



The Regional Intergovernmental Organization for the
Conservation of the Environment of the Red sea & Gulf of Aden



الهيئة الإقليمية للمحافظة على بيئة البحر الأحمر وخليج عدن

**The Regional Organization for the Conservation of Environment of the Red Sea and
Gulf of Aden**

Terms of Reference for Individual Consultant

Final Evaluation of the Project

**Red Sea and Gulf of Aden Strategic Ecosystem Management
(SEM Project)**

July 2018

Jeddah, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia

Terms of Reference
Individual Consultant
Final Evaluation of the Red Sea and Gulf of Aden Strategic Ecosystem
Management (SEM) Project

1. Background

In accordance with the M&E policies and procedures of World Bank (WB) and Global Environmental Facilities (GEF), a Final Evaluation of the “Red Sea and Gulf of Aden Strategic Ecosystem Management” Project (hereafter referred to as SEM Project) is required. The project is executed by the Regional Organization for Conservation of Environment of the Red Sea and Gulf of Aden (PERSGA), and implemented by the WB with support from GEF. The project started on January 1st 2014 and is approaching its closing by 31st December 2018. This TOR sets out the prospect for the project Final Evaluation.

1.1 Project Development Objective

The project development objective is “To improve management of selected marine protected areas by local communities’ participation and strengthen information sharing between PERSGA member countries”.

The project has designed and implemented a set of inked interventions to achieve its PDO involving institutional and community technical assistance, capacity building and support of on-ground activities. It contains four components, which were tailored to the most urgent needs and preparedness at different local, country and regional levels. Components (1) and (2) focus on MPAs and living marine resources management, respectively, and are mainly executed at two selected MPAs pilot sites (Wadi el Gemal National Park in Egypt and Dungenab Bay-Mukkawar Island National Park in Sudan) but open as demos for knowledge and experience sharing among other MPAs in the regional network of project member states, which include Djibouti, Jordan, Egypt, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, and Yemen. Component (3) is executed in all project member states and focuses on promotion and harmonizing regional coastal environmental and related socioeconomic monitoring. Component (4) is a management component that supports the Project execution with administration, procurement, financial and fiduciary management, and Project monitoring and evaluation. A brief description of the four components and their main interventions is given below.

1.2 Project Components

1.2.1 Component 1: Strengthening the principles of marine managed areas through stakeholder driven MPA implementation

This component worked at two Marine Protected Areas as pilots to strengthen capacities of MPAs management and to serve as Marine Managed Areas. The component was focused on the following main interventions:

- Update MPAs management plans with community and other stakeholder input and support the management plans implementation.
- Build capacity of the community stakeholders and institutions involved in MPA management and MMA zoning
- Develop a series of engagements/exchanges between MPA authority staff among PERSGA member countries including lessons that one jurisdiction can share with

another, and education/ awareness materials that highlight the challenges and success of community-based management of MMAs.

1.2.2 Component 2: Strengthening coastal communities using incentives approach to improve fisheries management and achieve other marine resource benefits

This component supported institutional and technical capacity for MPAs communities to use and protect living marine resources, increase net benefits derived from the resources in a sustainable manner, understand trade-offs associated with development and the costs and benefits to the community, organize as user groups around these uses, and develop alternative livelihood options through a community-driven process. The component was focused on the following main interventions:

- Review of relevant legislation, policies and management practices to identify entry points and provide recommendations for supporting co-management approaches, and build capacity of local user groups including local community for co-management and monitoring their resource uses and impacts;
- Support identification, planning and implementing sustainable economic activities to demonstrate small scale, low impact alternative livelihood sub-projects that are compliant with environmental and social safeguards.
- Strengthen community participation, improve community compliance and build ownership for resource protection and sustainability.
- Promote institutional capacities and legal framework for regional collaboration in sustainable fishery management

1.2.3 Component 3: Regional Environmental and Socioeconomic Monitoring Supporting Ecosystem Based Management (EBM) and Community Benefits

This component built on ongoing monitoring activities to strengthen capacities and help standardizing monitoring variables and approach between the participating countries. It also supported expansion of monitoring scope to include socio-economic data, and promote knowledge exchanges, data comparability and sharing through regional networking and database. Specific MPAs within the regional network were monitored during the project geared to enhance the monitoring capacity of member countries. The component was focused on the following main interventions:

- Conduct a gap analysis of coastal environmental monitoring capacity in each country and update standard survey methods and other relevant manuals.
- Build capacities of specialists in national monitoring teams and provide institutional and equipment support to promote sustainable monitoring of coastal and marine environments in the countries.
- Facilitate workshops to harmonize monitoring methods, discuss lessons and share experience among countries.
- Support establishment of a standardized integrated monitoring database for the region.
- Strengthen outreach concerning monitoring by raising the profile of stakeholder engagement, and informing them and the decision makers of the monitoring results.

1.4.4 Component (4) Project Management

This component supported the Project execution with technical, administration, procurement, financial management, fiduciary fulfilment, and project monitoring and evaluation. It involved establishing the Project Regional Steering Committee “RSC”, establishing and running of the Project Coordination Unit “PCU”, coordinating with the countries for nominating National Coordinators “NCs” and establishing National Steering Committees “NSCs”. The component also includes training of PERSGA and the local project management level on the administrative aspects. The project is executed by PERSGA, and complies with GEF IW and World Bank reporting requirements (e.g. providing a GEF-IW webpage consistent with IW LEARN), provides IW Experience Notes, initiating a GEF IW tracking tool, providing routine M&E, external Mid-Term and Final Evaluations, providing lessons learned and other project information to IW-LEARN, and participating in GEF IW Conferences and relevant activities).

2. Consultancy

2.1 Objectives of the Final Evaluation “FE”

The objective of the FE is to gain an independent assessment of the project achievements and impacts. This end of project evaluation focuses on the entire implementation period, and is forward looking to capture effectively lessons learnt and provide information on the nature, extent and where possible, the potential impact and sustainability of the SEM project.

The evaluation will thus assess the project design, scope, implementation and achievements. It will collate and analyze lessons learnt, challenges faced and best practices obtained during implementation, which will inform the next programming strategy in response to its priorities, and make recommendations regarding the specific actions in this regard. These should emphasize, for example issues to be addressed in the future follow up interventions, significant outcomes and success stories for potential expansion and replication.

The FE 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, PERSGA Focal Points and National Coordinators, and key stakeholders. The review consultant is expected to conduct a field mission to witness project interventions. Interviews will be held with the following organizations and individuals at a minimum:

- PERSGA staff who have project responsibilities;
- Project National Coordinators
- Stakeholders including the National Steering Committees and beneficiary communities in at least two of the Participating Countries,

The consultant will review all relevant sources of information, such as the project documents, project reports, project budget revisions, quarterly financial reports, national strategic and legal documents, and any other material that he / she considers useful for this evidence-based review and evaluation.

2.2 Scope of the FE

The SEM Project evaluation will assess the effectiveness of the implementation strategy and the results. This will include the implementation modalities, co-financing roles and responsibilities, coordination and partnership arrangements, institutional strengthening, beneficiary participation, replication and sustainability of the project outcomes. The evaluation will include review of the

project design and assumptions made at the beginning of the project development process; project management including the implementation strategies; project activities, as to assess the extent to which the project results have been achieved, partnerships established, capacities built, and cross cutting issues of mainstreaming development issues. It will also assess whether the project implementation strategy has been optimum and recommend areas for improvement and learning.

In order to achieve FE objectives, the consultant will consider the following categories of project performance. For each category, the consultant is required to rate overall progress using a six-point rating scale exemplified in Annex I:

2.2.1 Relevance

The FE will assess the extent to which:

- The project design and focus are relevant to the identified needs and objectives;
- Inputs, strategies and interventions approached are realistic and appropriate;
- The project objectives and results were achieved, and impacts and outputs are adequate for the overall objective?

2.2.2 Effectiveness

The FE will examine how the project was effective in:

- management processes and appropriateness in supporting implementation and delivering desired/planned results;
- M&E mechanism contributing to meeting project results;
- implementation strategies;
- responding to the needs of the beneficiaries;
- involving stakeholders;
- Adaptive management and execution to overcome obstacles/challenges, or grasping opportunity to upscale/ expand results?

2.2.3 Efficiency

The FE will assess the efficiency of the project implementation with regard to:

- utilizing the fund resources, where actual/ expected results justify costs incurred;
- synergy and coordination with other overlapping and similar interventions (funded nationally and /or by other donors)
- considering collaboration with the national institutions, development partners, and NGOs (co-finance)
- management structures, procedure and accountability
- procurement and financial management processes and procedures

2.2.4 Sustainability

The FE will assess how sustainability issues were considered in the project design, planning and implementation, examining:

- The extent that the benefits of the project are likely to be sustained after the completion of this project; exit strategies, and approaches to phase out assistance provided by the project including contributing factors and constraints
- Key factors that will require attention in order to improve prospects of sustainability of Project outcomes

- Success stories and potential for their replication/ scaling up of the approaches and outcomes
- Sustainability of capacities built at the individual and organizational level
- Main lessons and recommendations for harmonizing or comparable/ extensive interventions in future, e.g. comprehensive proposals for future interventions based on the current evaluation findings.

2.3 Expected Deliverables

The following deliverables are expected (see schedule of deliverables in 2.4 below):

2.3.1 Inception report

The FE consultant will prepare an inception report which details his understanding of the evaluation, the evaluation approach and how the evaluation questions will be addressed. This is to ensure that the evaluator and the stakeholders have a shared view of the assessment. The inception report will include an evaluation matrix summarizing the evaluation design, methodology, questions, data sources, collection and analysis tools, and measures by which questions will be evaluated. The report will include the scope of work, work plan, time frame after starting the evaluation process. The inception report should include a proposed schedule of tasks; activities and deliverables, with clear responsibilities for each task or product. The inception report will be discussed and agreed upon with PERSGA and project stakeholders.

2.3.2 Draft Evaluation report

The FE consultant will prepare a draft SEM Evaluation Report, cognizant of the proposed format of the report and checklist used for the assessment of valuation report (outlined in 2.3.3 below). The draft report will be submitted to PERSGA review and comments by its review panel and stakeholders, and to validate that the evaluation considered all relevant information and meets the required approach and quality criteria. The report will be produced in English. PERSGA is responsible for ensuring timely arrangement for the review and validation of the report involving stakeholders' remarks within the time-frame allocated.

2.3.3 The Final Report

The consultant shall consider above comments on the draft report to develop the final report stakeholders. The content and the structure of the final analytical report with findings, recommendations and lessons learnt should cover the above scope of the evaluation and should meet the requirements of M & E for PERSGA and World Bank. The content is expected to include the following:

- Executive summary (2-4 pages)
- Introduction (1-2 page)
- Description of the evaluation methodology (6-8 pages)
- Background of the project (4-6 pages)
- Analysis regarding the achievements of the objectives, outputs and outcomes; challenges, impacts, etc. (8-10 pages)
- Analysis of opportunities for guidance in future interventions (4-6 pages)
- Key findings, including practices, lessons learned and success stories (6-8 pages)
- Conclusions and recommendations (4-6 pages)
- Appendices (charts, tables, terms of reference, itinerary, people interviewed, documents reviewed, further readings)

2.4 Final Evaluation Deliverables

Deliverable	Time Frame
Inception Report	Within one week after signing of contract
Review and agreement on Inception Report	Within one week days after submission of the report
Draft Final Report (including field mission)	Within four weeks after approval of the inception report
Review of Draft Final Report	Within one week after submission of the draft report
Final Report	Within one week of receiving PERSGA comments on draft report
Presentation of the key findings and recommendations in the final review regional workshop	Within a month from clearing the Final Report

2.5 Type of contract, duty station and payment

This contract falls under short-term consultant category system of PERGSA. Payment will be on a lump sum and installment basis as specified below.

The consultant will work from his home base, where he has access to the relevant technical literature, to prepare for the evaluation. He will undertake a mission to PERSGA region to conduct field assessments at the project sites to establish required arrangement and networking with review team at PERSGA and interview relevant participants/beneficiaries, examine project outputs, and review & update input information/data, and discuss, thematic approach, layout, analysis results, content, etc of the draft document.

The payment installments will be delivered as follows:

- 25% after adoption of the inception report
- 50% after undertaking the field mission and submission of the draft final report
- 25% after the approval of the final report, participation in the final evaluation workshop and submission of workshop report

2.6 Required qualifications/expertise and application procedure

- Advanced degree (preferable PhD) in environmental policies, coastal zone management, marine sciences, development policies, economic planning, economics, public administration, management or in any other related field.
- Extensive knowledge and expertise in the field of evaluation of development projects and programs, including working with international organizations and donors, relevant technical areas for at least 10 years;

- Recent experience with result-based management evaluation methodologies, applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios;
- Demonstrable analytical skills;
- Excellent English communication skills. Arabic and French are advantages
- Experience with working in the region will be an added value.

Qualified candidates are requested to send their updated CVs, together with expression of interest to PERSGA in Jeddah, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, at the email address: projects@persga.org.

Annex I. Final Evaluation Review Rating Scale

Rating scale for project achievements

Highly Satisfactory (HS)	Project has achieved or exceeded all its major environmental and socioeconomic objectives, and yielded substantial environmental and socioeconomic benefits, without major shortcomings. The project can be presented as “good practice”.
Satisfactory (S)	Project has achieved most of its major environmental and socioeconomic objectives, and yield satisfactory environmental and socioeconomic benefits, with only minor shortcomings.
Moderately Satisfactory (MS)	Project has achieved most of its major relevant objectives but with either significant shortcomings or modest overall relevance. Project has achieved some of its major environmental and socioeconomic objectives or yielded some of the expected environment benefits.
Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)	Project has achieved some of its major global environmental and socioeconomic objectives but with major shortcomings, or achieved only some of its major environmental and socioeconomic objectives.
Unsatisfactory (U)	Project has not achieved most of its major environment or socioeconomic objectives n or yielded any satisfactory relevant benefits.
Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)	The project has failed to achieve any of its major environment objectives with no worthwhile benefits.

Rating scale for project management arrangement/ adaptive management

Highly Satisfactory (HS)	The project has no shortcomings and can be presented as “good practice”.
Satisfactory (S)	The project has minor shortcomings.
Moderately Satisfactory (MS)	The project has moderate shortcomings.
Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)	The project has significant shortcomings.
Unsatisfactory (U)	The project has major shortcomings.
Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)	The project has severe shortcomings.

Cofinance Table

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financer	Type of Co-financing	Confirmed at CEO endorsement / approval	Actual Amount Materialized at final review	Remarks
		Total			