TERMS OF REFERENCE

Mid-Term Review of the UN Environment/Global Environment Facility project
"Integrating Water, Land and Ecosystems Management
in
Caribbean Small Island Developing States (IWEco)"

Section 1: PROJECT BACKGROUND AND OVERVIEW

1. Project General Information

Table 1. Project summary

GEF Project ID:	4932		
Implementing Agency:	UNEP, UNDP	**Executing Agency:**	UNEP/CAR/RCU
Sub-programme:	Regional Seas Program	**Expected Accomplishment(s):**	See CEO Approval document
UN Environment approval date:		**Programme of Work Output(s):**	See CEO Approval document
GEF approval date:	15 April 2015	**Project type:**	Full Sized Project
GEF Operational Programme #:	……………	**Focal Area(s):**	Multi Focal Area
		GEF Strategic Priority:	………………..
Expected **start date:**	…………….	**Actual start date:**	20 September 2016
Planned **completion date:**	…………….	**Actual completion date:**	Activities: 19 September 2022 Administrative: 31 August 2023
Planned **project budget at approval:**	20,722,571 US $ (GEF)	**Actual total expenditures reported as of [date]:**	(*will be completed by end of 2019*)
GEF grant allocation:	20,722,571 US $	**GEF grant expenditures reported as of [date]:**	(*will be completed by end of 2019*)
Project Preparation Grant - GEF financing:	299,500 US $	**Project Preparation Grant - co-financing:**	350,000 US $
Expected **Medium-Size Project/Full-Size Project co-financing:**	68,017,191 US $ (co-funding)	**Secured Medium-Size Project/Full-Size Project co-financing:**	(*will be completed by end of 2019*)
First disbursement:	to IP US$90,000 on 26 July 2017	**Date of financial closure:**	Donor Agreement: 31 December 2023 UMOJA: 31 December 2024
No. of revisions:	none	**Date of last revision:**	n.a.
No. of Steering Committee meetings:	Inception: 20 September 2016 2nd RPSCM: 26 Feb 2018 3rd RPSCM: 02 April 2019	**Date of last/next Steering Committee meeting:**	**Last:** 02 April 2019	**Next:** April 2020
Mid-term Review/ Evaluation *(planned date):*	……………….	**Mid-term Review/ Evaluation (actual date):**	January / April 2020

Terminal Evaluation (*planned date*):	………………	Terminal Evaluation (actual date):	October 2022
Coverage - Country(ies):	Antigua & Barbuda; Cuba; Barbados; Dominican Republic; Grenada; Jamaica; Saint Kitts & Nevis; Saint Lucia; Saint Vincent & the Grenadines; Trinidad & Tobago	Coverage - Region(s):	Caribbean Region
Dates of previous project phases:	(IWCAM: 2006-2011)	Status of future project phases:	Not applicable

2. Project rationale

The GEF investment will contribute to removal of the barriers that continue to persist in many of the countries of the Caribbean in implementing sustainable solutions to realize multiple global environmental benefits through arresting water, land and biodiversity resources degradation. These solutions will be supported by the contributions of the project to accelerate and strengthen the needed policy, regulatory and institutional reforms along with empowered community engagement and private sector involvement. Tangible outcomes will include increased reliability of safe water and sanitation particularly to disadvantaged communities, reduction in nutrient and other pollutant loads into fresh and coastal waters, reduction in the volume of soil lost and sediment fluxes into rivers and marine environments, positive changes in the state of ecosystems in terms of species richness and abundance and contributions to global carbon sequestration.

3. Project objectives and components

Project Goal: to enhance the sustainable flow of ecosystem services and their contribution to sustainable socio-economic development in the Caribbean through the application of appropriate solutions for the improved integrated management of water, land and biological resources.

Project Objective: to contribute to the preservation of Caribbean ecosystems that are of global significance and the sustainability of livelihoods through the application of existing proven technologies and approaches that are appropriate for small island developing states through improved fresh and coastal water resources management, sustainable land management and sustainable forest management that also seek to enhance resilience of socio-ecological systems to the impacts of climate change.

4. Executing Arrangements

With reference to the IWEco Project document:

At the level of project management and coordination UNEP will be the lead Implementing Agency with UNDP being the Co-Implementing Agency for the part limited mainly to GEF Small Grants Projects (SGPs), development and maintenance of a project website, producing a project documentary, convening a IWC conference and support the participation of project personnel and stakeholders to 2 IWC conferences (of which 1 conference has been held already in 2015).

According to the Project Document, UN Environment Programme CAR/RCU will be the lead Executing Agency with CARPHA as co-Executing Agency[1]. OECS and PCI Media Impact will be the Co-partner Executing Agencies for respective components of the project or a mixture thereof:

- **UN ENVIRONMENT PROGRAMME** - the role of UN Environment Programme, as in the GEF IWCAM project, will be primarily as lead Implementing Agency, reporting to the GEF on project activities. It will have a key role not only at the regional level but also at the national level in supporting the implementation of regional

---

[1] CARPHA is currently a sub-contractor.

policies and the use of policy and management tools thanks to the support of the Regional Seas Regional Coordination Unit which have demonstrated and proven ability to operate at both national and regional level and long standing relationship with the countries of the region. This is further supported by a network of Convention Secretariat focal points in each of the project countries with whom UNEP has established a close working relationship. UN Environment programme's Task Manager for this project will be based in Washington DC where this position provides oversight to all UN Environment Programme's Regional Seas projects.

The **Caribbean Environment Programme Regional Coordinating Unit/Secretariat to the Cartagena Convention (Car/RCU)** will be the lead Executing Agency. The proposed execution arrangements take advantage of the recognized expertise of the Secretariat to the Cartagena Convention in matters related to the marine and coastal environment and in working in a multi-lingual environment, as well as its expertise in implementing the Cartagena Convention and particularly its LBS and SPAW Protocols. Another important regional stakeholder are the Regional Activity Centers for the Implementation of the Protocols on Land-based Sources of Pollution and the Specially Protected Areas and Wildlife. The technical node for the LBS Protocol is jointly shared between the Centre for Coastal and Marine Engineering and Management (CIMAB) in Cuba, and the Institute of Marine Affairs (IMA) in Trinidad and Tobago, while the Centre for the SPAW Protocol is located in Guadeloupe. All of these form part of the Caribbean Environment Programme's implementation structure. The project will include these centres in its networking and coordination activities and in any stakeholder and partnership arrangements. UN Environment through its office of Car/RCU will host the Regional Project Coordinator for this project, who will be based in Kingston, Jamaica.

- **UNDP** – UNDP will serve as co-Implementing Agency, along with UNEP for the overall project, and besides the interventions as described above, it will have a key role with the national innovative projects, recognizing the country presence of UNDP and the linkages between project activities and UNDP's country assistance strategies. UNDP's specific expertise and value vis-à-vis its regional and country offices will provide important support to the projects. UNDP will have responsibility for support in strengthening of livelihood opportunities in the development and execution of small-scale community investments associated with the national sub-projects in the eight countries through the GEF Small Grants Programme. UNDP will also have specific responsibility for execution of activities under Regional Sub-project 4 on Knowledge Management. The UNDP office in Panama will be the contact for these UNDP led interventions.

- The **Caribbean Public Health Agency – Environmental Health & Sustainable Development Department (CARPHA)** - Building on the experience of the GEF IWCAM project execution arrangement, the project component 2 will be co-executed by CARPHA EHSD Department , from its office at CARPHA in St. Lucia. The proposed execution arrangements take advantage of the recognized expertise of CARPHA's EHSD Department in the field of freshwater resource management. CARPHA's EHSD Department, like UN Environment Programme, has a long established relationship with the countries of the region. Sustainability of project benefits at the regional level will be enhanced through these arrangements. The Department maintains responsibility for provision of technical advisory services, conduct of environmental assessments, policy development and research on behalf of the countries in the areas of water, land/watershed resources management, wastewater, chemicals (pesticides and hazardous chemicals) and solid waste management. The Department is a training center for environmental laboratory diagnostics services through its accredited laboratory facility. The other CARPHA divisions will strengthen the human health-environmental management nexus particularly through epidemiological and other environmental health linkages.

5.   Project Cost and Financing

The Mid-Term Reviewers will receive an Excel overview showing the original project budget as per IWEco Project document, as well as the yearly projected budgets, the expenditures and commitments etc. as per main cost category.

6.   Implementation Issues

UNEP Task Manager to provide. The latest PIR report can act as guiding document.

Section 2. OBJECTIVE AND SCOPE OF THE MID TERM REVIEW

7.   Key Review principles

1.   Review findings and judgements should be based on **sound evidence and analysis**, clearly documented in the review report. Information will be triangulated (i.e. verified from different sources) as far as possible, and when verification is not possible, the single source will be mentioned (whilst anonymity is still protected). Analysis leading to evaluative judgements should always be clearly spelled out.

2.   The **"Why?"** Question. As this is a Mid-term Review particular attention should be given to identifying implementation challenges and risks to achieving the expected project objectives and sustainability. Therefore, the "Why?" question should be at the front of the consultants' minds all through the review exercise and is supported by the use of a theory of change approach. This means that the consultants need to go beyond the assessment of "*what*" the project performance was, and make a serious effort to provide a deeper understanding of "*why*" the performance was as it was. This should provide the basis for the lessons that can be drawn from the project.

3.   **Baselines and counterfactuals**. In attempting to attribute any outcomes and impacts to the project intervention, the evaluators should consider the difference between *what has happened with, and what would have happened without, the project*. This implies that there should be consideration of the baseline conditions, trends and counterfactuals in relation to the intended project outcomes and impacts. It also means that there should be plausible evidence to attribute such outcomes and impacts to the actions of the project. Sometimes, adequate information on baseline conditions, trends or counterfactuals is lacking. In such cases this should be clearly highlighted by the evaluators, along with any simplifying assumptions that were taken to enable the evaluator to make informed judgements about project performance.

4.   **Communicating review results.** A key aim of the review is to encourage reflection and learning by UN Environment staff and key project stakeholders. The consultant should consider how reflection and learning can be promoted, both through the review process and in the communication of review findings and key lessons. Clear and concise writing is required on all review deliverables. Draft and final versions of the main review report will be shared with key stakeholders by the Mid Term Review Manager (=UN Environment Task Manager). There may, however, be several intended audiences, each with different interests and needs regarding the report. The Review Manager will plan with the consultant(s) which audiences to target and the easiest and clearest way to communicate the key review findings and lessons to them. This may include some or all of the following; a webinar, conference calls with relevant stakeholders, the preparation of an review brief or interactive presentation.

8.   Objective of the Mid Term Review

1.   In line with the UN Environment Evaluation Policy[2] and the UN Environment Programme Manual[3], the Mid-Term Review or Evaluation (MTE) is undertaken approximately half way through project implementation to analyze whether the project is on-track, what problems or challenges the project is encountering, and what corrective actions are required. The MTE will assess project performance to date (in terms of relevance, effectiveness and efficiency), and determine the likelihood of the project achieving its intended outcomes and impacts, including their sustainability. The review has two primary purposes: (i) to provide evidence of results to meet accountability requirements, and (ii) to promote operational improvement, learning and knowledge sharing through results and lessons learned among UN Environment (as Main-Implementing Agency), UNDP (as co-Implementing Agency for specific elements of the project), CARPHA, OECS, PCIMedia and other main project partners. Therefore, the Review Mission will identify lessons of operational relevance for future project formulation and implementation (especially for the remainder of the project).

9.   Key Strategic Questions

In addition to the review criteria outlined in Section 10 below, the review will address the **strategic questions** listed below. These are questions of interest to UN Environment and to which the project is believed to be able to make a substantive contribution:

1)   To what extend have the current project interventions contributed to the expected Focal Area Outputs for International Waters (IW), Land Degradation (LD), Biodiversity (BD) and Sustainable Forest Management (SFM) as mentioned in the CEO Approval document?

2)   What are the major highlights in project achievements to date?

---

3) What are the major challenges the project has experienced so far?

4) Where does the project need to change focus in order to improve the level of achievement related to the expected Focal Area Outputs?

5) Mention strategic as well as political lessons learned for future GEF project formulation in the Caribbean region (elaborate on project design, project partners, project duration, etc.).

Section 3. APPROACH, RATING and DELIVERABLES

10. Review criteria and rating

1. All review criteria will be rated on a six-point scale. Sections A-I below, outline the scope of the criteria. A weightings table will be provided in excel format to support the determination of an overall project rating. The set of review criteria are grouped in **nine** categories: (A) Strategic Relevance; (B) Quality of Project Design; (C) Nature of External Context; (D) Effectiveness, which comprises assessments of the delivery of outputs, achievement of outcomes and likelihood of impact; (E) Financial Management; (F) Efficiency; (G) Monitoring and Reporting; (H) Sustainability; and (I) Factors Affecting Project Performance. The review consultants can propose other review criteria as deemed appropriate.

2. The *ratings will be presented in the form of a table*. Each of the nine categories should be rated separately with **brief justifications** based on the findings of the main analysis. An overall rating for the project should also be given. The following rating system is to be applied:

Criterion	Reviewer's Summary Comments	Reviewer's Rating
A. Strategic relevance		
B. Quality of Project design		
C. Nature of External context		
D. Effectiveness		
E. Financial Management		
F. Efficiency		
G. Monitoring and Reporting		
H. Sustainability		
I. Factors and processes affecting project performance		

All ratings will be on the GEF six-point scale.

GEF Performance Description	Alternative description on the same scale
HS = Highly Satisfactory	Excellent
S = Satisfactory	Well above average
MS = Moderately Satisfactory	Average
MU = Moderately Unsatisfactory	Below Average
U = Unsatisfactory	Poor
HU = Highly Unsatisfactory	Very poor (Appalling)

A. Strategic Relevance

The Mid Term Review will assess, in line with the OECD/DAC definition of relevance, 'the extent to which the activity is suited to the priorities and policies of the target group, recipient and donor'. The review will include an assessment of the project's relevance in relation to UN Environment's mandate and its alignment with UN Environment's policies and strategies at the time of project approval. Under strategic relevance an assessment of the complementarity of the project with other interventions addressing the needs of the same target groups will be made. This criterion comprises four elements:

    i.   *Alignment to the UN Environment Medium Term Strategy[4] (MTS) and Programme of Work (POW)*

The review should assess the project's alignment with the MTS and POW under which the project was approved and include, in its narrative, reflections on the scale and scope of any contributions made to the planned results reflected in the relevant MTS and POW.

    ii.   *Alignment to UN Environment / Donor/GEF Strategic Priorities*

Donor, including GEF, strategic priorities will vary across interventions. UN Environment strategic priorities include the Bali Strategic Plan for Technology Support and Capacity Building5 (BSP) and South-South Cooperation (S-SC). The BSP relates to the capacity of governments to: comply with international agreements and obligations at the national level; promote, facilitate and finance environmentally sound technologies and to strengthen frameworks for developing coherent international environmental policies. S-SC is regarded as the exchange of resources, technology and knowledge between developing countries. GEF priorities are specified in published programming priorities and focal area strategies.

    iii.   *Relevance to Regional, Sub-regional and National Environmental Priorities*

The review will assess the extent to which the intervention is suited, or responding to, the stated environmental concerns and needs of the countries, sub-regions or regions where it is being implemented. Examples may include: national or sub-national development plans, poverty reduction strategies or Nationally Appropriate Mitigation Action (NAMA) plans or regional agreements etc.

    iv.   *Complementarity with Existing Interventions*

An assessment will be made of how well the project, either at design stage or during the project mobilization, took account of ongoing and planned initiatives (under the same sub-programme, other UN Environment sub-programmes, or being implemented by other agencies) that address similar needs of the same target groups. The review will consider if the project team, in collaboration with Regional Offices and Sub-Programme Coordinators, made efforts to ensure their own intervention was complementary to other interventions, optimized any synergies and avoided duplication of effort. Examples may include UN Development Assistance Frameworks or One UN programming. Linkages with other interventions should be described and instances where UN Environment's comparative advantage has been particularly well applied should be highlighted.

Factors affecting this criterion may include:
- Stakeholders' participation and cooperation
- Responsiveness to human rights and gender equity
- Country ownership and driven-ness

B. Quality of Project Design

The quality of project design is assessed using an agreed template during the review inception phase, ratings are attributed to identified criteria and an overall Project Design Quality rating is established. This overall Project Design Quality rating is entered in the final review ratings table as item B. In the Main Review Report a summary of the project's strengths and weaknesses at design stage is included, while the complete Project Design Quality template is annexed in the Inception Report.

Factors affecting this criterion may include (at the design stage):
- Stakeholders participation and cooperation
- Responsiveness to human rights and gender equity

---

[4] UN Environment's Medium Term Strategy (MTS) is a document that guides UN Environment's programme planning over a four-year period. It identifies UN Environment's thematic priorities, known as Sub-programmes (SP), and sets out the desired outcomes, known as Expected Accomplishments (EAs), of the Sub-programmes.

[5] http://www.unep.org/GC/GC23/documents/GC23-6-add-1.pdf

C. Nature of External Context

At review inception stage a rating is established for the project's external operating context (considering the prevalence of conflict, natural disasters and political upheaval). This rating is entered in the final review ratings table as item C. Where a project has been rated as facing either an Unfavourable or Highly Unfavourable external operating context, and/or a negative external event has occurred during project implementation, the ratings for Effectiveness, Efficiency and/or Sustainability may be increased at the discretion of the Review Consultant and Review Manager (=UNEP Task Manager) together. A justification for such an increase must be given.

D. Effectiveness

i. Delivery of Outputs

The review will assess the project's success in producing the programmed outputs *(products, capital goods and services resulting from the intervention)* and achieving milestones as per the project design document (ProDoc). Any formal modifications/revisions made during project implementation will be considered part of the project design. Where the project outputs are inappropriately or inaccurately stated in the ProDoc, reformulations may be necessary in the reconstruction of the TOC. In such cases a table should be provided showing the original and the reformulation of the outputs for transparency. The delivery of outputs will be assessed in terms of both quantity and quality, and the assessment will consider their ownership by, and usefulness to, intended beneficiaries and the timeliness of their delivery. The review will briefly explain the reasons behind the success or shortcomings of the project in delivering its programmed outputs and meeting expected quality standards.

Factors affecting this criterion may include:
- Preparation and readiness
- Quality of project management and supervision[6]

ii. Achievement of Direct Outcomes

The achievement of direct outcomes *(short and medium-term effects of the intervention's outputs; a change of behaviour resulting from the use/application of outputs, which is not under the direct control of the intervention's direct actors)* is assessed as performance against the direct outcomes as defined in the reconstructed[7] Theory of Change. These are the first-level outcomes expected to be achieved as an immediate result of project outputs. As in 1, above, a table can be used where substantive amendments to the formulation of direct outcomes is necessary. The review should report evidence of attribution between UN Environment's intervention and the direct outcomes. In cases of normative work or where several actors are collaborating to achieve common outcomes, evidence of the nature and magnitude of UN Environment's 'substantive contribution' should be included and/or 'credible association' established between project efforts and the direct outcomes realised.

Factors affecting this criterion may include:
- Quality of project management and supervision
- Stakeholders' participation and cooperation
- Responsiveness to human rights and gender equity
- Communication and public awareness

iii. Likelihood of Impact

Based on the articulation of longer-term effects in the reconstructed TOC *(i.e. from direct outcomes, via intermediate states, to impact),* the review will assess the likelihood of the intended, positive impacts becoming a reality. Project objectives or goals should be incorporated in the TOC, possibly as intermediate states or long-term impacts. The Evaluation Office's approach to the use of TOC in project evaluations is outlined in a guidance note available on the EOU website,

---

[6] In some cases 'project management and supervision' will refer to the supervision and guidance provided by UN Environment to implementing partners and national governments while in others, specifically for GEF funded projects, it will refer to the project management performance of the executing agency and the technical backstopping provided by UN Environment.

[7] UN Environment staff are currently required to submit a Theory of Change with all submitted project designs. The level of 'reconstruction' needed during an evaluation will depend on the quality of this initial TOC, the time that has lapsed between project design and implementation (which may be related to securing and disbursing funds) and the level of any changes made to the project design. In the case of projects pre-dating 2013 the intervention logic is often represented in a logical framework and a TOC will need to be constructed in the inception stage of the evaluation.

web.unep.org/evaluation and is supported by an excel-based flow chart, 'Likelihood of Impact Assessment Decision Tree'. Essentially the approach follows a 'likelihood tree' from direct outcomes to impacts, taking account of whether the assumptions and drivers identified in the reconstructed TOC held. Any unintended positive effects should also be identified and their causal linkages to the intended impact described.

The review will also consider the likelihood that the intervention may lead, or contribute to, <u>unintended negative effects</u>. Some of these potential negative effects may have been identified in the project design as risks or as part of the analysis of Environmental, Social and Economic Safeguards.[8]

The review will consider the extent to which the project has played a <u>catalytic role or has promoted scaling up and/or replication</u>[9] as part of its Theory of Change and as factors that are likely to contribute to longer term impact.

Ultimately UN Environment and all its partners aim to bring about benefits to the environment and human well-being. Few projects are likely to have impact statements that reflect such long-term or broad-based changes. However, the review will assess the likelihood of the project to make a substantive contribution to the high-level changes represented by UN Environment's Expected Accomplishments, the Sustainable Development Goals[10] and/or the high-level results prioritised by the funding partner.

Factors affecting this criterion may include:
- Quality of Project Management and Supervision (including adaptive management)
- Stakeholders participation and cooperation
- Responsiveness to human rights and gender equity
- Country ownership and driven-ness
- Communication and public awareness

E. Financial Management

Financial management will be assessed under two themes: completeness of financial information and communication between financial and project management staff. The review will establish the actual spend across the life of the project of funds secured from all donors. This expenditure will be reported, where possible, at output level and will be compared with the approved budget. The review will assess the level of communication between the Project/Task Manager and the Fund Management Officer as it relates to the effective delivery of the planned project and the needs of a responsive, adaptive management approach. The review will verify the application of proper financial management standards and adherence to UN Environment's financial management policies. Any financial management issues that have affected the timely delivery of the project or the quality of its performance will be highlighted.

Factors affecting this criterion may include:
- Preparation and readiness
- Quality of project management and supervision

F. Efficiency

In keeping with the OECD/DAC definition of efficiency the review will assess the extent to which the project delivered maximum results from the given resources. This will include an assessment of the cost-effectiveness and timeliness of project execution. Focussing on the translation of inputs into outputs, cost-effectiveness is the extent to which an intervention has achieved, or is expected to achieve, its results at the lowest possible cost. Timeliness refers to whether planned activities were delivered according to expected timeframes as well as whether events were sequenced efficiently. The review will also assess to what extent any project extension could have been avoided through stronger project management and identify any negative impacts caused by project delays or extensions. The review will describe any cost or time-saving measures put in place to maximise results within the secured budget and agreed project timeframe and consider whether the project was implemented in the most efficient way compared to alternative interventions or approaches.

The review will give special attention to efforts by the project teams to make use of/build upon pre-existing institutions, agreements and partnerships, data sources, synergies and complementarities with other initiatives, programmes and projects

---

[8] Further information on Environmental, Social and Economic Safeguards (ESES) can be found at http://www.unep.org/about/eses

[9] *Scaling up* refers to approaches being adopted on a much larger scale, but in a very similar context. Scaling up is often the longer term objective of pilot initiatives. *Replication* refers to approaches being repeated or lessons being explicitly applied in new/different contexts e.g. other geographic areas, different target group etc. Effective replication typically requires some form of revision or adaptation to the new context. It is possible to replicate at either the same or a different scale.

[10] A list of relevant SDGs is available on the EO website www.unep.org/evaluation

etc. to increase project efficiency. The review will also consider the extent to which the management of the project <u>minimised UN Environment's environmental footprint.</u>

The factors underpinning the need for any project extensions will also be explored and discussed. As management or project support costs cannot be increased in cases of 'no cost extensions', such extensions represent an increase in unstated costs to implementing parties.

Factors affecting this criterion may include:
- Preparation and readiness (e.g. timeliness)
- Quality of project management and supervision
- Stakeholders participation and cooperation

G. Monitoring and Reporting

The review will assess monitoring and reporting across three sub-categories: monitoring design and budgeting, monitoring implementation and project reporting.

i. Monitoring Design and Budgeting

Each project should be supported by a sound monitoring plan that is designed to track progress against SMART[11] indicators towards the delivery of the project's outputs and achievement of direct outcomes, including at a level disaggregated by gender, vulnerability or marginalisation. The review will assess the quality of the design of the monitoring plan as well as the funds allocated for its implementation. The adequacy of resources for mid-term review and terminal evaluation should be discussed if applicable.

ii. Monitoring of Project Implementation

The ion will assess whether the monitoring system was operational and facilitated the timely tracking of results and progress towards projects objectives throughout the project implementation period. This should include monitoring the representation and participation of disaggregated groups in project activities. It will also consider how information generated by the monitoring system during project implementation was used to adapt and improve project execution, achievement of outcomes and ensure sustainability. The review should confirm that funds allocated for monitoring were used to support this activity.

iii. Project Reporting

UN Environment has a centralised Project Information Management System (PIMS) in which project managers upload six-monthly status reports against agreed project milestones. IWeco project does not report in PIMS. The review will assess the extent to which both UN Environment and donor reporting commitments have been fulfilled.

Factors affecting this criterion may include:
- Quality of project management and supervision
- Responsiveness to human rights and gender equity (e.g disaggregated indicators and data)

H. Sustainability

Sustainability is understood as the probability of direct outcomes being maintained and developed after the close of the intervention. The review will identify and assess the key conditions or factors that are likely to undermine or contribute to the persistence of achieved direct outcomes (i.e. 'assumptions' and 'drivers'). Some factors of sustainability may be embedded in the project design and implementation approaches while others may be contextual circumstances or conditions that evolve over the life of the intervention. Where applicable an <u>assessment of bio-physical factors</u> that may affect the sustainability of direct outcomes may also be included.

i. Socio-political Sustainability

The review will assess the extent to which social or political factors support the continuation and further development of project direct outcomes. It will consider the level of ownership, interest and commitment among government and other stakeholders to take the project achievements forwards. In particular the review will consider whether individual capacity development efforts are likely to be sustained.

---

[11] SMART refers to indicators that are specific, measurable, assignable, realistic and time-specific.

ii.   Financial Sustainability

Some direct outcomes, once achieved, do not require further financial inputs, e.g. the adoption of a revised policy. However, in order to derive a benefit from this outcome further management action may still be needed e.g. to undertake actions to enforce the policy. Other direct outcomes may be dependent on a continuous flow of action that needs to be resourced for them to be maintained, e.g. continuation of a new resource management approach. The review will assess the extent to which project outcomes are dependent on future funding for the benefits they bring to be sustained. Secured future funding is only relevant to financial sustainability where the direct outcomes of a project have been extended into a future project phase. Even where future funding has been secured, the question still remains as to whether the project outcomes are financially sustainable.

iii.   Institutional Sustainability

The review will assess the extent to which the sustainability of project outcomes (especially those relating to policies and laws) is dependent on issues relating to institutional frameworks and governance. It will consider whether institutional achievements such as governance structures and processes, policies, sub-regional agreements, legal and accountability frameworks etc. are robust enough to continue delivering the benefits associated with the project outcomes after project closure. In particular, the review will consider whether institutional capacity development efforts are likely to be sustained.

Factors affecting this criterion may include:
- Stakeholders participation and cooperation
- Responsiveness to human rights and gender equity (e.g. where interventions are not inclusive, their sustainability may be undermined)
- Communication and public awareness
- Country ownership and driven-ness

I.   *Factors and Processes Affecting Project Performance*

(These factors are rated in the ratings table, but are discussed within the Main Review Report as cross-cutting themes as appropriate under the other review criteria, above)

i.   Preparation and Readiness

This criterion focuses on the inception or mobilisation stage of the project (i.e. the time between project approval and first disbursement). The review will assess whether appropriate measures were taken to either address weaknesses in the project design or respond to changes that took place between project approval, the securing of funds and project mobilisation. In particular the review will consider the nature and quality of engagement with stakeholder groups by the project team, the confirmation of partner capacity and development of partnership agreements as well as initial staffing and financing arrangements. *(Project preparation is included in the template for the assessment of Project Design Quality).*

ii.   Quality of Project Management and Supervision

In some cases, 'project management and supervision' will refer to the supervision and guidance provided by UN Environment to implementing partners and national governments while in others, specifically for GEF funded projects, it will refer to the project management performance of the executing agency and the technical backstopping and supervision provided by UN Environment.

The review will assess the effectiveness of project management with regard to: providing leadership towards achieving the planned outcomes; managing team structures; maintaining productive partner relationships (including Steering Groups etc.); communication and collaboration with UN Environment colleagues; risk management; use of problem-solving; project adaptation and overall project execution. Evidence of adaptive management should be highlighted.

iii.   Stakeholder Participation and Cooperation

Here the term 'stakeholder' should be considered in a broad sense, encompassing all project partners, duty bearers with a role in delivering project outputs and target users of project outputs and any other collaborating agents external to UN Environment. The assessment will consider the quality and effectiveness of all forms of communication and consultation with stakeholders throughout the project life and the support given to maximise collaboration and coherence between various stakeholders, including sharing plans, pooling resources and exchanging learning and expertise. The inclusion and participation of all differentiated groups, including gender groups should be considered.

iv. Responsiveness to Human Rights and Gender Equity

The review will ascertain to what extent the project has applied the UN Common Understanding on the human rights-based approach (HRBA) and the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous People. Within this human rights context the review will assess to what extent the intervention adheres to UN Environment's Policy and Strategy for Gender Equality and the Environment.

In particular the review will consider to what extent project design, implementation and monitoring have taken into consideration: (i) possible gender inequalities in access to, and the control over, natural resources; (ii) specific vulnerabilities of women and children to environmental degradation or disasters; and (iii) the role of women in mitigating or adapting to environmental changes and engaging in environmental protection and rehabilitation.

v. Country Ownership and Driven-ness

The review will assess the quality and degree of engagement of government / public sector agencies in the project countries, including provide an assessment of the possibility for government/public sector to engage in the project (assess the actual available capacity and capability). While there is some overlap between Country Ownership and Institutional Sustainability, this criterion focuses primarily on the forward momentum of the intended projects results, ie. either a) moving forwards from outputs to direct outcomes or b) moving forward from direct outcomes towards intermediate states. The review will consider the involvement not only of those directly involved in project execution and those participating in technical or leadership groups, but also those official representatives whose cooperation is needed for change to be embedded in their respective institutions and offices. This factor is concerned with the level of ownership generated by the project over outputs and outcomes and that is necessary for long term impact to be realised. This ownership should adequately represent the needs of interest of all gendered and marginalised groups.

vi. Communication and Public Awareness

The review will assess the effectiveness of: a) communication of learning and experience sharing between project partners and interested groups arising from the project during its life and b) public awareness activities that were undertaken during the implementation of the project to influence attitudes or shape behaviour among wider communities and civil society at large. The review should consider whether existing communication channels and networks were used effectively, including meeting the differentiated needs of gendered or marginalised groups, and whether any feedback channels were established. Where knowledge sharing platforms have been established under a project the review will comment on the sustainability of the communication channel under either socio-political, institutional or financial sustainability, as appropriate.

11. Review Approach

The Mid-Term Review will be an in-depth review using a participatory approach whereby key stakeholders are kept informed and consulted throughout the review process. Both quantitative and qualitative review methods will be used as appropriate to determine project achievements against the expected outputs, outcomes and impacts. It is highly recommended that the consultant(s) maintains close communication with the project team and promotes information exchange throughout the review implementation phase in order to increase their (and other stakeholder) ownership of the review findings. Where applicable, the consultant(s) should provide a geo-referenced map that demarcates the area covered by the project and, where possible, provide geo-reference photographs of key intervention sites (e.g. sites of habitat rehabilitation and protection, pollution treatment infrastructure, etc.)

The findings of the review will be based on the following:

- (a) A **desk review** of:
  - Relevant background documentation, inter alia;
    1) Project CEO Approval document (reviewed version, dated 29 January 2018), with relevant and related communications
    2) Project Budget Excel sheets from 31 January 2018 (latest revised version)
    3) Project Cooperation Agreements (PCAs) with PCI Media Impact and CARPHA/OECS
  - Project design documents (including minutes of the project design review meeting at approval); Annual Work Plans and Budgets or equivalent, revisions to the project (Project Document Supplement), the logical framework and its budget;
  - Project reports such as six-monthly progress and financial reports, progress reports from collaborating partners, meeting minutes, relevant correspondence and including the Project Implementation Reviews and Tracking Tool etc.;
  - Project outputs:

1) Mission Reports of the Project Management Unit (PMU) members
2) Financial & Technical Progress reports from partners
3) Minutes of the Inception Meeting, Regional Project Steering Committee meetings (February 2018, April 2019)
4) Presentations as presented during the various Regional Project Steering Committee meetings.

- Recent evaluations/reviews of similar projects in order to identify common issues of concern (like the CLME+ project, or the IWEco 'sister project' the Pacific R2R).

(b) **Interviews** (individual or in group) with:
- UN Environment Task Manager (TM); Isabelle Vanderbeck (UNEP Washington)
- IWEco Project Management Unit (PMU) in Kingston, Jamaica; Jan Betlem (Regional Project Coordinator); Donna Sue-Spencer (Communications Specialist), Nicole Caesar (Technical & Monitoring expert), Shamene Parker (Project Management Assistant), Donna Henry Hernandez (Project Administrative Assistant).
- Director of the Cartagena Convention Secretariat office, Kingston, Jamaica; Lorna Innis
- Regional Project Coordinator of CLME+ Project (UNDP/GEF), Cartagena, Colombia: Patrick Debels
- Finance Officer, Cartagena Convention Secretariat office, Kingston, Jamaica; Clementiene Pinder
- Ecosystem Management Sub-Programme Coordinator, Nairobi, Kenya; Marieta Sankalien
- Project Partners:
  1) CARPHA, OECS, PCI Media, UNDP SGP, UNDP and UNEP/CAR/RCU representatives
  2) Representatives of selected partners from the Research, Governance, and Communications Partnership Groups
- Relevant resource persons:
  1) UNEP Sub Regional Office for the Caribbean: Vincent Sweeney
  2) Project Managers of projects like the CLME+ project, or the Pacific R2R.

(c) **Field visits**
- It is envisaged that the Mid Term Review Team visits four (4) IWEco project countries, to be selected by the Review Team members after their first 'desk study' of available project documentation has been completed, as well as the CARPHA Head Quarters in Trinidad, as well as CARPHA and OECS offices in St. Lucia.

  Other locations and institutions to be visited to the opinion of the review team.

12. Review Deliverables and Review Procedures

The review team will prepare:

- **Inception Report:** containing an assessment of project design quality, a draft reconstructed Theory of Change of the project, project stakeholder analysis, review framework and a tentative review schedule.

- **Preliminary Findings Note:** typically, in the form of a PowerPoint presentation, the sharing of preliminary findings is intended to support the participation of the project team, act as a means to ensure all information sources have been accessed and provide an opportunity to verify emerging findings. In the case of highly strategic project/portfolio reviews, the preliminary findings may be presented as a word document for review and comment.

- **Draft and Final Mid Term Review Report:** (see next chapter) containing an executive summary that can act as a stand-alone document; detailed analysis of the review findings organised by review criteria and supported with evidence; lessons learned and recommendations and an annotated ratings table.

- **Mid Term Review Bulletin:** a 2-page summary of key review findings for wider dissemination through the project's website and quarterly Newsletter.

The Review team is expected to participate with the 4th IWEco Regional Project Steering Committee Meeting, to be held in Grenada, in April/May 2020 (exact dates to be agreed upon).

- The Review Team will present the Mid Term Review findings to the Steering committee members and will advise and guide on the way forward.

Review of the draft review report. The review team will submit a draft report to the UNEP Task Manager and revise the draft in response to their comments and suggestions. Once a draft of adequate quality has been peer-reviewed and accepted, the Task Manager will share the cleared draft report with the Regional Project Coordinator, who will alert the Task Manager in case the report contains any blatant factual errors. The Task Manager will then forward revised draft report (corrected by the review team where necessary) to other project stakeholders, for their review and comments. Stakeholders may provide feedback on any errors of fact and may highlight the significance of such errors in any conclusions as well as providing feedback on the proposed recommendations and lessons. Any comments or responses to draft reports will be sent to the Task Manager for consolidation. The Task Manager will provide all comments to the review team for consideration in preparing the final report, along with guidance on areas of contradiction or issues requiring an institutional response.

Based on a careful review of the evidence collated by the review consultants and the internal consistency of the report, the UNEP Task Manager will provide an assessment of the ratings in the final review report. Where there are differences of opinion between the reviewer and the Task Manager on project ratings, both viewpoints will be clearly presented in the final report. The Task Manager ratings will be considered the final ratings for the project.

The Task Manager will prepare a **quality assessment** of the first and final drafts of the main review report, which acts as a tool for providing structured feedback to the Review consultants. The quality of the report will be assessed and rated against the criteria specified in template listed in Annex 1 and this assessment will be appended to the Final Mid Term Review Report.

The report should be brief, to the point and easy to understand. It must explain; the purpose of the review, exactly what was evaluated, and the methods used. The report must highlight any methodological limitations, identify key concerns and present evidence-based findings, consequent conclusions, recommendations and lessons. The report should be presented in a way that makes the information accessible and comprehensible and include an executive summary that encapsulates the essence of the information contained in the report to facilitate dissemination and distillation of lessons.

The review will rate the overall implementation success of the project and provide individual ratings of the eleven implementation aspects as described in Section 1 of this TOR. *The ratings will be presented in the format of a table* **with brief justifications based on the** findings of the main analysis.

Evidence, findings, conclusions and recommendations should be presented in a complete and balanced manner. Any dissident views in response to review findings will be appended in an annex. The Mid Term Review report shall be written in English, be of no more than 50 pages (excluding annexes), use numbered paragraphs and include:

- An **executive summary** (no more than 3 pages) providing a brief overview of the main conclusions and recommendations of the review;

- **Introduction and background** giving a brief overview of the reviewed project, for example, the objective and status of activities; places visited; who was involved; the key questions; and, the methodology.

- **Scope, objective and methods** presenting the review's purpose, the review criteria used and questions to be addressed;

- **Project Performance and Impact** providing *factual evidence* relevant to the questions asked by the evaluator and interpretations of such evidence. This is the main substantive section of the report. The evaluator should provide a commentary and analysis on all nine review aspects (A − H above).

- **Conclusions and rating** of project implementation success giving the evaluator's concluding assessments and ratings of the project against given review criteria and standards of performance. The conclusions should provide answers to questions about whether the project is considered good or bad, and whether the results are considered positive or negative. The ratings should be provided with a brief narrative comment in a table (see *Annex 1* to this Appendix);

- **Lessons (to be) learned** presenting general conclusions from the standpoint of the design and implementation of the project, based on good practices and successes or problems and mistakes. Lessons should have the potential for wider application and use. All lessons should 'stand-alone' and should:

Briefly describe the context from which they are derived

State or imply some prescriptive action;

Specify the contexts in which they may be applied (if possible, who when and where)

- **Recommendations** suggesting *actionable* proposals for improvement of the current project.

Prior to each recommendation, the issue(s) or problem(s) to be addressed by the recommendation should be clearly stated.

A high-quality recommendation is an actionable proposal that is:

1. Feasible to implement within the timeframe and resources available

2. Commensurate with the available capacities of project team and partners

3. Specific in terms of who would do what and when

4. Contains results-based language (i.e. a measurable performance target)

5. Includes a trade-off analysis, when its implementation may require utilizing significant resources that would otherwise be used for other project purposes.

Annexes may include additional material deemed relevant by the evaluator but must include:

1. The Mid Term Review Terms of Reference,

2. A list of interviewees, and review timeline

3. A list of documents reviewed/consulted

4. Summary co-finance information and a statement of project expenditure by activity

5. The expertise of the review team (brief CV).

The report will also include any response/comments from the project management team and/or the country focal points regarding the review findings or conclusions as an annex to the report, however, such will be appended to the report by UNEP Task Manager.

Draft reports submitted to UNEP Task Manager are shared with the corresponding Programme or Project Officer and his or her supervisor for initial review and consultation. The IWEco staff and senior Executing Agency staff are allowed to comment on the draft review report. They may provide feedback on any errors of fact and may highlight the significance of such errors in any conclusions. The consultation also seeks feedback on the proposed recommendations. UNEP Task Manager collates all review comments and provides them to the review for their consideration in preparing the final version of the report.

Section 4. RESPONSIBILITIES & CONTRACTUAL ARRANGEMENTS

13. Mid Term Review Team

For this review, the review team will consist of a Team Leader and one Supporting Consultant who will work under the overall responsibility of the UNEP Task Manager (Isabelle Vanderbeck), Fund Management Officer (Clementiene Pinder) and the Sub-programme Coordinator of the relevant UNEP Sub-Programme (Marieta Sankalien) The consultant(s) will liaise with the Task Manager on any procedural and methodological matters related to the review. It is, however, the consultants' individual responsibility to arrange for their visas and immunizations as well as to plan meetings with stakeholders, organize online surveys, obtain documentary evidence and any other logistical matters related to the assignment. The UN Environment Task Manager and project team will, where possible, provide logistical support (introductions, meetings etc.) allowing the consultants to conduct the review as efficiently and independently as possible.

The consultant/Team Leader will be hired for 2 1/2 months spread over the period [01 Month/2020 to 05 Month/2020] and should have: an advanced university degree in environmental sciences, international development or other relevant political or social sciences area; a minimum of 10 years of technical/review experience, including of evaluating large, regional or global programmes and using a Theory of Change approach; proficiency in English/knowledge of Spanish is required, along with excellent writing skills in English; team leadership experience and, where possible, knowledge of the wider UN system, specifically of the work of UN Environment.

The Supporting Consultant will be hired for 2 months spread over the period 01 Month/2020 to 05 Month/2020 and should have: at least an undergraduate university degree in environmental sciences, international development or other relevant political or social sciences area; a minimum of 5 years of technical/monitoring/review experience; a broad understanding and working experience within the Caribbean in the area of environmental conservation, awareness raising and project execution; proficiency in English and Spanish is required, along with excellent writing skills in English and, where possible,

knowledge of the UN system, specifically of the work of UN Environment. Experience in managing partnerships, knowledge management and communication is desirable for all review consultants.

The consultant/Team Leader will be responsible, in close consultation with the UN Environment Task Manager, for overall management of the review and timely delivery of its outputs, described above in Section 11 Evaluation Deliverables, above. The Supporting Consultant will make substantive and high-quality contributions to the review process and outputs. Both consultants will ensure together that all review criteria and questions are adequately covered.

Specifically, Mid-Term Review Team members will undertake the following:

Specific Responsibilities for Team Leader:

The Team Leader will be responsible, in close consultation with the UNEP Task Manager, for overall management of the mid-term review and timely delivery of its outputs, described above in Section 11 Evaluation Deliverables.

Specific Responsibilities for the Supporting Consultant:

The Supporting Consultant might be required to individually visit specific project partners or institutions to have interviews and physically meet project contacts, visit selected project areas to investigate on progress in the field and/or verify progress reports, and will make substantive and high-quality contributions to the review process and outputs. Both consultants will ensure together that all review criteria and questions are adequately covered.

In close consultation with the UNEP Task Manager, the Mid-Term Review Consultants will be responsible for the overall management of the Mid-Term Review and timely delivery of its outputs, data collection and analysis and report-writing. More specifically:

Inception phase of the Mid Term Review, including:
- preliminary desk review and introductory interviews with project staff;
- draft the reconstructed Theory of Change of the project;
- prepare the review framework;
- develop the desk review and interview protocols;
- draft the survey protocols (if relevant);
- develop and present criteria for country and/or site selection for the Mid-term Review mission;
- plan the review schedule;
- prepare the Inception Report, incorporating comments until approved by the UNEP Task Manager

Data collection and analysis phase of the review, including:
- conduct further desk review and in-depth interviews with project implementing and executing agencies, project partners and project stakeholders;
- (where appropriate and agreed) conduct a review mission(s) to selected countries, visit the project locations, interview project partners and stakeholders, including a good representation of local communities. Ensure independence of the evaluation and confidentiality of review interviews.
- regularly report back to the UNEP Task Manager on progress and inform of any possible problems or issues encountered and;
- keep the Project/Task Manager informed of the review progress and engage the Project/Task Manager in discussions on emerging findings throughout the review process.

Reporting phase, including:
- draft the Main Mid-term Review Report, ensuring that the review report is complete, coherent and consistent with the Task Manager guidelines both in substance and style;
- liaise with the Task Manager on comments received and finalize the Main Mid Term Review Report, ensuring that comments are taken into account until approved by the Task Manager
- prepare a Response to Comments annex for the main report, listing those comments not accepted by the Review Consultant and indicating the reason for the rejection; and
- prepare a 2-page summary of the key evaluation findings and lessons;

Managing relations, including:
- maintain a positive relationship with review stakeholders, ensuring that the review process is as participatory as possible but at the same time maintains its independence;

- communicate in a timely manner with the UNEP Task Manager on any issues requiring its attention and intervention.

14. Schedule of the Review

The table below presents the tentative schedule for the evaluation.

Table 3. Tentative schedule for the evaluation

Milestone	Tentative Dates
Inception Mission	January 2020
Inception Report	February 2020
Evaluation Mission	March 2020
Telephone interviews, surveys etc.	January - March 2020
Powerpoint/presentation on preliminary findings and recommendations	March 2020
Draft report to Evaluation Manager (and Peer Reviewer)	March 2020
Draft Report shared with UN Environment Project Manager and team (IWEco PCU) in Kingston	March 2020
Draft Report shared with wider group of stakeholders	During 3rd IWEco Project Steering Committee meeting
Final Report	April 2020
Final Report shared with all respondents	April 2020

15. Contractual Arrangements

Mid Term Review Consultants will be selected and recruited by the UNEP Task Manager under an individual Special Service Agreement (SSA) on a "fees only" basis (see below), issued through the IWEco PCU in Kingston. By signing the service contract with UN Environment/UNON, the consultant(s) certify that they have not been associated with the design and implementation of the project in any way which may jeopardize their independence and impartiality towards project achievements and project partner performance. In addition, they will not have any future interests (within six months after completion of the contract) with the project's executing or implementing units. All consultants are required to sigh the Code of Conduct Agreement Form.

Fees will be paid on an instalment basis, paid on acceptance by the UNEP Task Manager of expected key deliverables. The schedule of payment is as follows:

Schedule of Payment for the [Consultant/Team Leader]:

Deliverable	Percentage Payment
Approved Inception Report	30%
Approved Draft Main Mid Term Review Report	30%
Approved Final Main Mid Term Review Report	40%

Schedule of Payment for the Support Consultant:

Deliverable	Percentage Payment
Approved Inception Report	30%
Approved Draft Main Mid Term Review Report	30%
Approved Final mid Term Review Report	40%

Fees only contracts: Air tickets will be purchased by UN Environment (PCU IWEco Kingston) and 75% of the Daily Subsistence Allowance for each authorised travel mission will be paid up front. Local in-country travel will only be reimbursed where agreed in advance with the UNEP Task Manager and on the production of acceptable receipts. Terminal expenses and residual DSA entitlements (25%) will be paid after mission completion.

In case the consultants are not able to provide the deliverables in accordance with these guidelines, and in line with the expected quality standards by the UN Environment Evaluation Office, payment may be withheld at the discretion of the UNEP Task Manager until the consultants have improved the deliverables to meet UN Environment's quality standards.

If the consultant(s) fail to submit a satisfactory final product to UN Environment in a timely manner, i.e. before the end date of their contract, the UNEP Task Manager reserves the right to employ additional human resources to finalize the report, and to reduce the consultants' fees by an amount equal to the additional costs borne by the UNEP Task Manager to bring the report up to standard.