

**MID-TERM REVIEW TERMS OF REFERENCE**

# Position Information

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Post Title: | Mid Term Evaluation Consultant |
| Practice Area: | Environment and Livelihoods |
| Post Level: | International Consultant |
| Duration of the assignment: | Maximum 30 working days spread over 11 weeks (11th December 2023 to 20th February 2024) |
| Duty station: | Thimphu, with travel to the target field sites (about 10-14 working days) |
| Cluster/Project: | Environment &Livelihood Portfolio |
| Supervisor: | Portfolio Manager, Environment &Livelihood Portfolio |

# INTRODUCTION

This is the Terms of Reference (ToR) for the UNDP-GEF Midterm Review (MTR) of the *full* -sized project titled **“**“Mainstreaming biodiversity Conservation into the tourism sector in Bhutan” (PIMS 6319) implemented through the Department of Tourism, Ministry of Industry, Commerce and Employment, Royal Government of Bhutan, which is to be undertaken from *2021-2026*. The project started on August 11*, 2021* and is in its *third* year of implementation. **In line with the UNDP-GEF Guidance on MTRs, this MTR process was initiated after the submission of the First Project Implementation Report (PIR).** This ToR sets out the expectations for this MTR. The MTR process must follow the guidance outlined in the document [*Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects*](http://web.undp.org/evaluation/documents/guidance/GEF/mid-term/Guidance_Midterm%20Review%20_EN_2014.pdf)*.*

# PROJECT BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Bhutan has adopted a unique cautious approach to tourism development guided by “High value, Low volume” since its inception in the early 1970s. This unique approach has consistently sought to ensure tourism growth consistent with the carrying capacity of our physical, socio-cultural, and natural environment and ensure that the benefits from tourism are maximized with minimal negative impacts while providing a rewarding experience for our visitors.

Bhutan’s tourism industry continued to grow, albeit the halt created by the COVID-19 pandemic, to become one of the major economic sectors contributing significantly toward socio-economic development of the country through revenue and foreign currency generation and employment creation amongst others. Prior to the pandemic, in 2019 a total of 315,599 foreign individuals visited Bhutan which is an increase of 15% over 2018 contributing in excess of US$300million in tourism receipts and US$23.42million in direct tourism revenue through the Sustainable Development Fees. This has created employment opportunities for over 52,000 individuals and business opportunities for over 6,500 tourism establishments in the country. The growth in tourism has also promoted growth in other sectors such as agriculture, handicrafts, entertainment, transport and related services across the diverse tourism value chain.

The Department of Tourism (erstwhile Tourism Council of Bhutan (TCB) is implementing the UNDP-Global Environment Facility (GEF) funded Ecotourism project on “Mainstreaming biodiversity Conservation into the tourism sector in Bhutan”. The project seeks to mainstream biodiversity conservation into tourism development in Bhutan as a long-term strategy for mitigation of threats to biodiversity and to generate sustainable conservation financing and livelihoods. The project intends to establish Bhutan as a **model ecotourism destination** to generate livelihood opportunities, sustainable financing for landscapes within and outside protected areas, facilitate human-wildlife coexistence, and mitigate the negative impacts of increasing tourism on Bhutan’s socio-cultural heritage and globally significant biodiversity.

The project landscape includes two protected areas of Bumdeling Wildlife Sanctuary and Sakteng Wildlife Sanctuary in eastern Bhutan and five Dzongkhags (districts) of Lhuentse, Mongar, Trashigang, Trashi Yangtse and Zhemgang that covers 19 gewogs/blocks. The project has a total budget of USD 13,926,690 comprising of a grant from GEF resources of USD 4,854,128 and co-finance from UNDP CO and the government of USD 9,072,562.

**The project has three main components:**

**Component 1:** Enabling and coordinated policy and institutional framework for ecotourism and wildlife tourism.

**Component 2:** Demonstration of innovative and diversified ecotourism within the landscape that supports human-wildlife coexistence.

**Component 3:** Ecotourism capacity, promotion, knowledge management and M&E

The project implementing partner is the Department of Tourism, Ministry of Industry, Commerce and Employment (MOICE). Department of Forest and Park Services (DoFPS), Ministry of Energy & Natural Resources (MoENR), District administrations and gewogs and community members are also involved in implementation process. The collaborative arrangement has been set up at the technical level through the designation of focal persons in the line ministries and departments.

The project implementation was slightly delayed in the first year due to COVID-19 and national transformation and reform initiatives. However, the project implementation has picked up from second year.

**OBJECTIVES OF THE MTR**

The MTR will assess progress towards the achievement of the project objectives and outcomes as specified in the Project document, and assess early signs of project success or failure with the goal of identifying the necessary changes to be made in order to set the project on-track to achieve its intended results. The MTR will also review the project’s strategy, action plans, and its risks to sustainability.

* The main purpose of the MTR is to assess whether the project is on course in line with its project strategic target setting and UNDP Country Programme Document, and make recommendation to enhance and improve the project performance as well as suggestion for future improvement (i.e. in the areas related to the appropriate project design, process of implementation, effectiveness, efficiency, partnership and sustainability).
* Using the results findings and lessons learnt to improve the project document and framework to reflect on the current project context and situation with strong connection to the Country Programme Action Plan (CPAP) / Country Programme Document and related current strategic country focused areas.

# MTR APPROACH & METHODOLOGY

The MTR must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful.

The MTR team will review all relevant sources of information including documents prepared during the preparation phase (i.e. PIF, UNDP Initiation Plan, UNDP Environmental & Social Safeguard Policy, the Project Document, project reports including Annual Project Review/PIRs, project budget revisions, lesson learned reports, national strategic and legal documents, and any other materials that the team considers useful for this evidence-based review). The MTR team will review the baseline GEF focal area Tracking Tool submitted to the GEF at CEO endorsement, and the midterm GEF focal area Tracking Tool that must be completed before the MTR field mission begins.

The MTR team is expected to follow a collaborative and participatory approach[[1]](#footnote-2) ensuring close engagement with the Project Team, government counterparts (the GEF Operational Focal Point), the UNDP Country Office, UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Adviser, direct beneficiaries, and other key stakeholders.

Engagement of stakeholders is vital to a successful MTR.[[2]](#footnote-3) Stakeholder involvement should include interviews with stakeholders who have project responsibilities, including but not limited to *(Department of Tourism, Ministry of Industry, Commerce and Employment, Ministry of Energy and Natural Resources, Department of Forests and Park Services, District Administrations of Tashiyangtse, Tashigang, Mongar, Lhuntse and Zhemgang, Sakteng Wildife Sanctuary, Bumdeling Wildlife Sanctuary,*); executing agencies, senior officials and task team/ component leaders, key experts and consultants in the subject area, Project Board, project stakeholders, academia, local government and CSOs, etc. Considering the COVID-19 situation, the MTR team should consider using technologies and tools to effectively engage stakeholders virtually.

Additionally, the MTR team may require conducting field missions to the project landscapes that include the following:

* **Five districts:** covering Tashiyangtse, Tashigang, Mongar, Lhuntse and Zhemgang
* **Two Protected areas and three forestry divisions:** , covering Sakteng Wildlife Sanctuary and Bumdeling Wildlife Sanctuary, forestry divisions of Mongar, Tashigang and Zhemgang.

The final MTR report should describe the full MTR approach taken and the rationale for the approach making explicit the underlying assumptions, challenges, strengths and weaknesses about the methods and approach of the review.

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

The final methodological approach including interview schedule, field visits and data to be used in the MTR should be clearly outlined in the Inception Report and be fully discussed and agreed between UNDP, stakeholders and the MTR team.

A validation mission may be considered if it is confirmed to be safe for staff, consultants, stakeholders and if such a mission is possible within the MTR schedule.

# DETAILED SCOPE OF THE MTR

The MTR team will assess the following four categories of project progress. See the [*Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects*](http://web.undp.org/evaluation/documents/guidance/GEF/mid-term/Guidance_Midterm%20Review%20_EN_2014.pdf) for extended descriptions.

### Project Strategy

**Project design:**

* Review the problem addressed by the project and the underlying assumptions.
* Review the effect of any incorrect assumptions or changes to the context to achieving the project results as outlined in the Project Document.
* Review the impact of global pandemic (Covid -19) to the project and potential opportunities for post Covid recovery actions.
* Review the relevance of the project strategy and assess whether it provides the most effective route towards expected/intended results. Were lessons from other relevant projects properly incorporated into the project design?
* Was the project concept in line with the national sector development priorities and plans of the country.
* Review how the project addresses country priorities including the 13 FYP and country ownership.
* Review the opportunities the project should adapt to achieve the outcomes.
* Review decision-making processes: were perspectives of those who would be affected by project decisions, those who could affect the outcomes, and those who could contribute information or other resources to the process, taken into account during project design processes?
* Review the extent to which relevant gender and safeguard issues were raised in the project design. See Annex 9 of *Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects* for further guidelines.
* If there are major areas of concern, recommend areas for improvement.

### Results Framework/Logframe:

* Undertake a critical analysis of the project’s logframe indicators and targets, assess how “SMART” the midterm and end-of-project targets are (Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Relevant, Time-bound), and suggest specific amendments/revisions to the targets and indicators as necessary.
* Are the project’s objectives and outcomes or components clear, practical, and feasible within its time frame?
* Examine if progress so far has led to or could in the future catalyse beneficial development effects (i.e. income generation, biodiversity conservation, gender equality and women’s empowerment, improved governance etc...) that should be included in the project results framework and monitored on an annual basis.
* Ensure broader development and gender aspects of the project are being monitored effectively. Develop and recommend SMART ‘development’ indicators, including sex-disaggregated indicators and indicators that capture development benefits.

### ii. Progress Towards Results

**Progress Towards Outcomes Analysis:**

* Review the logframe indicators against progress made towards the end-of-project targets using the Progress Towards Results Matrix and following the *Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects*; colour code progress in a “traffic light system” based on the level of progress achieved; assign a rating on progress for each outcome; make recommendations from the areas marked as “Not on target to be achieved” (red).

**Table. Progress Towards Results Matrix (Achievement of outcomes against End-of-project Targets).**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Project Strategy** | **Indicator[[3]](#footnote-4)** | **Baseline Level[[4]](#footnote-5)** | **Level in 1st PIR (self- reported)** | **Midterm Target[[5]](#footnote-6)** | **End-of-project Target** | **Midterm Level & Assessment[[6]](#footnote-7)** | **Achievement Rating[[7]](#footnote-8)** | **Justification for Rating** |
| **Objective:** | Indicator (if applicable): |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Outcome 1:** | Indicator 1: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Indicator 2: |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Outcome 2:** | Indicator 3: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Indicator 4: |  |  |  |  |  |
| Etc. |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Etc.** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**Indicator Assessment Key**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Green= Achieved | Yellow= On target to be achieved | Red= Not on target to be achieved |

**In addition to the progress towards outcomes analysis:**

* Review the project’s alignment/transition to GEF Core Indicators in accordance with the GEF 2019 Guidelines on Core Indicators and Sub-indicators.
* Compare and analyse the GEF Tracking Tool/Core Indicator at the Baseline with the one completed right before the Midterm Review.
* Identify remaining barriers to achieving the project objective in the remainder of the project.
* By reviewing the aspects of the project that have already been successful, identify ways in which the project can further expand these benefits.

### iii. Project Implementation and Adaptive Management

**Management Arrangements:**

* Review overall effectiveness of project management as outlined in the Project Document. Have changes been made and are they effective? Are responsibilities and reporting lines clear? Is decision-making transparent and undertaken in a timely manner? Recommend areas for improvement.
* Review the quality of execution of the Executing Agency/Implementing Partner(s) and recommend areas for improvement.
* Review the quality of support provided by the GEF Partner Agency (UNDP) and recommend areas for improvement.
* Do the Executing Agency/Implementing Partner and/or UNDP and other partners have the capacity to deliver benefits to or involve women? If yes, how?
* What is the gender balance of project staff? What steps have been taken to ensure gender balance in project staff?
* What is the gender balance of the Project Board? What steps have been taken to ensure gender balance in the Project Board?

**Work Planning:**

* Review any delays in project start-up and implementation, identify the causes and examine if they have been resolved.
* Review and propose an acceleration plan that would help project to achieve results as well as financial delivery
* Are work-planning processes results-based? If not, suggest ways to re-orientate work planning to focus on results?

Examine the use of the project’s results framework/ logframe as a management tool and review any changes made to it since project start.

**Finance and co-finance:**

* Consider the financial management of the project, with specific reference to the cost-effectiveness of interventions.
* Review the changes to fund allocations as a result of budget revisions and assess the appropriateness and relevance of such revisions.
* Does the project have the appropriate financial controls, including reporting and planning, that allow management to make informed decisions regarding the budget and allow for timely flow of funds?
* Informed by the co-financing monitoring table to be filled out, provide commentary on co-financing: is co-financing being used strategically to help the objectives of the project? Is the Project Team meeting with all co-financing partners regularly in order to align financing priorities and annual work plans?

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

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

**Project-level Monitoring and Evaluation Systems:**

* Review the monitoring tools currently being used: Do they provide the necessary information? Do they involve key partners? Are they aligned or mainstreamed with national systems? Do they use existing information? Are they efficient? Are they cost-effective? Are additional tools required? How could they be made more participatory and inclusive?
* Examine the financial management of the project monitoring and evaluation budget. Are sufficient resources being allocated to monitoring and evaluation? Are these resources being allocated effectively?
* Review the extent to which relevant gender issues were incorporated in monitoring systems. See Annex 9 of Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects for further guidelines.

**Stakeholder Engagement:**

* Project management: Has the project developed and leveraged the necessary and appropriate partnerships with direct and tangential stakeholders?
* Participation and country-driven processes: Do local and national government stakeholders support the objectives of the project? Do they continue to have an active role in project decision-making that supports efficient and effective project implementation?
* Participation and public awareness: To what extent has stakeholder involvement and public awareness contributed to the progress towards achievement of project objectives?
* How does the project engage women and girls? Is the project likely to have the same positive and/or negative effects on women and men, girls and boys? Identify, if possible, legal, cultural, or religious constraints on women’s participation in the project. What can the project do to enhance its gender benefits?

**Reporting:**

* Assess how adaptive management changes have been reported by the project management and shared with the Project Board.
* Assess how well the Project Team and partners undertake and fulfil GEF reporting requirements (i.e. how have they addressed poorly rated PIRs, if applicable?)
* Assess how lessons derived from the adaptive management process have been documented, shared with key partners and internalized by partners.

**Communications & Knowledge Management:**

* Review internal project communication with stakeholders: Is communication regular and effective? Are there key stakeholders left out of communication? Are there feedback mechanisms when communication is received? Does this communication with stakeholders contribute to their awareness of project outcomes and activities and investment in the sustainability of project results?
* Review external project communication: Are proper means of communication established or being established to express the project progress and intended impact to the public (is there a web presence, for example? Or did the project implement appropriate outreach and public awareness campaigns?)
* For reporting purposes, write one half-page paragraph that summarizes the project’s progress towards results in terms of contribution to sustainable development benefits, as well as global environmental benefits.

**Social and Environmental Standards (Safeguards)**

* Validate the risks identified in the project’s most current SESP, and those risks’ ratings; are any revisions needed?
* Summarize and assess the revisions made since CEO Endorsement/Approval (if any) to:
  + The project’s overall safeguards risk categorization.
  + The identified types of risks[[8]](#footnote-9) (in the SESP).
  + The individual risk ratings (in the SESP).
* Describe and assess progress made in the implementation of the project’s social and environmental management measures as outlined in the SESP submitted at CEO Endorsement/Approval (and prepared during implementation, if any), including any revisions to those measures. Such management measures might include Environmental and Social Management Plans (ESMPs) or other management plans, though can also include aspects of a project’s design; refer to Question 6 in the SESP template for a summary of the identified management measures.

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

### iv. Sustainability

* Validate whether the risks identified in the Project Document, Annual Project Review/PIRs and UNDP Risk Management Module are the most important and whether the risk ratings applied are appropriate and up to date. If not, explain why.
* In addition, assess the following risks to sustainability:

**Financial risks to sustainability:**

* What is the likelihood of financial and economic resources not being available once the GEF assistance ends (consider potential resources can be from multiple sources, such as the public and private sectors, income generating activities, and other funding that will be adequate financial resources for sustaining project’s outcomes)?

**Socio-economic risks to sustainability:**

* Are there any social or political risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project outcomes? What is the risk that the level of stakeholder ownership (including ownership by governments and other key stakeholders) will be insufficient to allow for the project outcomes/benefits to be sustained? Do the various key stakeholders see that it is in their interest that the project benefits continue to flow? Is there sufficient public / stakeholder awareness in support of the long-term objectives of the project? Are lessons learned being documented by the Project Team on a continual basis and shared/ transferred to appropriate parties who could learn from the project and potentially replicate and/or scale it in the future?

**Institutional Framework and Governance risks to sustainability:**

* Do the legal frameworks, policies, governance structures and processes pose risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project benefits? While assessing this parameter, also consider if the required systems/ mechanisms for accountability, transparency, and technical knowledge transfer are in place.

**Environmental risks to sustainability:**

* Are there any environmental risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project outcomes?

### Conclusions & Recommendations

The MTR team will include a section of the report setting out the MTR’s evidence-based conclusions, in light of the findings.[[9]](#footnote-10)

Recommendations should be succinct suggestions for critical intervention that are specific, measurable, achievable, and relevant. A recommendation table should be put in the report’s executive summary. See the *Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects* for guidance on a recommendation table.

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

**Ratings**

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

Table. MTR Ratings & Achievement Summary Table for “Mainstreaming biodiversity Conservation into the tourism sector in Bhutan” Project

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Measure** | **MTR Rating** | **Achievement Description** |
| **Project Strategy** | N/A |  |
| **Progress Towards Results** | Objective Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale) |  |
| Outcome 1 Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale) |  |
| Outcome 2 Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale) |  |
| Outcome 3 Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale) |  |
| Etc. |  |
| **Project Implementation & Adaptive Management** | (rate 6 pt. scale) |  |
| **Sustainability** | (rate 4 pt. scale) |  |

# TIMEFRAME

The MTR consultancy will be approximately 30 working days over a time period of 11 weeks starting from 11th December 2023- 20th February 2024 and shall not exceed FOUR months from when the consultant is hired. The tentative MTR timeframe is as follows:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **TIMEFRAME** | **ACTIVITY** |
| 20th November 2023 | Application closes |
| 5th December 2023 | Select MTR Team |
| 11th December, 2023 | Contract Signing |
| 13th December 2023 ( 4 days) | Document review and preparing MTR Inception Report |
| 18th December 2023 (3 days) | Finalization andValidation of MTR Inception Report |
| 25th December 2023 (9 days) | [[10]](#footnote-11)MTR mission: stakeholder meetings, interviews, field visits[1] |
| 8th January 2024 (5days) | Submission of draft report |
| 19th January 2024 (5 days) | Incorporating audit trail from feedback on draft report/Finalization of MTR report (note: accommodate time delay in dates for circulation and review of the draft report) and preparation of management Response |
| 26th January 2024 (1 day) | Concluding Stakeholder Workshop with the MTR team and the stakeholders. |
| 1st February 2024 (3days) | Expected date of full MTR completion |

# MIDTERM REVIEW DELIVERABLES

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **#** | **Deliverable** | **Description** | **Timing** | **Responsibilities** |
| **1** | **MTR Inception Report** | MTR team clarifies objectives and methods of Midterm Review | No later than 2 weeks before the MTR mission: 18th December 2023 | MTR team submits to the Commissioning Unit and project management |
| **2** | **Presentation** | Initial Findings | End of MTR mission: 26th December 2023 | MTR Team presents to project management and the Commissioning Unit |
| **3** | **Draft Final Report** | Full report (using guidelines on content outlined in Annex B) with annexes | Within 3 weeks of the MTR mission: 19th January 2024 | Sent to the Commissioning Unit, reviewed by RTA, Project Coordinating Unit, GEF OFP |
| **4** | **Final Report\*** | Revised report with audit trail detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final MTR report | Within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft: 1st February 2024 | Sent to the Commissioning Unit |

\*The final MTR report must be in English. If applicable, the Commissioning Unit may choose to arrange for a translation of the report into a language more widely shared by national stakeholders.

# 7. MTR ARRANGEMENTS

The principal responsibility for managing this MTR resides with the Commissioning Unit. The Commissioning Unit for this project’s MTR is UNDP Bhutan Country office. Supervision and monitoring performance of the consultant shall be provided by UNDP BTN CO. The Portfolio Manager of Environment & Livelihood Cluster will provide overall quality assurance on the draft reports.

The commissioning unit will contract the consultants and ensure the timely provision of per diems and travel arrangements in Bhutan for the MTR team, if the travel is permitted. The Project Team will be responsible for liaising with the MTR team to provide all relevant documents, set up stakeholder interviews, and arrange field visits.

The Commissioning Unit and Project Team will provide logistic support in the implementation of remote/ virtual meetings if travel to project site is restricted. An updated stakeholder list with contact details (phone and email) will be provided by the Commissioning Unit to the MTR team.

# TEAM COMPOSITION

A team of two independent consultants will conduct the MTR - one international team leader (with experience and exposure to projects and evaluations in other regions globally) and one local expert from the country of the project. The consultants cannot have participated in the project preparation, formulation, and/or implementation (including the writing of the Project Document) and should not have a conflict of interest with project’s related activities.

The National Consultant will be recruited separately to support the International Consultant, who will be the team leader. The International Consultant will be required to work with the National Consultant as a team to complete the assignment.

The national consultant will work closely with the International Consultant in supporting any work that needs to be undertaken as laid out in this ToR, and other tasks, as required. The National Consultant will also act as a focal point for coordinating and working with relevant stakeholders in Bhutan. In the case of international travel restriction and the mission is not possible, the MTR team will use alternative means of interviewing stakeholders and data collection (i.e. Skype interview, mobile questionnaires, etc.) including the field visit by the National Consultant under the International Consultant’s guidance.

The selection of consultants will be aimed at maximizing the overall “team” qualities in the following areas:

Recent experience with result-based management evaluation methodologies;

* Experience applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios;
* Competence in adaptive management, as applied to GEF focal areas including Biodiversity, Climate Change Adaptation and Sustainable Forest Management, ecotourism.
* Experience working with the GEF or GEF-evaluations;
* Experience working in the least developed countries particularly in the Asia Region;
* Work experience in relevant technical areas for at least 10 years;
* Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender and GEF focal areas such as Biodiversity Conservation, Climate Change Adaptation and Sustainable Forest Management, ecotourism; experience in gender sensitive evaluation and analysis.
* Excellent communication skills;
* Demonstrable analytical skills;
* Project evaluation/review experiences within United Nations system will be considered an asset;
* Experience with implementing evaluations remotely will be considered an asset.
* A Master’s degree in fields of Agriculture, Natural Resource Management, ecotourism, and Climate Change Adaptation, or other closely related field.

### Qualification Criteria

**The Team Leader/International Consultant** should possess the following qualifications and experience:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Education: | At least a Master’s degree or equivalent in fields related to Biodiversity conservation, Natural Resource Management, Ecotourism, Agriculture, Tourism, Policy and development, Environment Management, Climate Change, and Community development and relevant field. |
| Experience: | * A minimum of 10 years of relevant experience is required. * Strong technical background in ecotourism, biodiversity conservation, protected areas management, livelihoods, or related areas of natural resource management in the Asia-Pacific region, preferably experience working in Bhutan. * Substantive experience in reviewing and evaluating similar projects, preferably those involving UNDP/GEF or other United Nations development agencies or major donors; * Experience applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios; |
| Competencies: | Demonstrate ability to assess complex situations, succinctly distills critical issues, and draw forward-looking conclusions and recommendations;  Ability and experience to lead multi-disciplinary and national teams, and deliver quality reports within the given time;  Highly knowledgeable of participatory monitoring and evaluation processes, and experience in evaluation of technical assistance projects with major donor agencies;  Familiarity with the challenges developing countries face in adapting to climate change; livelihood and economy, and Familiarity with Bhutan or similar countries;  Excellent interpersonal, coordination and planning skills, and ability to work in a team.  Ability and willingness to travel to districts. |
| Language Requirements: | Excellent English writing and communication skills |

# 10. PAYMENT MODALITIES AND SPECIFICATIONS

*First payment:* 20% of the contract lump-sum amount will be paid within 15 days after submission and acceptance of the consultancy inception report which includes work-plan, key milestones and approach of conducing the assignment consistent with the Terms of Reference.

*Second payment:* 40% of the contract lump-sum amount will be paid within 15 days after submission the draft evaluation report and draft revised RRF.

*Last payment:* 40% of the contract lump-sum amount will be paid within 15 days after submission and acceptance of the final evaluation report and final revised RRF.

Every payment is subject to receipt of certification of payment and performance evaluation for the last payment duly completed and signed by Portfolio Manager, Environment and Livelihood Cluster, UNDP – Bhutan.

In line with the UNDP’s financial regulations, when determined by the Commissioning Unit and/or the consultant that a deliverable or service cannot be satisfactorily completed due to the impact of COVID-19 and limitations to the MTR, that deliverable or service will not be paid.

Due to the current COVID-19 situation and its implications, a partial payment may be considered if the consultant invested time towards the deliverable but was unable to complete to circumstances beyond his/her control.

11. **Criteria for selection**

A combined scoring method will be used to evaluate the offers. Technical Evaluation Criteria will be weighted a maximum of 70% and combined with the price offer which will be weighted a maximum of 30%.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1. **Academic qualification and specialization of the national Consultant** | | **Points (10)** |
| 1.1 | * Minimum of Master’s degree or equivalent in fields related to project management, Monitoring and evaluation, Biodiversity conservation, Natural Resource Management, Ecotourism, Tourism, Policy and development, Environment Management, Climate Change, and Community development and relevant field.   Points allocation:  Proven qualification in Project management, Monitoring and Evaluation, Community Development, Policy and Planning. Biodiversity conservation and Environment management: 10 points  Proven qualification in Policy and Planning, Biodiversity conservation, Environment Management and other relevant field: 5 points | 10 |
|  | **TOTAL SECTION 1** | **10** |
|  | | |
| 1. **Technical competency of the International Consultant (prior consulting experience)** | | **Points (30)** |
| 2.1 | Should have at least 10 years of relevant work experience in Experience/knowledge in Project management, Monitoring and Evaluation, Gender mainstreaming, Social and Environmental safe guards, Policy and planning, ecotourism, biodiversity conservation, protected areas management, livelihoods, or related areas of natural resource management in the Asia-Pacific region. Substantive experience in reviewing and evaluating similar projects, preferably those involving UNDP/GEF or other United Nations development agencies or major donors. *(maximum points 15)*  Points allocation:  More than 15 years of relevant work experience with proven record of evaluation of project of similar scope, nature and complexity: 15 *points.*  *Completed more than* 10 years of relevant work experience with proven record of evaluation of project of similar scope, nature and complexity: 10 *points.*  *Completed at least* 10 years of relevant work experience with proven record of evaluation of project of similar scope, nature and complexity: 5 *points.* | 15 |
| 2.2 | Shall have completed at least five projects related to Monitoring and Evaluation for projects. *(maximum points 15)*  Points allocation:  Completed 10 to 15 such assignments (M&E and Mid-term review): 15 *points.*  Completed 7 to 10 such assignments (M&E and Mid-term review): 10 *points.*  Completed at least 5 such assignments (M&E and Mid-term review): 5 *points.* | 15 |
|  | **TOTAL SECTION 2** | **30** |
|  | | |
| 1. **Quality of technical proposal (methodology)** | | **Points (30)** |
| 3.1 | Detailed elaboration and understanding of requirements *(maximum points 15)*  Points allocation:  Methodology fully addresses all tasks specified and demonstrates no weakness: *15 points.*  Addresses all aspects of the ToR but and demonstrates only a few minor weaknesses: 10 *points.* | 15 |
| 3.2 | Appropriateness and feasibility of the proposed timeline (*(maximum points 15*)  Points allocation:  Proposed timeline is in line with the tasks as specified in the TOR and supported by clear evidence to demonstrate feasibility = 15 points  Proposed timeline is slightly deviating from the tasks as specified in the TOR and demonstrated minor weaknesses = 10 points | 15 |
|  | **TOTAL SECTION 3** | **30** |
|  | **Sub Total Technical** | **70** |
|  | **Sub-Total Financial** | **30** |
|  | **Total (Technical + Financial)** | **100** |

# 12. APPLICATION PROCESS

### Recommended Presentation of Proposal:

a) Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability using the template[[11]](#footnote-12) provided by UNDP;

b) CV or a Personal History Form (P11 form[[12]](#footnote-13));

c) Brief description of approach to work/technical proposal of why the individual considers him/herself as the most suitable for the assignment, and a proposed methodology on how they will approach and complete the assignment; (max 1 page)

d) Financial Proposal that indicates the all-inclusive fixed total contract price and all other travel related costs (such as flight ticket, per diem, etc), supported by a breakdown of costs, as per template attached to the Letter of Confirmation of Interest template. If an applicant is employed by an organization/company/institution, and he/she expects his/her employer to charge a management fee in the process of releasing him/her to UNDP under Reimbursable Loan Agreement (RLA), the applicant must indicate at this point, and ensure that all such costs are duly incorporated in the financial proposal submitted to UNDP.

All application materials should be submitted to the address (UNDP Country Office, Bhutan) in a sealed envelope indicating the following reference “Consultant for (Enhancing Sustainability and Climate Resilience of Forest and Agriculture Landscape and Community Livelihoods in Bhutan) Midterm Review” or by email at the following address ONLY: ([procurement.bt@undp.org](mailto:procurement.bt@undp.org)) by (12.00 pm and September 20, 2020). Incomplete applications will be excluded from further consideration.

Criteria for Evaluation of Proposal: Only those applications which are responsive and compliant will be evaluated. Offers will be evaluated according to the Combined Scoring method – where the educational background and experience on similar assignments will be weighted at 70% and the price proposal will weigh as 30% of the total scoring. The applicant receiving the Highest Combined Score that has also accepted UNDP’s General Terms and Conditions will be awarded the contract.

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

1. PIF
2. UNDP Initiation Plan
3. UNDP Project Document
4. UNDP Environmental and Social Screening results
5. Project Inception Report
6. All Project Implementation Reports (PIR’s)
7. Quarterly progress reports and work plans of the various implementation task teams
8. Audit reports
9. The proposed Core Indicator mid-term values (and adjusted baselines if possible)
10. Oversight mission reports
11. All monitoring reports prepared by the project
12. Financial and Administration guidelines used by Project Team

The following documents will also be available:

1. Project operational guidelines, manuals and systems
2. UNDP country/countries programme document(s)
3. Minutes of the ***(Ecotourism project: Mainstreaming biodiversity conservation into the tourism sector in Bhutan)*** Project Steering Committee Meetings and other meetings (i.e. Project Appraisal Committee meetings)
4. Project site location maps
5. Any additional documents, as relevant.

**ToR ANNEX B: Guidelines on Contents for the Midterm Review Report[[13]](#footnote-14)**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **i.** | Basic Report Information (for opening page or title page)   1. Title of UNDP supported GEF financed project 2. UNDP PIMS# and GEF project ID# 3. MTR time frame and date of MTR report 4. GEF Operational Focal Area/Strategic Program 5. Executing Agency/Implementing Partner and other project partners 6. MTR team members 7. Acknowledgements | | |
| **ii.** | Table of Contents | | |
| **iii.** | Acronyms and Abbreviations | | |
| **1.** | Executive Summary (3-5 pages)   1. Project Information Table 2. Project Description (brief) 3. Project Progress Summary (between 200-500 words) 4. MTR Ratings & Achievement Summary Table 5. Concise summary of conclusions 6. Recommendation Summary Table | | |
| **2.** | Introduction (2-3 pages)   1. Purpose of the MTR and objectives 2. Scope & Methodology: principles of design and execution of the MTR, MTR approach and data collection methods, limitations to the MTR 3. Structure of the MTR report | | |
| **3.** | Project Description and Background Context (3-5 pages)   1. Development context: environmental, socio-economic, institutional, and policy factors relevant to the project objective and scope 2. Problems that the project sought to address: threats and barriers targeted 3. Project Description and Strategy: objective, outcomes and expected results, description of field sites (if any) 4. Project Implementation Arrangements: short description of the Project Board, key implementing partner arrangements, etc. 5. Project timing and milestones 6. Main stakeholders: summary list | | |
| **4.** | Findings (12-14 pages) | | |
| **4.1** | Project Strategy   * Project Design * Results Framework/Logframe | |
| **4.2** | Progress Towards Results   * Progress towards outcomes analysis * Remaining barriers to achieving the project objective | |
| **4.3** | Project Implementation and Adaptive Management   * Management Arrangements * Work planning * Finance and co-finance * Project-level monitoring and evaluation systems * Stakeholder engagement * Reporting * Communications | |
| **4.4** | Sustainability   * Financial risks to sustainability * Socio-economic to sustainability * Institutional framework and governance risks to sustainability * Environmental risks to sustainability | |
| **5.** | Conclusions and Recommendations (4-6 pages) | | |
|  | **5.1** | | Conclusions   * Comprehensive and balanced statements (that are evidence-based and connected to the MTR’s findings) which highlight the strengths, weaknesses and results of the project |
| **5.2** | | Recommendations   * Corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project * Actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the project * Proposals for future directions underlining main objectives |
| **6.** | Annexes   * MTR ToR (excluding ToR annexes) * MTR evaluative matrix (evaluation criteria with key questions, indicators, sources of data, and methodology) * Example Questionnaire or Interview Guide used for data collection * Ratings Scales * MTR mission itinerary * List of persons interviewed * List of documents reviewed * Co-financing table (if not previously included in the body of the report) * Signed UNEG Code of Conduct form * Signed MTR final report clearance form * Annexed in a separate file: Audit trail from received comments on draft MTR report * Annexed in a separate file: Relevant midterm CCA tracking tools * Annexed in a separate file: GEF-UNDP Co-financing template for MTR-TE | | |

ToR ANNEX C: Midterm Review Evaluative Matrix Template

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Evaluative Questions** | **Indicators** | **Sources** | **Methodology** |
| **Project Strategy: To what extent is the project strategy relevant to country priorities, country ownership, and the best route towards expected results?** | | | |
| Is the project a good idea given the situation needing improvement? | Extent to which project objectives and outcomes relates to | * Project documents, project staff, project partners, * Data collected throughout the MTR mission, etc.) * Annual and Quarterly Reports * Field Reports from project personnel * National/Ministerial policy documents*/strategic plans* * Media articles/reports | * Individual interviews * Document analysis/ Desk reviews * Reports * Focused Group Discussions (FGDs) * Other |
| **Progress Towards Results: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved thus far?** | | | |
| How have the project beneficiaries been satisfied with the project deliverables and outcomes? Does it deal with target group priorities? Why or why not? | Project indicators relating to percentage of households and communities that have benefited through project intervention.  Project indicators relating to number of project beneficiaries (includes people engaged in training, awareness-raising and education, pilot villages, delivery of project initiatives, stakeholder meetings and project governance) | * Project documents, project staff, project partners, * Data collected throughout the MTR mission, etc.) * Annual and Quarterly Reports * Field Reports from project personnel * National/Ministerial policy documents*/strategic plans* * Media articles/reports | * Individual interviews * Document analysis/ Desk reviews * Reports * FGDs * Other |
| **Project Implementation and Adaptive Management: Has the project been implemented efficiently, cost-effectively, and been able to adapt to any changing conditions thus far? To what extent are project-level monitoring and evaluation systems, reporting, and project communications supporting the project’s implementation?** | | | |
| * Are inputs (resources and time) used in the best possible way to achieve the outcomes? | Government provides annual financial support (in-kind and grant) to maintain national adaptation and monitoring tool | * Project documents, project staff, project partners, * Data collected throughout the MTR mission, etc.) * Annual and Quarterly Reports * Field Reports from project personnel * National/Ministerial policy documents*/strategic plans*   Media articles/reports | * Individual interviews * Document analysis/ Desk reviews * Reports * FGDs * Other |
| How are the realised outputs delivered or why did expected outputs fail in some cases? | * Extent to which monitoring, evaluation and reporting is maintained and contributes towards adaptive management. | * Project documents, project staff, project partners, * Data collected throughout the MTR mission, etc.) * Annual and Quarterly Reports * Field Reports from project personnel * National/Ministerial policy documents*/strategic plans* * Media articles/reports | * Individual interviews * Document analysis/ Desk reviews * Reports * FGDs * Other |
| **Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, socio-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?** | | | |
| To what extent is the project contributing towards its longer-term goals? What unanticipated positive or negative consequences is the project having? Why did they arise? | * Extent of adaptive management employed by project management | * Project documents, project staff, project partners, * Data collected throughout the MTR mission, etc.) * Annual and Quarterly Reports * Field Reports from project personnel * National/Ministerial policy documents*/strategic plans* * Media articles/reports | * Individual interviews * Document analysis/ Desk reviews * Reports * FGDs * Other |
| * What has been put in place to ensure continuity of the project (financial, institutional arrangements, socio-economic programs)? * What are the remaining risks to project sustainability? | * Status of risk logs and risk monitoring mechanisms * Status of sustainability plans and exit strategy | * Project documents, project staff, project partners, * Data collected throughout the MTR mission, etc.) * Annual and Quarterly Reports * Field Reports from project personnel * National/Ministerial policy documents*/strategic plans* * Media articles/reports |  |
| **COVID-19 impact in project implementation** | | | |
| * How did COVID impacted project implementation? * What issues and challenges did the project encountered due to COVID? * What are some of the key project milestone affected (delayed, deferred, cancelled) due to COVID? * What mechanisms are put in place to tackle issues and challenges related to COVID impact? | * Status of financial delivery and physical progress | * Standard Progress Reports | **Interviews**  **Desk Review** |

**ToR ANNEX D: MTR Ratings**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Ratings for Progress Towards Results:** (one rating for each outcome and for the objective) | | |
| 6 | Highly Satisfactory (HS) | The objective/outcome is expected to achieve or exceed all its end-of-project targets, without major shortcomings. The progress towards the objective/outcome can be presented as “good practice”. |
| 5 | Satisfactory (S) | The objective/outcome is expected to achieve most of its end-of-project targets, with only minor shortcomings. |
| 4 | Moderately Satisfactory (MS) | The objective/outcome is expected to achieve most of its end-of-project targets but with significant shortcomings. |
| 3 | Moderately Unsatisfactory (HU) | The objective/outcome is expected to achieve its end-of-project targets with major shortcomings. |
| 2 | Unsatisfactory (U) | The objective/outcome is expected not to achieve most of its end-of-project targets. |
| 1 | Highly Unsatisfactory (HU) | The objective/outcome has failed to achieve its midterm targets, and is not expected to achieve any of its end-of-project targets. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Ratings for Project Implementation & Adaptive Management:** (one overall rating) | | |
| 6 | Highly Satisfactory (HS) | Implementation of all three components – management arrangements, work planning, finance and co-finance, project-level monitoring and evaluation systems, stakeholder engagement, reporting, and communications – is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management. The project can be presented as “good practice”. |
| 5 | Satisfactory (S) | Implementation of most of the three components is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management except for only few that are subject to remedial action.. |
| 4 | Moderately Satisfactory (MS) | Implementation of some components is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management, with some components requiring remedial action. |
| 3 | Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU) | Implementation of part components is not leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive, with most components requiring remedial action. |
| 2 | Unsatisfactory (U) | Implementation of components is not leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management. |
| 1 | Highly Unsatisfactory (HU) | Implementation of none of the three components is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Ratings for Sustainability:** (one overall rating) | | |
| 4 | Likely (L) | Negligible risks to sustainability, with key outcomes on track to be achieved by the project’s closure and expected to continue into the foreseeable future |
| 3 | Moderately Likely (ML) | Moderate risks, but expectations that at least some outcomes will be sustained due to the progress towards results on outcomes at the Midterm Review |
| 2 | Moderately Unlikely (MU) | Significant risk that key outcomes will not carry on after project closure, although some outputs and activities should carry on |
| 1 | Unlikely (U) | Severe risks that project outcomes as well as key outputs will not be sustained |

**ToR ANNEX E: UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluators/Midterm Review Consultants[[14]](#footnote-15)**

**Evaluators/Consultants:**

1. Must present information that is complete and fair in its assessment of strengths and weaknesses so that decisions or actions taken are well founded.
2. Must disclose the full set of evaluation findings along with information on their limitations and have this accessible to all affected by the evaluation with expressed legal rights to receive results.
3. Should protect the anonymity and confidentiality of individual informants. They should provide maximum notice, minimize demands on time, and respect people’s right not to engage. Evaluators must respect people’s right to provide information in confidence and must ensure that sensitive information cannot be traced to its source. Evaluators are not expected to evaluate individuals and must balance an evaluation of management functions with this general principle.
4. Sometimes uncover evidence of wrongdoing while conducting evaluations. Such cases must be reported discreetly to the appropriate investigative body. Evaluators should consult with other relevant oversight entities when there is any doubt about if and how issues should be reported.
5. Should be sensitive to beliefs, manners and customs and act with integrity and honesty in their relations with all stakeholders. In line with the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights, evaluators must be sensitive to and address issues of discrimination and gender equality. They should avoid offending the dignity and self-respect of those persons with whom they come in contact in the course of the evaluation. Knowing that evaluation might negatively affect the interests of some stakeholders, evaluators should conduct the evaluation and communicate its purpose and results in a way that clearly respects the stakeholders’ dignity and self-worth.
6. Are responsible for their performance and their product(s). They are responsible for the clear, accurate and fair written and/or oral presentation of study limitations, findings and recommendations.
7. Should reflect sound accounting procedures and be prudent in using the resources of the evaluation.

**MTR Consultant Agreement Form**

Agreement to abide by the Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN System:

Name of Consultant: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Name of Consultancy Organization (where relevant): \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**I confirm that I have received and understood and will abide by the United Nations Code of Conduct for Evaluation.**

Signed at *\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ (Place)* on *\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ (Date)*

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**ToR ANNEX F: MTR Report Clearance Form**

*(to be completed by the Commissioning Unit and UNDP-GEF RTA and included in the final document)*

**Midterm Review Report Reviewed and Cleared By:**

**Commissioning Unit**

Name: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Advisor**

Name: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**ToR ANNEX G: Audit Trail Template**

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

**To the comments received on (*date*) from the Midterm Review of Mainstreaming biodiversity conservation into the tourism sector in Bhutan , UNDP Project ID-*PIMS #6319)***

*The following comments were provided in track changes to the draft Midterm Review report; they are referenced by institution (“Author” column) and track change comment number (“#” column):*

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

1. For ideas on innovative and participatory Monitoring and Evaluation strategies and techniques, see [UNDP Discussion Paper: Innovations in Monitoring & Evaluating Results](http://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/librarypage/capacity-building/discussion-paper--innovations-in-monitoring---evaluating-results/), 05 Nov 2013. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
2. For more stakeholder engagement in the M&E process, see the [UNDP Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results](http://www.undg.org/docs/11653/UNDP-PME-Handbook-(2009).pdf), Chapter 3, pg. 93. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
3. Populate with data from the Logframe and scorecards [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
4. Populate with data from the Project Document [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
5. If available [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
6. Colour code this column only [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
7. Use the 6 point Progress Towards Results Rating Scale: HS, S, MS, MU, U, HU [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
8. Risks are to be labeled with both the UNDP SES Principles and Standards, and the GEF’s “types of risks and potential impacts”: Climate Change and Disaster; Disadvantaged or Vulnerable Individuals or Groups; Disability Inclusion; Adverse Gender-Related impact, including Gender-based Violence and Sexual Exploitation; Biodiversity Conservation and the Sustainable Management of Living Natural Resources; Restrictions on Land Use and Involuntary Resettlement; Indigenous Peoples; Cultural Heritage; Resource Efficiency and Pollution Prevention; Labor and Working Conditions; Community Health, Safety and Security. [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
9. Alternatively, MTR conclusions may be integrated into the body of the report. [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
10. [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
11. <https://intranet.undp.org/unit/bom/pso/Support%20documents%20on%20IC%20Guidelines/Template%20for%20Confirmation%20of%20Interest%20and%20Submission%20of%20Financial%20Proposal.docx> [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
12. <http://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/corporate/Careers/P11_Personal_history_form.doc> [↑](#footnote-ref-13)
13. The Report length should not exceed 40 pages in total (not including annexes). [↑](#footnote-ref-14)
14. [www.undp.org/unegcodeofconduct](http://www.undp.org/unegcodeofconduct) [↑](#footnote-ref-15)