**TERMS OF REFERENCE (ToR) FOR THE MIDTERM REVIEW OF
THE GLOFOULING PARTNERSHIPS PROJECT**

1.   SCOPE OF WORK

The required work is to develop the Midterm Review (MTR) of the full-sized UNDP-supported GEF-financed project titled "Building Partnerships to Assist Developing Countries to Minimize the Impacts from Aquatic Biofouling (GloFouling Partnerships) (PIMS 5775) implemented by the International Maritime Organization (IMO). This statement of work sets out the Terms of Reference (ToR) and expectations for the MTR.

2.   PROJECT BACKGROUND INFORMATION

The GloFouling Partnerships project was designed as an intervention at the global, regional and national levels, with the aim to develop best practices and build capacity in developing countries for implementing the IMO and other relevant guidelines for biofouling management and to catalyze overall reductions in the transboundary introduction of biofouling-mediated invasive aquatic species, with additional benefits in the reduction of GHG emissions from global shipping.

The project is formed as a truly global partnership that spurs government action and industry innovation and know-how in order to reduce the transfer of IAS from international shipping, while also reaching out to other marine sectors in a holistic approach. While the reach is global, all the intended outcomes, outputs and activities are directly geared towards the national level with a view to improving maritime institutions, technologies and operations as well as achieving improved monitoring and impact mitigation in the participating developing countries.

2.1   Project duration and finance

The project was launched in December 2018, with a 5-year duration (terminating in November 2023); it is currently in its third year of implementation. The main source of cash finance is from the Global Environment Facility (GEF), with a contribution of USD 6,980,000. Other cash and in-kind contributions, plus a detailed financial analysis and budget may be found in the Project Document[1] (pages 94 to 101).

2.2   Project components

The aims and objectives of the GloFouling Partnerships focus on national Legal, Policy and Institutional Reform (LPIR) in targeted developing countries, with an emphasis on integrated management and cross-sectoral coordination. Thus, Project work is divided into five major components:

---

[1] The Project Document for the GloFouling Partnerships may be downloaded from the project website here: Project publications | GloFouling (imo.org).

1. Legal, Policy and Institutional Reforms (LPIR) in participating countries, developed and implemented to minimize the risk of Invasive Aquatic Species (IAS) transferred through biofouling.
2. Capacity building and technical support for the implementation of the 2011 Biofouling Guidelines and best practices for biofouling management in other ocean industries.
3. Public-private partnerships to bring active private sector participation at global, regional, national and local levels, to support the development of innovative technological and other solutions and financial sustainability for the control and management of biofouling.
4. Knowledge management systems and enhanced stakeholder and institutional cooperation for research, monitoring and evaluation of biofouling management and control measures.
5. Monitoring and evaluation.

A detailed list of key outcomes may be found in the Project Document (page 68).

2.3 Institutional arrangements and relevant partners

While IMO will focus on shipping and associated industries, the Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission of UNESCO (IOC-UNESCO) has joined the project as an IMO executing partner to expand the approach to other non-ship based maritime sectors with a view to identify best practices that may address the transfer of invasive aquatic species through improved biofouling management. IOC-UNESCO will work hand in hand with the GloFouling Project Coordination Unit (GloFouling PCU) at IMO to increase awareness of this environmental challenge among key stakeholders.

The GloFouling Partnerships implementation strategy follows a 4-tiered approach (based on IMO's Glo-X model):

A. A global tier, providing international coordination and information dissemination, developing toolkits, guidelines and training materials, providing capacity building to developing countries and establishing a strong cooperation with industry representatives and NGOs.
B. A regional tier, providing regional coordination and harmonization, and promoting information sharing.
C. A significant country tier that establishes a fast track (Lead Partnering Country - LPC) and partner track (Partnering Country - PC) process for GEF-eligible countries in the priority regions. LPCs commit to develop and implement a National Biofouling Management Strategy and Action Plan (NBMS), with a view to guide the adoption of LPIR.
D. A local tier in each LPC to provide practical experiences in the implementation of the tools developed by the Project through targeted demonstration sites that should facilitate engagement of stakeholders at the national level and provide opportunities for technology demonstration for the private sector, and with particular attention to best management practices for recreational craft.

The project is managed globally through the Project Coordination Unit (PCU), based at the IMO headquarters in London, UK. The global tier includes the Global Project Task Force (GPTF), comprised by representatives from UNDP, IMO, IOC-UNESCO, LPCs, RCOs, Strategic Partners and Industry, to provide overall management and advisory support for the project. There are also global outputs and activities focused on developing guidance and best practices

that will form the baseline for providing training to country officials and experts on strategic planning and LPIR, and the carrying out of applied biofouling management measures. In addition, global level activities include integration of private sector stakeholders, public awareness raising and the development of knowledge management systems that are expected to function as an information clearing house in support of a uniform global approach, as well as an R&D Forum and exhibition.

GloFouling Partnerships will use regional mechanisms to deliver outputs more broadly within target regions and to deliver sustainable biofouling management measures beyond the life of the GloFouling Partnerships Project. Six regions are involved in the GloFouling Partnership effort: South America, South Asia, Red Sea and Gulf of Aden, Pacific, Eastern Africa and Southeast Asia. Agreements with Regional Coordinating Organizations (RCOs) have been established to coordinate the development of strategies, policies or programmes at the regional level. The five RCOs are SPREP (Pacific), SACEP (South Asia), PEMSEA (South East Asia), PERSGA (Red Sea and Gulf of Aden) and CPPS (South America) and Eastern Africa (coordinated through IMO's Regional presence).

The pre-eminent focus of GloFouling Partnerships is at the national level, where activities are designed to provide the tools and techniques to enable LPCs to reform their legal, policy and institutional structures in order to establish a risk-based and cost-effective approach to improved biofouling management that will reduce the risks of marine bio-invasions. National level intervention is carried out based on two tracks:

- A fast track involving 12 Lead Partnering Countries (LPCs), which have committed themselves to developing national biofouling management strategies and policy reforms: Brazil, Ecuador, Fiji, Indonesia, Jordan, Madagascar, Mauritius, Mexico, Peru, Philippines, Sri Lanka and Tonga

- A partner track involving countries (Partnering Countries – PCs) in each priority region who are invited to participate in the regional task forces and in regional training and workshop activities.

3.   MTR PURPOSE

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. Therefore, the MTE mission is also expected to make recommendations on the work plan for the remaining project period.

The evaluation will follow approaches adopted by GEF for the assessment of IW projects and UNDP M&E guidelines.

The MTE will also identify lessons learnt and best practices from the Project that could be applied to future and on-going projects.

4.   MTR APPROACH & METHODOLOGY

The MTR report must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The evaluation process must follow the guidance outlined in the document *Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects* (accessed here).

The MTR will review all relevant sources of information including documents prepared during the preparation phase (i.e. PIF, UNDP Initiation Plan, UNDP Social and Environmental Screening Procedure/SESP), the Project Document, project reports including annual PIRs, project budget revisions, national strategic and legal documents, and any other materials that the team considers useful for this evidence-based review. The MTR team will review the baseline GEF focal area Core Indicators/Tracking Tools submitted to the GEF at CEO endorsement, and the midterm GEF focal area Core Indicators/Tracking Tools that must be completed before the MTR assignment begins.

The MTR team is expected to follow a collaborative and participatory approach[2] ensuring close engagement with the Project Team, the GEF Operational Focal Point, Regional Coordinating Organizations, National Focal Points or Project Coordinators in Lead Partnering Countries, and other key stakeholders.

Engagement of stakeholders is vital to a successful MTR. Stakeholder involvement should include interviews with stakeholders who have project responsibilities, including but not limited to executing agencies, the PCU, senior officials in LPCs and RCOs, key experts and consultants in the subject area, project stakeholders, academia, local government and CSOs, etc.

The specific design and methodology for the MTR should emerge from consultations between the MTR team and the above-mentioned parties regarding what is appropriate and feasible for meeting the MTR purpose and objectives and answering the evaluation questions, given limitations of budget, time and data. The MTR team must use gender-responsive methodologies and tools and ensure that gender equality and women's empowerment, as well as other cross-cutting issues and SDGs are incorporated into the MTR report.

The final methodological approach including interview schedule and data to be used in the MTR must be clearly outlined and be fully discussed and agreed between UNDP, stakeholders and the MTR team during preparatory meetings for the MTR Inception Report.

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

5.1   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.

---

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

- 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.
  - Were relevant gender issues (e.g. the impact of the project on gender equality in the programme country, involvement of women's groups, engaging women in project activities) raised in the Project Document?
- 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.

5.2   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 1st 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/Core Indicators 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.

5.3 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.
- Do the Executing Agency/Implementing Partner and/or UNDP and other partners have the capacity to deliver benefits to or involve women? If yes, how?
- What is the gender balance of project staff? What steps have been taken to ensure gender balance in project staff?
- What is the gender balance of the Project Board? What steps have been taken to ensure gender balance in the Project Board?

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?

---

[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.

- 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 by the Commissioning Unit and project team, 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?

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financer	Type of Co-financing	Co-financing amount confirmed at CEO Endorsement (US$)	Actual Amount Contributed at stage of Midterm Review (US$)	Actual % of Expected Amount
		TOTAL			

- Include the separate GEF Co-Financing template (filled out by the Commissioning Unit and project team) which categorizes each co-financing amount as 'investment mobilized' or 'recurrent expenditures'. (This template will be annexed as a separate file.)

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?
- Review the extent to which relevant gender issues were incorporated in monitoring systems. See Annex 9 of *Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects* for further guidelines.

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?
- How does the project engage women and girls? Is the project likely to have the same positive and/or negative effects on women and men, girls and boys? Identify, if possible,

legal, cultural, or religious constraints on women's participation in the project. What can the project do to enhance its gender benefits?

Social and Environmental Standards (Safeguards)
- Validate the risks identified in the project's most current SESP, and those risks' ratings; are any revisions needed?
- Summarize and assess the revisions made since CEO Endorsement/Approval (if any) to:
    o The project's overall safeguards risk categorization.
    o The identified types of risks[8] (in the SESP).
    o The individual risk ratings (in the SESP).
- Describe and assess progress made in the implementation of the project's social and environmental management measures as outlined in the SESP submitted at CEO Endorsement/Approval (and prepared during implementation, if any), including any revisions to those measures. Such management measures might include Environmental and Social Management Plans (ESMPs) or other management plans, though can also include aspects of a project's design; refer to Question 6 in the SESP template for a summary of the identified management measures.

A given project should be assessed against the version of UNDP's safeguards policy that was in effect at the time of the project's approval.

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 & Knowledge Management:
- 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.
- List knowledge activities/products developed (based on knowledge management approach approved at CEO Endorsement/Approval).

---

[8] Risks are to be labeled with both the UNDP SES Principles and Standards, and the GEF's "types of risks and potential impacts": Climate Change and Disaster; Disadvantaged or Vulnerable Individuals or Groups; Disability Inclusion; Adverse Gender-Related impact, including Gender-based Violence and Sexual Exploitation; Biodiversity Conservation and the Sustainable Management of Living Natural Resources; Restrictions on Land Use and Involuntary Resettlement; Indigenous Peoples; Cultural Heritage; Resource Efficiency and Pollution Prevention; Labor and Working Conditions; Community Health, Safety and Security.

5.4 Sustainability

- Validate whether the risks identified in the Project Document, Annual Project Review/PIRs and the ATLAS Risk Register 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?

5.5 Conclusions and Recommendations

The MTR team will include a section in the MTR report for evidence-based conclusions, in light of the findings.

Additionally, the MTR consultant/team is expected to make recommendations to the Project Team. Recommendations should be succinct suggestions for critical intervention that are specific, measurable, achievable, and relevant. A recommendation table should be put in the report's executive summary. See the *Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects* for guidance on a recommendation table.

The MTR team should make no more than 15 recommendations total.

5.6 Ratings

The MTR team will include its ratings of the project's results and brief descriptions of the associated achievements in a *MTR Ratings & Achievement Summary Table* in the Executive Summary of the MTR report. See Annex E for ratings scales. No rating on Project Strategy and no overall project rating is required.

Table. MTR Ratings & Achievement Summary Table for GloFouling Partnerships

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 shall not exceed 40 working days, and shall not exceed five months from when the consultant(s) are hired. The tentative MTR timeframe is as follows:

ACTIVITY	NUMBER OF WORKING DAYS	COMPLETION DATE
Document review and preparing MTR Inception Report (MTR Inception Report due no later than 2 weeks before the MTR mission)	*To be determined*	*(date)*
MTR mission: stakeholder meetings, interviews	*To be determined*	*(date)*
Presentation of initial findings- last day of the MTR mission	*To be determined*	*(date)*
Preparing draft report (due within 3 weeks of the MTR mission)	*To be determined*	*(date)*
Finalization of MTR report/ Incorporating audit trail from feedback on draft report (due within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on the draft)	*To be determined*	*(date)*

Should there be any, travel needs shall be clearly outlined in the MTR Inception Report, with consideration of travel restrictions in place due to the COVID-19 pandemic.

7.   MIDTERM REVIEW DELIVERABLES

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

The final MTR report must be in English.

6. MTR ARRANGEMENTS

The principal responsibility for managing this MTR resides with the Commissioning Unit. The Commissioning Unit for this project's MTR is the GloFouling PCU, based at IMO headquarters in London, UK.

The Commissioning Unit will contract the consultant(s) and ensure the timely provision an updated stakeholder list with contact details (phone and email). Additionally, the PCU will be responsible for liaising with the MTR team to provide all relevant documents, set up stakeholder interviews, and arrange field visits.

7.   TEAM COMPOSITION

A team of one (or two) independent consultant(s) will conduct the MTR. The consultant(s) 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-related activities.

The selection of the consultant(s) will be aimed at maximizing the overall qualities in the following areas:

Education
- A Master's degree in marine science, naval engineering, ship management and logistics or another closely related field.

Experience

- Recent experience with result-based management evaluation methodologies;
- Experience applying SMART targets and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios;
- Competence in adaptive management, as applied to GEF International Waters
- Experience in evaluating projects, preferably in the context of the United Nations system and/or other major donors and with multi-country global projects;
- Experience in relevant technical areas for at least 10 years;
- Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender and GEF International Waters; experience in gender sensitive evaluation and analysis;
- Excellent writing and communication skills;
- Demonstrable analytical skills with demonstrated ability to assess complex situations in order to succinctly and clearly distil critical issues and draw well supported conclusions;
- An ability to assess policy and governance framework and institutional capacity; and
- Familiarity with the work of IMO and the issue of Invasive Alien Species and biofouling.

Language
- Fluency in written and spoken English is essential.

8.   ETHICS

The MTR team will be held to the highest ethical standards and is required to sign a code of conduct upon acceptance of the assignment. This MTR will be conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation'. The MTR team must safeguard the rights and confidentiality of information providers, interviewees and stakeholders through measures to ensure compliance with legal and other relevant codes governing

collection of data and reporting on data. The MTR team must also ensure security of collected information before and after the MTR and protocols to ensure anonymity and confidentiality of sources of information where that is expected. The information, knowledge and data gathered in the MTR process must also be solely used for the MTR and not for other uses without the express authorization of UNDP and partners.

9.   PAYMENT SCHEDULE

1)   20% payment upon satisfactory delivery of the final MTR Inception Report and approval by the Commissioning Unit
2)   40% payment upon satisfactory delivery of the draft MTR report to the Commissioning Unit
3)   40% payment upon satisfactory delivery of the final MTR report and approval by the Commissioning Unit and RTA (via signatures on the TE Report Clearance Form) and delivery of completed TE Audit Trail. Criteria for issuing the final payment of 40%[9]:
   - The final MTR report includes all requirements outlined in the MTR TOR and is in accordance with the MTR guidance.
   - The final MTR report is clearly written, logically organized, and is specific for this project (i.e. text has not been cut & pasted from other MTR reports).
   - The Audit Trail includes responses to and justification for each comment listed.

10.   APPLICATION PROCESS

Recommended Presentation of Proposal:

a) **Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability**
b) **CV** and a **Personal History Form**[10]
c) **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)
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. 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 IMO 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 IMO.

All application materials should be submitted by email to the address glofouling@imo.org indicating the following reference: "Consultant for GloFouling Midterm Review".

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

---

[9] The Commissioning Unit is obligated to issue payments to the MTR team as soon as the terms under the ToR are fulfilled. If there is an ongoing discussion regarding the quality and completeness of the final deliverables that cannot be resolved between the Commissioning Unit and the MTR team, the Technical Advisor will be consulted. If needed, the Commissioning Unit's senior management, Procurement Services Unit and Legal Support Office will be notified as well so that a decision can be made about whether or not to withhold payment of any amounts that may be due to the evaluator(s), suspend or terminate the contract and/or remove the individual contractor from any applicable rosters. See the UNDP Individual Contract Policy for further details: https://popp.undp.org/_layouts/15/WopiFrame.aspx?sourcedoc=/UNDP_POPP_DOCUMENT_LIBRARY/Public/PSU_Individual%20Contract_Individual%20Contract%20Policy.docx&action=default
[10] Microsoft Word - PHF-Rev 2-2007.doc (imo.org)

70% and the price proposal will weigh as 30% of the total scoring. The applicant receiving the Highest Combined Score will be awarded the contract, subject to acceptance of IMO's General Terms and Conditions.

***

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

1. PIF
2. UNDP Initiation Plan
3. UNDP Project Document
4. UNDP Social and Environmental Screening Procedure (SESP)
5. Project Inception Report
6. All Project Implementation Reports (PIR's)
7. Quarterly progress reports and work plans of the various implementation task teams
8. Audit reports
9. Finalized GEF focal area Tracking Tools/Core Indicators at CEO endorsement and midterm
10. Oversight mission reports
11. All monitoring reports prepared by the project
12. Financial and Administration guidelines used by Project Team

The following documents will also be available:
13. Project operational guidelines, manuals and systems
14. UNDP country/countries programme document(s)
15. Minutes of the ExCom meetings
16. Any additional documents, as relevant.

***

ToR ANNEX B: Guidelines on Contents for the Midterm Review Report[11]

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

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

---

[11] The Report length should not exceed 40 pages in total (not including annexes).

- Project-level monitoring and evaluation systems
- Stakeholder engagement
- Social and Environmental Standards (Safeguards)
- Reporting
- Communications & Knowledge Management

   4.4 Sustainability
- Financial risks to sustainability
- Socio-economic to sustainability
- Institutional framework and governance risks to sustainability
- Environmental risks to sustainability

5. Conclusions and Recommendations *(4-6 pages)*

   5.1 Conclusions
- Comprehensive and balanced statements (that are evidence-based and connected to the MTR's findings) which highlight the strengths, weaknesses and results of the project

   5.2 Recommendations
- Corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project
- Actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the project
- Proposals for future directions underlining main objectives

6. Annexes
- MTR ToR (excluding ToR annexes)
- MTR evaluative matrix (evaluation criteria with key questions, indicators, sources of data, and methodology)
- Example Questionnaire or Interview Guide used for data collection
- Ratings Scales
- MTR mission itinerary
- List of persons interviewed
- List of documents reviewed
- Co-financing table (if not previously included in the body of the report)
- Signed UNEG Code of Conduct form
- Signed MTR final report clearance form
- *Annexed in a separate file:* Audit trail from received comments on draft MTR report
- *Annexed in a separate file:* Relevant midterm tracking tools (*METT, FSC, Capacity scorecard, etc.) or Core Indicators*
- *Annexed in a separate file: GEF Co-financing template (categorizing co-financing amounts by source as 'investment mobilized' or 'recurrent expenditure')*

***

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?			
(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? To what extent has progress been made in the implementation of social and environmental management measures? Have there been changes to the overall project risk rating and/or the identified types of risks as outlined at the CEO Endorsement stage?			
Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, socio-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?			

***

ToR ANNEX D: UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluators/Midterm Review Consultants[12]

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.
8. Must ensure that independence of judgement is maintained and that evaluation findings and recommendations are independently presented.
9. Must confirm that they have not been involved in designing, executing or advising on the project being evaluated.

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: _____

***

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

***

(to be completed and signed by the Commissioning Unit and RTA and included in the final document)

Midterm Review Report Reviewed and Cleared By:

Commissioning Unit (M&E Focal Point)

Name: _____

Signature: _____   Date: _____

Regional Technical Advisor (Nature, Climate and Energy)

Name: _____

Signature: _____   Date: _____

***

ToR ANNEX G: Audit Trail Template

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

To the comments received on (*date*) from the Midterm Review of (*project name*) (UNDP Project ID-*PIMS #)*

The following comments were provided in track changes to the draft Midterm Review report; they are referenced by institution ("Author" column) and not by the person's name, and track change comment number ("#" column):

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

_____