2 attached)



Table 1. Co-financing and Leveraged Resources

(For projects that have undergone a mid-term, phase or a terminal evaluation)

A. CO-FINANCING

Co financing (Type/ Source)	IA own Financing (mill US\$)		Multi-lateral Agencies (Non-GEF) (mill US\$)		Bi-laterals Donors (mill US\$)		Central Government (mill US\$)		Local Government (mill US\$)		Private Sector (mill US\$)		NGOs (mill US\$)		Other Sources* (mill US\$)		Total Financing (mill US\$)		Total Disbursemen t (mill US\$)		
	Pro posed	Actua l	Pro posed	Actua l	Pro posed	Actua l	Pro posed	Actua l	Pro posed	Actua l	Pro posed	Actua l	Pro posed	Actua l	Pro posed	Actual	Pro posed	Actua l	Pro posed	Actua l	
Grant																					
Credits																					
Loans																					
Equity																					
In-kind																					
Non-grant Instruments*																					
Other Types*																					
TOTAL																					

- “Proposed” co-financing refers to co-financing proposed at CEO endorsement.
- Please describe “Non-grant Instruments” (such as guarantees, contingent grants, etc):

- Please explain “Other Types of Co-financing”:

- Please explain “Other Sources of Co-financing”:

Projects that have not realized expected co-financing levels must provide explanations. Please describe in 50 words the resources the project has leveraged since inception and indicate how these resources are contributing to the project’s global environmental objective.



Table 2. Summary of Evaluation Findings

OBJECTIVE	MEASURABLE INDICATORS FROM PROJECT LOGFRAME	MID TERM TARGET	STATUS OF DELIVERY*	RATING**
OUTCOMES	MEASURABLE INDICATORS FROM PROJECT LOGFRAME	MID TERM TARGET	STATUS OF DELIVERY	RATING
* STATUS OF DELIVERY:		** RATINGS:	Highly Satisfactory = HS	
GREEN / COMPLETED	= Indicators show successful achievement		Satisfactory = S	
YELLOW	= Indicators show expected completion by end of Project		Marginally Satisfactory = MS	
RED	= Indicators show poor achievement - unlikely to be complete by end of Project		Unsatisfactory = U	



ANNEX B

Key Documentation for Review

1. UNDP/GEF Project Document
2. Quarterly project progress reports
3. Project Implementation Report/Annual Project Report (PIR/APR)
4. GEF International Waters Results Framework Reports
5. Tracking tools for GEF International Focal Area/IWP
6. Inception Report
7. Regional Steering Committee/Multipartite Review Minutes/Reports
8. Project Technical Reports
9. Financial and Audit Reports



ANNEX C

Ethical Code of Conduct for UNDP Evaluations

Evaluations of UNDP-supported activities need to be independent, impartial and rigorous. Each evaluation should clearly contribute to learning and accountability. Hence evaluators must have personal and professional integrity and be guided by propriety in the conduct of their business.

Evaluators:

Must present information that is complete and fair in its assessment of strengths and weaknesses so that decisions or actions taken are well founded

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.

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.

Evaluations sometimes uncover evidence of wrongdoing. 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.

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.

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.



Should reflect sound accounting procedures and be prudent in using the resources of the evaluation.