## 

## Terms of Reference (TOR) for Midterm Review of the Implementing the Nagoya Protocol on Access to Genetic Resources and Benefit Sharing in Bhutan

1. **INTRODUCTION**

The Midterm Review (MTR) of the UNDP-GEF Medium sized project entitled ‘Implementing the Nagoya Protocol on Access to Genetic Resources and Benefit Sharing in Bhutan’ implemented by the National Biodiversity Centre (NBC), Ministry of Agriculture and Forests, Menjong Sorig Pharmaceuticals (MSP), Department of Traditional Medicine Services and Bio-Bhutan, is planned to commence during the third quarter of 2016. The project started in October 2014 and will close by September 2018. The project is currently in its second year of implementation. In compliance with the requirement of the approved project document, this MTR process is being initiated at the mid-point of the project. 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).

**2. PROJECT BACKGROUND INFORMATION**

Bhutan’s unique biogeographic location at the intersection of the Indo-Malayan Realm and the Palearctic Realm combined with extreme altitudinal range and micro-climatic conditions have given rise to an outstanding diversity of flora and fauna. More than 5,600 species of vascular plants, close to 200 species of mammal, and some 690 species of birds have been recorded in a country that is just 38,394 km2 in geographical size, the second smallest in all of South Asia. At the global level, the country forms the core of the Eastern Himalaya which is recognized to be a global biodiversity hotspot and a globally important eco-region. The global significance of the country’s biodiversity is accentuated by the fact that they hitherto occur virtually un-fragmented over vast stretches of natural land as a result of limited human intrusion. There is a profound nexus between the country’s biodiversity and its people. Sixty-nine per cent of the population live in the rural areas subsisting on an integrated farm-based livelihood system that combines crop agriculture, livestock rearing, and use of a wide range of forest products. The ethno-botanical uses, even to this day, remain significant. Traditional medicines, derived from more than 200 species of medicinal plants in the wild, form an important part of the public health services system. In the rural areas, local people collect a wide range of biological resources for food, incense, energy, and handicraft production.

The country’s biodiversity, although in a relatively good state, is threatened by overharvesting fueled by population growth and transformation from a subsistence economy to a consumer-based economy, competitive land uses for urbanization and infrastructure development, industrial and mining operations especially in the southern region, poaching along the porous borders with India and China, human-wildlife conflicts as result of crop and livestock depredation by wildlife, and climate change exacerbating the risks of forest fire, and pest and disease.

To counter the various threats to biodiversity, the country has planned various strategies for the conservation and sustainable use of biological resources for socio-economic development at national and local levels. One of the recent biodiversity programs includes bio-prospecting and ABS. However, the country currently does not have a fully functional regulatory and institutional framework for ABS, and the institutional and personnel capacity to carry out bio-prospecting beyond basic level and develop and manage ABS schemes that are compliant with Nagoya Protocol.

This project has been conceived with the objective to develop and implement a national ABS framework, build national capacities and facilitate the discovery of nature-based products. It will focus on three components: (a) development and operationalization of a national regulatory and institutional framework for ABS; (b) capacity development and awareness-raising for the implementation of the national ABS framework; and (c) demonstration of best practices of ABS processes

**The project has the following Project Goal, Objective, outcomes and outputs:**

**The project’s goal is** to contribute to the conservation and sustainable use of globally significant biodiversity in Bhutan. **The project objective is to** develop and implement a national ABS framework, build national capacities and facilitate the discovery of nature-based products.

**The project objective will be achieved through the implementation of three inter-connected components as follow**:

**The first project component** will involve review and consultative processes for approval of the draft ABS policy, promulgation of the Biodiversity Rules and Regulations for ABS implementation in compliance with the approved ABS policy and the Nagoya Protocol and based on an extensive consultation process, and establishment and operationalization of an institutional framework in accordance with the requirements of the Biodiversity Rules and Regulations.

**The second component** will involve upgrading of the bio-prospecting laboratory facilities and improving the technical skills of the lab technicians, staff training on ABS Regime Management based on a toolkit and training course developed through a comparative assessment of best approaches and practices for ABS management relevant to Bhutan, and a study tour for a group of Bhutanese to observe and secure first-hand knowledge and insights on bio-prospecting and ABS activities in the South and South East Asia regions. It will also include a series of advocacy and sensitization events and mass media programs to raise awareness of ABS among various groups using well-developed communication materials.

**The third component** will support the development and operationalization of three pilot ABS agreements that are compliant with Nagoya Protocol and encompass the best practices of ABS processes. The pilots will be implemented by three different institutions: The National Biodiversity Center, a government research and development institution which is also the national focal agency for ABS and Nagoya Protocol; Menjong Sorig Pharmaceuticals, a government company with the mandate for research and production of traditional medicines; and Bio Bhutan, a private sector enterprise developing and producing bio-products with the involvement of local community groups. Each will engage with international partners for analysis and product development. This component will also involve the development and dissemination of knowledge resources emanating from the country’s experience in ABS.

Each of the above components will have outcomes that will be realized through the delivery of specific outputs that are designed to produce certain outputs. These outcomes and their corresponding outputs are enumerated below:

**Outcome 1: An operational national regulatory and institutional framework on ABS.**

* Output 1.1: An approved national ABS policy in place and disseminated
* Output 1.2: Biodiversity rules and regulations developed and promulgated in compliance with the approved ABS policy, Biodiversity Act and Nagoya Protocol
* Output 1.3: Institutional mechanisms for ABS established and operational

**Outcome 2: Strengthened stakeholder capacity and awareness supports implementation of the national ABS framework**

* Output 2.1: Upgraded facilities and staff skills for bio-prospecting laboratory work and TK documentation
* Output 2.2: Improved technical capacity for implementing ABS activities
* Output 2.3: Increased awareness of ABS and associated national regulatory and institutional framework among a wide range of stakeholders

**Outcome 3: Best practice ABS processes are demonstrated recognizing the principles of biodiversity conservation, Prior Information Consent (PIC) and Mutually Agreed Terms (MAT) including the fair and equitable sharing of benefits through ABS agreements**

* Output 3.1: Three pilot ABS agreements / schemes compliant with the approved ABS Policy and Nagoya Protocol developed and operationalized
* Output 3.2: Knowledge resources emanating from Bhutan’s experience of ABS are developed and disseminated.

**3. 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, its risks to sustainability. In addition, the MTR is expected to identify and assist in the documentation of lessons and good practices from the project.

**4. MTR APPROACH & METHODOLOGY**

The MTR must provide evidence based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The MTR consultant 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 consultant considers useful for this evidence-based review). The MTR consultant will review the baseline GEF tracking Tool for biodiversity focal area 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-1) ensuring close engagement with the Project Team, government counterparts (the GEF Operational Focal Point), the UNDP Country Office, UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Advisers, and other key stakeholders.

Engagement of stakeholders is vital to a successful MTR.[[2]](#footnote-2) Stakeholder involvement should include interviews with stakeholders who have project responsibilities, including but not limited to executing agencies, senior officials and task team/ component leaders, Project manager, key experts in the subject area, Project Board members including the Chair, project stakeholders, project beneficiaries, academia, local government and CSOs, etc.

Additionally, the MTR consultant is expected to conduct field missions to the project sites at Lokchina Gewog under Chhukha Dzongkhag, Dagala Gewog under Thimphu Dzongkhag and Langthel Gewog under Trongsa Dzongkhag.

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.

**5. DETAILED SCOPE OF THE MTR**

The MTR consultant will assess the following four categories of project progress. See the *Guidance for Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects* for extended descriptions.[[3]](#footnote-3)

**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.
* 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, taken into account 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/Log frame:

* Undertake a critical analysis of the project’s log frame 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 log frame 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[[4]](#footnote-4)** | **Baseline Level[[5]](#footnote-5)** | **Level in 1st PIR** | **Midterm Target[[6]](#footnote-6)** | **End-of-project Target** | **Midterm Level & Assessment[[7]](#footnote-7)** | **Achievement Rating[[8]](#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:

* Compare and analyse the GEF Tracking Tool 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.

Work Planning:

* Review any delays in project start-up and implementation, identify the causes and examine if they have been resolved.
* 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/ log frame 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?

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.

Communications:

* 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-page note that summarizes the project’s progress towards results in terms of contribution to sustainable development goals advancement.

**iv. Sustainability**

* Validate whether the risks identified in the Project Document, Annual Project Review/PIRs 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 team will include a section of the report setting out the MTR’s evidence-based conclusions, in light of the findings.[[9]](#footnote-9)

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 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 (Implementing the Nagoya Protocol on Access to Genetic Resources and Benefit Sharing in Bhutan)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **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) |  |
| **Project Implementation & Adaptive Management** | (rate 6 pt. scale) |  |
| **Sustainability** | (rate 4 pt. scale) |  |

1. **TIMEFRAME**

The total duration of the MTR will be approximately 28 working days (spread over two months) including 10 days of field visits to project sites, starting from 14 November 2016. The tentative MTR timeframe is as follows:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **TIMEFRAME** | **ACTIVITY** |
| *8/11/2016* | Application closes |
| *11/11/2016* | Select MTR Team |
| *16/11/2016* | Sign the contract with the consultant |
| *17/11/2016 (1 day)* | Prep the MTR Team (handover of Project Documents) |
| *18 – 20/ 11/2016 (3 days)* | Document review and preparing MTR Inception Report |
| *21/11/2016 (1 day)* | Finalization and submission of MTR Inception Report to CO |
| 22-25/11/2016 (4 Days) | MTR mission: stakeholder meetings, interviews in Thimphu |
| *26/11 - 11/12/2016 (11 days)* | MTR mission: stakeholder meetings, interviews, field visits |
| *12/12/2016 (1 day)* | Mission wrap-up meeting & presentation of initial findings- earliest end of MTR mission |
| *13 – 16/12/ 2016 (4 days)* | Preparing draft report |
| *18/12/2016* | Submission of draft report to CO and Project Manager |
| *19-23/12/2016* | Review of draft report by CO and Project Manager |
| *24/12/2016* | Submission of comments to Consultant by CO and Project Manager |
| *26-27/12/2016 (2 days)* | Incorporating feedback on draft report /Finalization of MTR report |
| *28/12/2016 – 6/1/2017* | Preparation & Issue of Management Response by CO |
| *9/1/2017 (1 day)* | Submission of final report. Expected date of full MTR completion |

1. **MIDTERM REVIEW DELIVERABLES**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **#** | **Deliverable** | **Description** | **Timing** | **Responsibilities** |
| **1** | **MTR Inception Report** | MTR consultant clarifies objectives and methods of Midterm Review | Within five working days from the date of contract signing | MTR consultant submits to the UNDP CO and project management |
| **2** | **Presentation** | Presentation of Initial Findings to the UNDP CO and project stakeholders | End of MTR mission | MTR consultant 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 1 week of the MTR mission | 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 10 days of receiving UNDP comments on draft | Sent to the Commissioning Unit |

\*The final MTR report must be in English.

1. **MTR ARRANGEMENTS**

The principal responsibility for managing this MTR resides with the Commissioning Unit. The Commissioning Unit for this project’s MTR is t*he UNDP Bhutan Country Office.*

The Commissioning Unit will contract the consultant and ensure the timely provision of per diems and travel arrangements within the country for the MTR Consultant. The Project team will be responsible for liaising with the MTR Consultant to provide all relevant documents, set up stakeholder interviews, and arrange field visits.

1. **PROVISION OF MONITORING AND PROGRESS CONTROLS**

Under the overall guidance of the UNDP RR a.i. and the UNDP Regional Technical Advisor in Bangkok, the Consultant will report directly to the Portfolio Manager, Economic Integration and Innovation, UNDP and work very closely with the Project Manager at the National Biodiversity Centre.

The consultant shall submit work outputs to UNDP Bhutan based on timelines stipulated in the work plan.

1. **DEGREE OF EXPERTISE AND QUALIFICATIONS**

UNDP is looking for a home based independent consultant to conduct the MTR - with the following expertise and qualification:

* A Master’s degree in Natural Resource Management, Biodiversity Conservation, Environmental Science, Sustainable Development, Development Studies or relevant discipline, or other closely related field.
* Work experience in relevant technical areas for at least 7 years;
* Recent experience with result-based management evaluation methodologies;
* Experience applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios;
* Project evaluation/review experiences within United Nations system, GEF and/or other donor funded projects;
* Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender and biodiversity related projects; experience in gender sensitive evaluation and analysis;
* Excellent communication skills;
* Evidence/demonstrable analytical skills.

*Note: The consultant 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.*

1. **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.

The details of selection are as follow:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Criteria** | **Weight** | **Max. Point** |
| Technical | 70 |  |
| * Education qualification; * Work experience in relevant technical areas for at least 7 years; * Recent experience with result-based management monitoring and evaluation methodologies; * Experience applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios; * Project evaluation/review experiences within United Nations system, GEF and other donor funded projects; * Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender and biodiversity related projects; experience in gender sensitive evaluation and analysis; * Excellent communication skills; * Evidence/demonstrable analytical skills. |  | 10  10  10  10  10  10  5  5 |
| **Sub-total A. (Technical)** |  | **70** |
| Financial | 30 | 30 |
| **Sub-Total B.(Financial)** |  | **30** |
| **Total (A+B)** |  | **100** |

1. **PAYMENT MODALITIES AND SPECIFICATIONS**

10% of payment upon approval of the final MTR Inception Report

40% upon submission of the draft MTR report

50% upon finalization of the MTR report

1. **APPLICATION PROCESS[[10]](#footnote-10)**

**Recommended Presentation of Proposal:**

1. **Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability** using the [template](https://intranet.undp.org/unit/bom/pso/Support%20documents%20on%20IC%20Guidelines/Template%20for%20Confirmation%20of%20Interest%20and%20Submission%20of%20Financial%20Proposal.docx)[[11]](#footnote-11) provided by UNDP;
2. **CV** and a **Personal History Form** ([P11 form](http://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/corporate/Careers/P11_Personal_history_form.doc)[[12]](#footnote-12));
3. **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)
4. **Financial Proposal** that indicates the all-inclusive fixed total contract price and all other travel related costs (such as professional fees, transportation, communications, 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 mailed at procurement.bt@undp.org This email address is being protected from spam bots, you need Javascript enabled to view it by ***(5:30 PM on 8 November 2016).*** Incomplete applications will be excluded from further consideration.

**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. Project Implementation Report (PIR)
7. Quarterly progress reports and work plans of the various implementation task teams
8. Finalized GEF focal area Tracking Tools at CEO endorsement and midterm (*fill in specific TTs for this project’s focal area*)
9. Oversight mission reports
10. All monitoring reports prepared by the project
11. 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 project Board Meetings and other meetings (i.e. Project Appraisal Committee meetings)
4. Project site location maps

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

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **I.** | Basic Report Information *(for opening page or title page)*   * Title of UNDP supported GEF financed project * UNDP PIMS# and GEF project ID# * MTR time frame and date of MTR report * Region and countries included in the project * GEF Operational Focal Area/Strategic Program * Executing Agency/Implementing Partner and other project partners * MTR team members * Acknowledgements | | |
| **ii.** | Table of Contents | | |
| **iii.** | Acronyms and Abbreviations | | |
| **1.** | Executive Summary *(3-5 pages)*   * Project Information Table * Project Description (brief) * Project Progress Summary (between 200-500 words) * MTR Ratings & Achievement Summary Table * Concise summary of conclusions * Recommendation Summary Table | | |
| **2.** | Introduction *(2-3 pages)*   * Purpose of the MTR and objectives * Scope & Methodology: principles of design and execution of the MTR, MTR approach and data collection methods, limitations to the MTR * Structure of the MTR report | | |
| **3.** | Project Description and Background Context *(3-5 pages)*   * Development context: environmental, socio-economic, institutional, and policy factors relevant to the project objective and scope * Problems that the project sought to address: threats and barriers targeted * Project Description and Strategy: objective, outcomes and expected results, description of field sites (if any) * Project Implementation Arrangements: short description of the Project Board, key implementing partner arrangements, etc. * Project timing and milestones * Main stakeholders: summary list | | |
| **4.** | Findings *(12-14 pages)* | | |
| **4.1** | Project Strategy   * Project Design * Results Framework/Log frame | |
| **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 *(6-8 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**  **5.3** | | Lessons and good practices from the project (minimum of 2 pages)  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 tracking tools (*METT, FSC, Capacity scorecard, etc.)* | | |

**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?** | | | |
| (include evaluative question(s)) | (i.e. relationships established, level of coherence between project design and implementation approach, specific activities conducted, quality of risk mitigation strategies, etc.) | (i.e. project documents, national policies or strategies, websites, project staff, project partners, data collected throughout the MTR mission, etc.) | (i.e. document analysis, data analysis, interviews with project staff, interviews with stakeholders, etc.) |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| **Progress Towards Results: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved thus far?** | | | |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| **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?** | | | |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| **Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, socio-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?** | | | |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

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

**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 E: 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 seven 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 seven 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 of the seven components is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management, with some components requiring remedial action. |
| 3 | Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU) | Implementation of some of the seven components is not leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive, with most components requiring remedial action. |
| 2 | Unsatisfactory (U) | Implementation of most of the seven components is not leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management. |
| 1 | Highly Unsatisfactory (HU) | Implementation of none of the seven 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 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: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

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-1)
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-2)
3. <http://web.undp.org/evaluation/documents/guidance/GEF/mid-term/Guidance_Midterm%20Review%20_EN_2014.pdf> [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. Populate with data from the Log frame and scorecards [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. Populate with data from the Project Document [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. If available [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. Colour code this column only [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. Use the 6 point Progress Towards Results Rating Scale: HS, S, MS, MU, U, HU [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. Alternatively, MTR conclusions may be integrated into the body of the report. [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. Engagement of the consultants should be done in line with guidelines for hiring consultants in the POPP: <https://info.undp.org/global/popp/Pages/default.aspx> [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
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-11)
12. <http://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/corporate/Careers/P11_Personal_history_form.doc> [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
13. The Report length should not exceed *40* pages in total (not including annexes). [↑](#footnote-ref-13)
14. [www.undp.org/unegcodeofconduct](http://www.undp.org/unegcodeofconduct) [↑](#footnote-ref-14)