

## TERMS OF REFERENCE

Title: **Consultant for Mid Term Review**

Project: Living with Change - Resilient Mangroves, Fisheries and People of Fiji and PNG

Report to: Programme Manager Great Sea Reef

Project #: SPPO0147

## PROJECT OVERVIEW

Small Island Development States are a group of countries that share a range of similar development and environmental degradation problems due to the particularities of insular systems, both geographically as well as ecologically. These issues are increasingly aggravated by the effects of climatic change, specifically more frequent extreme weather events, to which coastal communities are particularly vulnerable. Papua New Guinea and Fiji are two examples of countries where local populations that are highly and directly dependent on natural resources and ecosystem services, are continually degrading the very resource base they depend on for basic services such as food production and coastal protection. Notably, mangrove ecosystems that provide these services through fish production as well as storm and wave energy reduction, have been degraded significantly in both countries. Thus, the project is working towards a two-fold outcome:

- The sustainability and resilience of livelihoods and food security of the focal coastal communities in PNG and Fiji have improved to address climate change impacts  
and
- Critical mangrove ecosystems in the target areas are maintained or restored to effectively secure ecosystem services as an adaptive approach to climate change impacts.

In order to achieve these outcomes, the project applies a range of approaches to create the enabling conditions and increased awareness necessary for climate-adapted livelihoods and resource management. These include:

- Creation of awareness among resource users on climate change and its effects on the marine resource-based livelihoods people depend on
- Mainstreaming of climate change and adaptation considerations in community-based and other sub-national planning instruments including fisheries management as well as disaster risk reduction plans
- Mapping of critical mangrove areas and decision-making on their future management, including restoration measures
- Integration of sustainable fisheries measures under climate change considerations and strengthening of local fisheries management bodies
- Piloting of small-scale livelihoods initiatives to reduce dependency on marine resources
- Strengthening of PNG's and Fiji's role in regional initiatives for mangrove conservation

## PURPOSE, USE, OBJECTIVES, AND SCOPE OF THE MID-TERM-REVIEW

The Mid-Term-Review (MTR) should offer an opportunity to reflect upon the overall project progress and context by assessing the relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, adaptive capacity and sustainability of the project strategies in the review period. Focus shall lie on the criterion effectiveness.

So far, the project is considered to be well-delivered in both countries individually. However, the donor BMZ is particularly interested to see added value at the regional level – both between the two countries of implementation as well as for third countries, e.g. through regional bodies such as SPC or the Mangrove Charta.

Accordingly, the MTR is considered an integral part of the project's learning agenda and shall provide the basis for adaptive management in the remaining months of implementation until December 2020.

The MTR won't assess the general project impact since the timeframe of the project's goals and final outcome is far beyond the period reviewed.

The knowledge generated during the MTR will be used as basis for:

- Redesign/Prioritization of the project strategies and activities
- Adjustments of the project timeline and budget
- Reporting to donors to enhance accountability, credibility and transparency (for possible change requests)
- Sharing Lessons Learned within and outside of WWF regarding approaches for climate-adapted mangrove management

The MTR shall be carried out by WWF internally (WWF Pacific and Australia), under methodological guidance of an external consultant to facilitate the process. Results shall be made available to WWF Germany in due course.

## EVALUATION CRITERIA AND LEARNING QUESTIONS

### ***Criterion 1: Relevance and Quality of Design***

Relevance and quality of design is a measure of the extent to which the project design represents a necessary, sufficient, and appropriate approach to achieving changes in key factors (e.g. direct and indirect threats, opportunities, stakeholder positions, enabling conditions) necessary to bring about positive changes in targeted elements of biodiversity/footprint.

### **Key Questions to Assess Relevance and Quality of Design**

- RQ1. Relevance to context, priorities of stakeholders, and objectives:** *Is the project focusing on the identified threats and does it remain relevant in the current context? Are there any major shifts in the project context (political, economic, social, environmental, and legal) and in the attitude/priorities of stakeholder?*
- RQ2. Suitability of strategic approach:** *Is the theory of change clear? Has the project taken and will it continue to take the best, most efficient strategic approach?*
- RQ3. Coherence and sufficiency of project portfolio:** How does the project add up to other project and strategies in the region? How does the project integrates or is in line with ACAI's and Global Practices?
- RQ4. Adherence to WWF social policies:** What is the level of participation, representation and level of information sharing among vulnerable communities, involved or affected by the project? Were relevant social and environmental safeguards taken into consideration?

## **Criterion 2: Efficiency**

Efficiency is a measure of the relationship between outputs (i.e. the products or services of an intervention) and inputs (i.e. the resources that it uses), and may include a measure of 'value for money.'

### **Key Questions to Assess Efficiency**

#### **Efic1. Financial & Administrative Resources**

- *Are the financial and work plans consistent with one another (i.e. sufficient financial resources to support planned activities)? Are there improvements to be made in financial planning and resourcing?*
- *Is actual spend in line with the budget?*

**Efic2. Use of Time:** *Are there thorough, well founded work plans being implemented according to plan, monitored, and adapted as necessary?*

**Efic3. Human Resources:** *Are human resources appropriate, adequate, efficiently organized and operating effectively (e.g. include considerations of capacity needs and gaps, communications, division and clarity of roles and responsibilities, processes for evaluation and improvement)?*

## **Criterion 3: Effectiveness**

Effectiveness is a measure of the extent to which the intervention's intended outcomes—its specific objectives or intermediate results—have been achieved. More explicitly, effectiveness is the relationship between an intervention's *outputs*—its products or services or immediate results—and its *outcomes*—the intended changes in key factors affecting conservation targets (e.g. threats, behaviours, enabling conditions for conservation).

### **Key Questions to Assess Effectiveness**

**Efct1. Planned result versus Achievement:** *Focusing on stated objectives, desired outcomes, and intermediate results (as opposed to delivery of activities and outputs), what has and has not been achieved (both intended and unintended)?*

**Efct2. Factors Affecting Effectiveness:** *Which strategies are proving to be effective, and which are not? What anticipated and unanticipated factors have promoted or impeded the programme's progress? What supporting or impeding factors might affect successful implementation in the next planning period?*

**Efct3. Testing the Assumptions:** *To what extent have targeted key factors—drivers, opportunities, and threats —been affected to the degree they need to be to achieve the stated goals?*

- *Do the improved resource use planning regulations (fisheries management plans, disaster reduction plans etc.) lead to benefits or restrictions for the different stakeholders?*
- *Are the benefits or land use restrictions being realized by stakeholders? Do this lead to further positive change in attitudes and behaviors?*
- *Do positive changes in stakeholder's attitudes and behaviors lead to a reduction in threats such as unsustainable management practices, new infrastructure project without safeguards and unsustainable fishing practice etc.?*

**Efct4. Coordination & Communication:** *Which communication strategies with stakeholders and partners are effective? Which quality conditions for effective collaboration with stakeholders are given in the project? Are internal communication mechanisms sufficient to allow for effective steering of the project and maintaining the donor as well as WWF Germany informed (i.e. Regional Coordination Group, Project Steering Group)?*

**Efct5. Improving Effectiveness:** *What lessons can be taken and applied to improve effectiveness in the coming years?*

#### **Criterion 4: Impact – not considered in this MTR**

#### **Criterion 5: Sustainability**

Sustainability is a measure of whether the benefits of a conservation intervention are likely to continue after external support has ended.

##### **Key Questions to Assess Sustainability**

**Sust1. Evidence for Sustainability:** *Is there evidence that the following key ingredients are being established or exist to the extent necessary to ensure the desired impacts of the project?*

- *Necessary policy support measures.*
- *Adequate socio-cultural integration, including no negative impact on affected groups (e.g. by gender, religion, ethnicity, economic class) and/or on benefits realized by them, as well as ensuring necessary motivation, support, and leadership by relevant individuals and groups.*
- *Adequate institutional and organisational capacity and clear distribution of responsibilities among those organisations or individuals necessary to ensure continuity of project/programme activities or impacts. For example, local government, educational or religious institutions (e.g. schools, pagodas).*
- *Technical and economic viability and financial sustainability.*
- *Does the project provide sufficient added value to contribute to sustainable mangrove management on a regional level, the way it is structured and implemented at the moment?*

**Sust2. Exit—Phase Out Plan:** *Based upon existing plans and observations made during the evaluation, what are the key strategic options for the future of the project (e.g. exit, scale down, replicate, scale-up, continue business-as-usual, major changes to approach)?*

#### **Criterion 6: Adaptive Capacity**

Adaptive Capacity is a measure of the extent to which the project or programme regularly assesses and adapts its work, and thereby ensures continued relevance in changing contexts, strong performance, and learning.

##### **Key Questions to Assess Adaptive Capacity**

**AC1. Monitoring of efficiency, effectiveness, impact:**

- *Are adequate steps taken to ensure regular reflection on efficiency, effectiveness, and impact by the project team and partners? Is monitoring information being used to support regular adaptation of the strategic approach?*
- *Are lessons documented and shared in a manner that is promoting learning by the project team and the broader organisation?*

**AC2. Learning:** *Identify any exceptional experiences that should be highlighted regarding what worked and didn't work (e.g. case-studies, stories, good practices)?*

**AC3. Risk Assessment:** *How often were the original risks and assumptions revisited during the intervention cycle? Were the risks assessed adequately enough and were external assumptions identified realistically? How were mitigation strategies identified and responded to by the intervention team to optimize?*

## METHODOLOGY CONSIDERATIONS

The defined criteria for the project MTR will be assessed through a **mix of methods**:

1. **Desk research.** Prior the MTR workshop relevant documents should be prepared and consulted by the M&E team:
  - Project Progress Reports
  - Project proposals (situation analysis, etc.)
  - Project financial budgets & work plans
  - Risk Register
  - Monitoring Plan
  - Other project reports & reviews (program portfolio review)
2. **Learning Sessions during the MTR Workshop.** The Sessions will focus on the Criterion Effectiveness and Adaptive Capacity. Following methods and approach will be used:
  - Bucket Analysis:
    - Reflection on the ToC and the monitoring data for defined indicators/available information on the Outputs/Outcomes and Assumptions
    - Identification of Outputs/Outcomes with limited or no progress
    - What worked well? What does not work well?
    - Identification of causes
    - Assessment of the assumptions
    - Identification for adaptive management scenarios for improvement
3. **Interviews with selected stakeholder.** These can take place via telephone and video conference as well. The following stakeholders should be considered:
  - **Fiji:** Nailaga, Nacula, Tavua District Representatives, Ministry of Fisheries, Ba Provincial Office, Reserve Bank of Fiji, Uni Fiji.
  - **PNG:**
    - i. **Communities, LLGs and Districts**
      - Kranget/Bilia – Ward 1, Ambenob LLG, **Madang District**
      - Siar – Ward 5, Ambenob LLG, **Madang District**
      - Rempi, Ward 22, Sumgilbar LLG, **Sumkar District**
      - Ulingan Communities – Korak-Ward 35; Meiwok/Sarar/Sikor/Ulingan-Ward 34; Toto-Ward 33; Medebur-Ward 32 and Moro-Ward 24, Almami LLG, **Bogia District**
    - ii. **National & Provincial Government**
      - National Fisheries Authority
      - Climate Change Development Authority
      - Madang Provincial Administration – Disaster and Fisheries Divisions
    - iii. **Academic Institutions**
      - Divine Word University (DWU)** – Communications, Health Sciences, Post Graduate & Research and Tourism & Hospitality Faculties
      - University of Papua New Guinea** – Centre for Climate Change and Sustainable Development
    - iv. **Other Institutions**
      - National Development Bank/People's Micro bank
      - Tupira Surf Club
    - v. **Other NGOs**
      - World Vision PNG, Madang Area Programme
      - NGO Promotion Inc

MTR PROCESS, DELIVERABLES, AND TIMELINE

Major Evaluation Task/Output	Dates or Deadline	Who is Responsible

# Annex 1: MTR Report Structure

## Title Page

- ♦ Report title, project title, and contract number (if appropriate), Date of report, Authors and their affiliation, Locator map (if appropriate)

## Executive Summary (*max. 2 pages*)

- ♦ Principal findings and recommendations, organised by the evaluation criteria
- ♦ Summary of lessons learned

## Table of Contents

## List of Acronyms and Abbreviations

## Body of the report

### A. Introduction (*max 1 page*)

- Concise presentation of the project/programme characteristics
- Purpose, objectives, and intended use of the evaluation (reference and attach the ToR as an annex)
- Evaluation methodology and rationale for approach (reference and attach as annexes the mission itinerary; names of key informants; a list of consulted documents; and any synthesis tables containing project/programme information used in the exercise)
- Composition of the evaluation team, including any specific roles of team members

### B. Evaluation Findings and Recommendations (*4-6 pages*)

- Findings and recommendations organised by each of the evaluation criteria, including sufficient but concise rationale.
- Tables, graphics, and other figures to help convey key findings including template 'Management Response'

### C. Overall Lessons Learned (*max 3 pages*)

- Lessons learned regarding what worked, what didn't work, and why
- Lessons learned with wider relevance, that can be generalised beyond the project

## Annexes

- ♦ Terms of Reference
- ♦ MTR Design Matrix
- ♦ Documents consulted
- ♦ Project theory of change
- ♦ Specific project monitoring data, as appropriate
- ♦ Recommendations summary table

Prepared by Supervisor: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Accepted by Employee: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Approved by Country Manager: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

**A: What is to be provided by WWF PNG Office:**

1. Detail GL listing for the Withholding Tax Account



2. Ensure records are available for cross-checking and tying of outstanding balance as per the reconciliation to source documents.

**B: What is to be done by the Consultant?**

<b>Task #</b>	<b>What to do</b>	<b>Time frame</b>
1	Reconcile the detail GL listings (2005 to 2013) for Withholding Tax account and determine break-up of this accumulated tax balance of PGK119,291.75	3 working days
2	Review the summarised reconciliation working sheet with Supervisor Concern. The consultant will meet with his/her supervisor to go over the summary reconciled spreadsheet.	0.5 working days
3	Based on the agreed summarised reconciled worksheet. The Consultant will vouch to confirm and tie back the outstanding balances to source documents.	2.5 working days
4	Provide a Final Withholding Tax Reconciliation Report with recommendation on final steps to take to clear off the records.	2 working days

The Outcome of the Final Recommendation will be implemented by Contracting Office as per the Key deliverable output.