

TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR THE CONSULTANT

Terminal evaluation of the GEF-UNDP-IMO GloBallast Partnerships Programme

INTRODUCTION

In accordance with UNDP and GEF M&E policies and procedures, all full and medium-sized UNDP support GEF financed projects are required to undergo a terminal evaluation upon completion of implementation. These terms of reference (TOR) sets out the expectations for a Terminal Evaluation (TE) of the *GEF-UNDP-IMO GloBallast Partnerships Programme* (PIMS 3050 IW FSP: Building Partnerships to Assist Developing Countries to Reduce the Transfer of Harmful Aquatic Organisms in Ships' Ballast Water (GloBallast Partnerships)).

The essentials of the project to be evaluated are presented in the Project summary available in the next section.

PROJECT SUMMARY

Project Title:	Building Partnerships to Assist Developing Countries to Reduce the Transfer of Harmful Aquatic Organisms in Ships' Ballast Water (GloBallast Partnerships)			
GEF Project ID:	2261		<i>at endorsement</i> <i>(Million US\$)</i>	<i>at completion</i> <i>(Million US\$)</i>
UNDP Project ID:	00058008	GEF financing:	6.387	
Country:	Global	IA/EA own:	4.318	
Region:	Global	Government:	9.849	
Focal Area:	International Waters	Other:	3.533	
FA Objectives, (OP/SP):		Total co-financing:	17.701	
Executing Agency:	IMO	Total Project Cost:	24.088	
Other Partners involved:	ProDoc Signature (date project began):			17 Sept 2007
	(Operational) Closing Date:		Proposed: Sept 2012	Actual: June 2017

The project was designed to assist vulnerable developing states and regions to implement sustainable, risk-based mechanisms for the management and control of ships' ballast water and sediments in order to minimize the adverse impacts of aquatic invasive species transferred by ships. In the achievement of this objective, 4 outcomes have been identified, each with corresponding outputs and activities. The four key outcomes expected from the project are as follows:

- 1) Learning, evaluation and adaptive management increased;
- 2) Ballast Water Management Strategies in place, with legal, policy and institutional reforms developed, implemented and sustained at national level;
- 3) Knowledge management tools and marine monitoring systems are effectively utilised to expand global public awareness and stakeholder support, improve understanding of ballast water impacts on marine ecology, and enhance maritime sector communications;

- 4) Public-private partnerships developed to spur the development of cost-effective ballast water technology solutions.

OBJECTIVE AND SCOPE

The TE will be conducted according to the guidance, rules and procedures established by UNDP and GEF as reflected in the [UNDP Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-supported, GEF-financed Projects](#).

The objectives of the evaluation are to assess the achievement of project results, and to draw lessons that can both improve the sustainability of benefits from this project, and aid in the overall enhancement of UNDP programming.

EVALUATION APPROACH AND METHOD

An overall approach and method¹ for conducting project terminal evaluations of UNDP-supported GEF-financed projects has developed over time. The Consultant (evaluator) is expected to frame the evaluation effort using the criteria of **relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and impact**, as defined and explained in the UNDP Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-supported, GEF-financed Projects. A set of questions covering each of these criteria have been drafted and are included with this TOR (Appendix C). The Consultant is expected to amend, complete and submit this matrix as part of an evaluation inception report, and shall include it as an annex to the final report.

The evaluation must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The Consultant is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with government counterparts, in particular the GEF operational focal point, GloBallast PCU, UNDP GEF Technical Adviser region and key stakeholders. The Consultant is expected to conduct field missions to Panama and London. Interviews will be held with the following organizations and individuals at a minimum: GloBallast Project Coordination Unit (PCU); IMO officers; UNDP officers; Strategic Partners (e.g. World Maritime University, IMarEST, etc.); GloBallast Regional Coordinators; National Focal Points for GloBallast Lead Partnering Countries.

The Consultant will review all relevant sources of information, such as the project document, project reports – including Annual APR/PIR, project budget revisions, midterm review, progress reports, GEF focal area tracking tools, project files, national strategic and legal documents, and any other materials that the Consultant considers useful for this evidencebased assessment. A list of documents that the project team will provide to the Consultant for review is included in Appendix B of this Terms of Reference.

EVALUATION CRITERIA AND RATINGS

An assessment of project performance will be carried out, based against expectations set out in the Project Logical Framework/Results Framework (see Appendix A), which provides performance and impact indicators for project implementation along with their corresponding means of verification. The evaluation will at a minimum cover the criteria of: **relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact**. Ratings must be provided on the following performance criteria. The completed table must be included in the evaluation executive summary. The obligatory rating scales are included in Appendix D.

Evaluation Ratings:			
1. Monitoring and Evaluation	rating	2. IA& EA Execution	rating
M&E design at entry		Quality of UNDP Implementation	
M&E Plan Implementation		Quality of Execution - Executing Agency	
Overall quality of M&E		Overall quality of Implementation / Execution	

¹ For additional information on methods, see the [Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results](#), Chapter 7, pg. 163.

3. Assessment of Outcomes	rating	4. Sustainability	rating
Relevance		Financial resources:	
Effectiveness		Socio-political:	
Efficiency		Institutional framework and governance:	
Overall Project Outcome Rating		Environmental:	
		Overall likelihood of sustainability:	

PROJECT FINANCE / COFINANCE

The evaluation will assess the key financial aspects of the project, including the extent of co-financing planned and realized. Project cost and funding data will be required, including annual expenditures. Variances between planned and actual expenditures will need to be assessed and explained. Results from recent financial audits, as available, should be taken into consideration. The Consultant(s) will receive assistance from the Project Team to obtain financial data in order to complete the co-financing table below, which will be included in the terminal evaluation report.

Co-financing (type/source)	UNDP own financing (mill. US\$)		Government (mill. US\$)		Partner Agency (mill. US\$)		Total (mill. US\$)	
	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Actual	Actual
Grants								
Loans/Concessions								
<input type="checkbox"/> In-kind support								
<input type="checkbox"/> Other								
Totals								

MAINSTREAMING

UNDP-supported GEF-financed projects are key components in UNDP country programming, as well as regional and global programmes. The evaluation will assess the extent to which the project was successfully mainstreamed with other UNDP priorities, including poverty alleviation, improved governance, the prevention and recovery from natural disasters, and gender.

IMPACT

The Consultant will assess the extent to which the project is achieving impacts or progressing towards the achievement of impacts. Key findings that should be brought out in the evaluations include whether the project has demonstrated: a) verifiable improvements in ecological status, b) verifiable reductions in stress on ecological systems, and/or c) demonstrated progress towards these impact achievements.²

CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS AND LESSONS

The evaluation report must include a chapter providing a set of **conclusions, recommendations and lessons**.

² A useful tool for gauging progress to impact is the Review of Outcomes to Impacts (ROTI) method developed by the GEF Evaluation Office: [ROTI Handbook 2009](#)

IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS

The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation resides with the Executing Agency (IMO). It has been agreed that the Executing Agency will contract the Consultant and ensure the timely provision of salaries, per diems and travel arrangements for the evaluation team. The GloBallast PCU will also be responsible for liaising with the Consultant to set up stakeholder interviews, arrange field visits, coordinate with the Government representatives, etc.

EVALUATION TIMEFRAME

The total duration of the evaluation will be 40 days according to the following plan:

Activity	Duration	Completion Date
Preparation	5 days	10 March 2017
Evaluation Mission	15 days	30 April 2017
Draft Evaluation Report	10 days	15 May 2017
Final Report	10 days	31 May 2017

EVALUATION DELIVERABLES

The Consultant is expected to deliver the following:

Deliverable	Content	Timing	Responsibilities
Inception Report	Consultant provides clarifications on timing and method	No later than 1 week before the mission to Panama.	Consultant submits to UNDP and GloBallast PCU
Presentation	Initial Findings	End of evaluation mission (London)	To PCU and UNDP
Draft Final Report	Full report, (per annexed template) with annexes	Within 3 weeks of the evaluation mission	Sent to IMO, reviewed by RTA, PCU, GEF OFPs
Final Report*	Revised report	Within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft	Sent to IMO and UNDP for uploading to UNDP ERC.

* When submitting the final evaluation report, the Consultant is required also to provide an 'audit trail', detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final evaluation report.

CONSULTANT/EVALUATOR ETHICS

Evaluation consultants will be held to the highest ethical standards and are required to sign a Code of Conduct (Annex E) upon acceptance of the assignment. UNDP evaluations are conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the [UNEG 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluations'](#).

PAYMENT SCHEDULE

Days	Milestone
15	Following submission of the inception report and completion of the first mission travel to Panama

15	Following submission and approval of the 1 st draft of the terminal evaluation report
10	Following submission and approval (IMO and UNDP RTA) of the final terminal evaluation report