

TERMS OF REFERENCE

Individual Contractor

I. Assignment Information

Assignment Title:	Midterm Review Consultant
UNDP Practice Area:	Programme
Cluster/Project:	Generating, Accessing and Using Information and Knowledge Related to the Three Rio Conventions Project
Post Level:	Senior Specialist
Contract Type:	Individual Contractor (IC)
Duty Station:	Home/Phnom Penh
Expected Place of Travel:	NA
Contract Duration:	25 days, with 5 days mission in Cambodia

II. Project Description

The Generating, Accessing and Using Information related to the 3 Rio Conventions project is in line with the GEF-5 CCCD Programme Frameworks two (2) and four (4), which calls for countries to generate, access and use information and knowledge and to strengthen capacities to implement and manage global convention guidelines. It is also aligned with the first objective of GEF6 that is to integrate global environmental needs into management information systems (MIS). It is a direct response to national priorities identified through the National Capacity Self-Assessment (NCSA) conducted in 2005-2006 and that is part of the institutional strengthening underway at MOE and MAFF. Through a learning-by-doing process, this project will harmonize existing environmental information systems, integrating internationally accepted measurement standards and methodologies, as well as develop a more consistent reporting on the global environment. Under the first outcome, the project will support the development of national capacities to effectively and efficiently standardize environment-related information that is generated on the implementation of the Rio Conventions in Cambodia, and give open-access to this information. In parallel to this, the project will support the strengthening of Cambodia's capacity to better engage stakeholders and better coordinate the implementation of the Rio Conventions in the country. Under the second outcome, project resources will be used to improve the use of environment-related information for the development of innovative tools supporting decision-making processes related to the implementation of the Rio Conventions. The project support will also include activities to develop the capacity in using this environment-related knowledge of national institutions involved in international negotiations at Conventions COPs, as well as using this knowledge to produce national reports meeting Conventions reporting obligations.

The project's objective is to improve access to environmental information related to the Rio Conventions through the harmonization of existing environmental management information systems and improving coordination of the implementation of these conventions in Cambodia. The harmonization of these existing systems will be translated into better access to information related to the implementation of the Rio Conventions in Cambodia.

The project is delineated into two main components as follows:

Component 1: Improved access and generation of information related to the three Rio Conventions

Component 2: Improved use of information and knowledge related to the Rio Conventions.

To ensure that the project is making a solid progress toward delivering its activities toward the expected outputs and outcomes, the project is currently looking for an international consultant to conduct the project midterm review (MTR).

III. Scope of Work

The MTR will assess progress towards the achievements of the project objectives and outcomes as specified in the Project Document and Inception Report), and assess early signs of project success or failure with the goal of identifying the necessary changes to be made to set the project on-track to achieve its intended results. The MTR will also review the project's strategy, its risks to sustainability.

The Midterm Review (MTR) Consultant shall prepare and submit the following outputs:

- MTR Inception Report providing clarification on the objectives and his/her methods to deliver the assignment;
- Produce initial findings and present to the project management and other relevant stakeholders;
- Produce draft MTR report and share to project team for comment; and
- Produce final MTR report with all comments incorporated at the level of quality expected.

To deliver the above outputs, the MTR Consultant will take the following tasks:

- Conduct desk review of project documents (i.e. PIF, UNDP Initiation Plan, Project Document, Inception Report, Project Progress Report (Quarterly and Annual), Finalized GEF capacity development scorecard, Project Board meeting minutes, Financial and Administration guidelines used by Project Team, project operational guidelines, manuals and systems, etc.) provided by the Project Team and UNDP focal point;
- Since the project has no field intervention, the MTR Consultant also conducts interviews with key stakeholders (list of key stakeholders will be provided on the consultant by PMU once s/he is on board);
- Keep close communication and update with the assigned focal points from PMU and UNDP for this assignment;
- Based on the input information from the desk review and stakeholder consultations, conduct the assessment on the project on the four categories; namely 1) project strategy; 2) project progress toward result; 3) project implementation and adaptive management; and 4) sustainability.

Below is the detail of the 4 categories for the project MTR assessment (See the *Guidance for Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects* for extended descriptions):

i. 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 and Inception Report.
- 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?
- Review how the project addresses country priorities. Review country ownership. Was the project concept in line with the national sector development priorities and plans of the country (or of participating countries in the case of multi-country projects)?
- 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, considered during project design processes?
- Review the extent to which relevant gender 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, 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 ¹	Baseline Level ²	Level in 1 st PIR (self-reported)	Midterm Target ³	End-of-project Target	Midterm Level & Assessment ⁴	Achievement Rating ⁵	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:

- Compare and analyse the GEF Tracking Tool at the Baseline with the one completed right before the Midterm Review.

¹ Populate with data from the Logframe and scorecards

² Populate with data from the Project Document and Inception Report

³ If available

⁴ Colour code this column only

⁵ Use the 6-point Progress Towards Results Rating Scale: HS, S, MS, MU, U, HU

- 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 and Inception Report. 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.

Work Planning:

- 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 because 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 to align financing priorities and annual work plans?

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?

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?

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.

iv. Sustainability

- Validate whether the risks identified in the Project Document, Inception Report and the ATLAS 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 Consultant will include a section of the report setting out the MTR's evidence-based conclusions, considering the findings.⁶

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 Consultant should make no more than 10 recommendations total.

Ratings

The MTR Consultant 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.

⁶ Alternatively, MTR conclusions may be integrated into the body of the 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 the 3 Rio Conventions 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)	

IV. Expected Outputs and Deliverables

N	Deliverables/Outputs	Estimated Duration to Complete	Target Due Dates	Review and Approvals Required
1	Deliverable 1: Inception report entailing the methodology used to conduct this MTR toward its expected output	3 days	21 April 2017	Reviewed and cleared by 3 Rio project team/ UNDP Programme analyst, approved by UNDP ACD/Team leader and endorsed by NPD
2	Deliverable 2: Draft initial finding produced and presented to the relevant project stakeholders	7 days	5 May 2017	
3	Deliverable 3: Draft MTR report produced	10 days	22 May 2017	
4	Deliverable 4: Final MTR report produced with all comments incorporated	5 days	9 June 2017	
Total # of Days:		25 days		

While the number of days allocated for each output is fixed, the tentative schedule of the each of the outputs above can be slightly adjusted once the consultant is on board based on the consultation with project team.

V. Institutional Arrangement

Under overall direct supervision of the 3 Rio conventions project management team, ACD/Programme Team Leader, oversight of Programme analyst and direct guidance from the 3 Rio Conventions Project Coordinator, the consultant will be responsible to deliver the outputs stated above with the level of quality expected.

Role of the consultant

- The consultant is responsible to provide his/her technical expertise to produce the expected outputs;
- The consultant shall cover all the related cost for his mission to Cambodia. The field work to the province will be covered by the project;
- The consultant shall work under the assigned focal persons from UNDP project team and PMU;
- The consultant needs to maintain daily communication with the UNDP project focal person as and when problems emerge during the consultancy period, especially if they affect the scope of the job.

Role of project focal team and UNDP

- 3 Rio Conventions PMU, and the relevant UNDP programme team will provide overall quality assurance for this consultancy;
- 3 Rio Conventions PMU and the relevant UNDP programme team will review deliverables for payment release;
- Focal points from PMU and UNDP will act as the focal persons to interact with the consultant to facilitate the assignment, facilitate the review of each output and ensure the timely generation of the comments from stakeholders on each output.

VI. Payment Milestones

The consultant will be paid on a lump sum basis under the following installments.

N	Outputs/Deliveries	Payment Schedule	Payment Amount
1	Upon satisfactory completion of the deliverable 1.	4 th week of April 2017	20%
2	Upon satisfactory completion of the deliverable 2.	2nd week of May 2017	30%
3	Upon satisfactory completion of the deliverable 3.	4 th week of May 2017	20%
4	Upon satisfactory completion of the deliverable 4.	2 nd week of June 2017	30%

VII. Duration of the Work

The consultant will work **for 25 working days** from **April 2017 to June 2017**. The consultant is expected to be on board in early **April 2017** and complete the assignment no later than the **end of June 2017**.

VIII. Duty Station

This assignment is home-based and requires the consultant to travel to Cambodia one time. The initial proposed mission schedule is as the following:

- Cambodia country mission: around the 1st week of May 2017. To have a around of stakeholder meeting to kick start the assignment. The expect duration in the country is 4 working days;

The above mission plan could be further discussed and could be adjusted based on the discussion between the consultant and the project focal persons, to be validated by the project management team and UNDP Programme Head.

The consultant should submit financial proposal with all cost included. This financial proposal shall cover the profession fee, cost incurred when she/he is in Cambodia, and air ticket to Cambodia.

IX. Minimum Qualifications of the Individual Contractor

Education:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ An advanced University education (MS or PhD) with expertise in natural resource management, biodiversity management, agriculture, forestry, climate change, environmental management, and other related disciplines
Experience:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Work experience in relevant technical areas for at least 7 years; ▪ Experience working with the GEF or GEF-evaluations; ▪ Demonstrated understanding of issues related to capacity development in the context of environment and global conventions. ▪ Experience working in Asia region, especially on capacity development and Rio Conventions; ▪ Experience in supporting to the projects related to adaptive management, as applied to (<i>capacity development in GEF projects</i>); ▪ Project evaluation/review experiences within United Nations system will be considered an asset;
Other Competency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Time management (in managing deliverables) ▪ Team management ▪ Professionalism, courtesy, patience ▪ Outstanding inter-cultural communication, networking and coordination skills
Language Requirement:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Excellent written and oral English

X. Criteria for Evaluation of Level of Technical Compliance of Individual Contractor

Technical Evaluation Criteria	Obtainable Score
Work experience in relevant technical areas for at least 7 years	20
Experience working with the GEF or GEF-evaluations	20
Demonstrated understanding of issues related to capacity development in the context of environment and global conventions	30
Experience working in Asia region, especially on capacity development and Rio Conventions	10
Experience in supporting to the projects related to adaptive management, as applied to (<i>capacity development in GEF projects</i>)	15
Project evaluation/review experiences within United Nations system will be considered an asset	5
Total Obtainable Score:	100