

UNDP-GEF Midterm Review Terms of Reference

1. INTRODUCTION

This is the Terms of Reference (ToR) for the UNDP-GEF Midterm Review (MTR) of the *full*-sized project titled Mainstreaming Sustainable Land Management in Rangeland Areas of Ngamiland- District Landscapes for Improved Livelihoods project. (PIMS # 4629) implemented through the Department of Forestry and Range Resources (DFRR) under the Ministry of Wildlife, Environment and Tourism (MEWT) supported by the Department of Animal Production (DAP) under the Ministry of Agriculture (MoA) as Implementing Partners, which is to be undertaken in 2016. The project started on the 12th March 2014 and is in its second year of implementation. In line with the UNDP-GEF Guidance on MTRs, this MTR process was initiated before the submission of the second 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* see: <http://web.undp.org/evaluation/guidance.shtml#>.

2. PROJECT BACKGROUND INFORMATION

The Mainstreaming Sustainable Land Management in Rangeland Areas of Ngamiland- District Landscapes for Improved Livelihoods project was designed to address prevalent land and livestock management processes in Ngamiland that are likely to compromise the continued flow of ecosystem goods and services from the savannah ecosystem that are necessary to sustain the national economy, livelihoods and the rich fauna and flora diversity. The long-term solution proposed by the Ngamiland Sustainable Land Management project's the project is to mainstream SLM principles into the livestock production sector, specifically in areas adjacent to the Okavango Delta where rangeland degradation is most intense. Critically, local communities need to participate meaningfully in rangeland governance. However, inadequate knowledge and skills for adoption of SLM in livestock management and livelihood support systems, and policy and market distortions that provide disincentives for adopting SLM and sustainable range management principles in the livestock production sector are significant barriers.

Project goal is to mainstream SLM in rangeland areas of Ngamiland District productive landscapes for improved livelihoods and to do this, the project's interventions have been organized into two components, each with several outcomes and outputs, as described below:

Outcome 1 of the project: -Effective range management improves range condition and flow of ecosystem services to support livelihoods of local communities in Ngamiland.

Under this outcome, the project will put in place systems and capacities for applying improved range management principles over one million hectares of rangelands, to deliver the following outcomes:

- Sustainable land management adopted in over 1 million hectares, reducing land degradation from overstocking of cattle, goats and other livestock and enhancing ecosystem functions (water cycling, soil protection and biodiversity status);
- Bush encroachment reduced and perennial grasses increased to return over 0.5 million hectares of current bush invaded land into ecologically healthier "wooded grasslands" with consequent increase in rangeland condition and at least 40% increase in primary productivity;
- Capacity indicators for key land use decision making and extension support institutions increased as measured by the capacity score card.

The outcomes will be delivered via the following outputs and sub-outputs.

- i. *Output 1.1:* Local level land use plans developed for each pilot area to support sustainable utilization of range resources.
- ii. *Output 1.2:* Improved range management and mixed livelihood systems are piloted in line with the land use plan.
- iii. *Output 1.3:* Bush-control program is piloted and provides financial incentives for controlled bush clearance
- iv. *Output 1.4:* Fire management strategy is piloted in Tsodilo line with the provisions of the land use plans.
- v. *Output 1.5:* System for monitoring of range condition and productivity is in place.

Outcome 2 of the project: -Effective resource governance frameworks and markets provide incentives for livestock off-take and compliance with SLM.

Under this outcome, the project has to facilitate the conditions necessary for development and successful implementation of the local integrated land use plans and replication of the pilot activities developed under Outcome 1. These conditions relate to improved capacity for local resource governance catalyzed through GEF resources (Outputs 2.1, 2.2), removing barriers to small-scale, non-meat, livestock product-based enterprises catalyzed through GEF resources (Output 2.3), and improved access to markets for Ngamiland meat catalyzed through cofinancing (Outputs 2.4 and 2.5).

- i. *Output 2.1:* A regional multi-stakeholder forum for facilitating a dialogue on SLM and mainstreaming SLM into regional and national policy programs and processes is created and empowered.
- ii. *Output 2.2:* Improved access of farmers to markets for livestock products.
- iii. *Output 2.3:* Processing plant in Ngamiland increases quantity and variety of locally processed beef products, allowing higher sales of livestock products and off-take (supported through BMC cofinancing)
- iv. *Output 2.4:* Product placement secured in local and regional markets (supported through BMC cofinancing)

The project is implemented in the Ngamiland District lies in the northwest of the country and covers an area of about 109,000 km² (10,900,000 hectares) of richly endowed rangelands and wetlands. The district is home to the famous Okavango Delta, a wetland of international importance listed under the Ramsar Convention. The Ngamiland District can be broadly sub-divided into six land use zones which are; rable agriculture, livestock rearing, fishing, harvesting veld products, Wildlife Management Areas and tourism. Of these areas, the project will focus SLM demonstrations in the Hainaveld and Toteng–Maun ranches, Lake Ngami and surrounding areas, and northern and western Ngamiland.

The Ngamiland SLM project is a five year initiative that started in March 2014 and will end in March 2019. It has a total allocated resources (grants) amounting to US\$ 31,680,800 and this amount includes US\$ 4, 081, 800.00 which constitute the total resource allocated to UNDP in the Project Document (i.e. Regular UNDP TRAC- US\$1, 000, 000.00 and US\$ 3, 081,800.00 as a contribution from GEF. Government of Botswana’s contribution which is generally in-kind amounts to US\$ 10, 475, 000.00 (DFRR—US\$2,675,000.00; DEA--US\$1,300,000.00; NWDC—US\$3,500,000.00 and DAP—US\$ 3, 000, 000.00). Other contributors include Parastatal Organisation through co-financing- Botswana Meat Commission US\$ 14,183,000.00 National academic Institution- University of Botswana (Okavango Research Institute) US\$2,061,000 and Civil society organizations include -Kalahari Conservation Society US\$630,000.00 and Thare Segolo Foundation US\$250,000.00.

The implementing partners for the project are, Department of Forestry and Range Resources and Department of Animal Production. Other key stakeholders include Department of Environmental Affairs, Tswana Land Board and North West District Council including the District Land Use planning Unit. The Communities and the tribal leadership in the district are also key partners in the project, not only as beneficiaries but also as participants in implementing project activities on the ground hence existing local structures are recognized and adopted for easier implementation of project activities. The project is executed by the Government of Botswana, under the UNDP National Execution (NEX) modality following NEX guidelines and requirements that are set out in the UNDP Programming Manual. Oversight of project activities is the responsibility of the Project Steering Committee (PSC), chaired by the Permanent Secretary of MEWT (or his/her nominee). Day-to-day operational oversight is ensured by UNDP, through the UNDP Office in Gaborone, and strategic oversight by the UNDP/GEF SLM Regional Technical Advisor responsible for the project. The UNDP Country Office in Botswana is responsible institution. The Executing Agency is the MEWT through the Department of Forestry and Range Resources (DFRR) in partnership with the Ministry of Agriculture (Department of Animal Production – DAP) as lead agencies. Project activities are undertaken by relevant governmental, nongovernmental, parastatal, private sector and community based entities. The executing agency remains accountable to UNDP for the delivery of agreed outputs, and for financial management, including the cost effectiveness of project activities. Project office is headed by National SLM Project Coordinator (NPC), assisted by Project Officer and Finance and Administration Officer. The three are contracted through UNDP Service Contracts. They source technical supported from implementing partners as and when needed. At the District level the Technical Reference Group (TRG) assist in guiding the project implementation. The TRG is made up of representatives from both central and local government it is mainly made up of Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) as a structure that exists at local government level. This arrangement is meant to avoid duplication of structures hence it was expedient that the project does not call or establish new structured. Overall oversight of project performance is the responsibility of the Project Steering Committee. Project Steering Committee established by the PS of MEWT, and includes key project partners (DFRR, DEA DAP and DAC) and UNDP. PSC makes strategic decisions bringing project achievements and requirements to central level attention.

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.

4. 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 approach¹ ensuring close engagement with the Project Team, government counterparts (the GEF Operational Focal Point), the UNDP Country Office(s), UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Advisers, and other key stakeholders.

Engagement of stakeholders is vital to a successful MTR.² Stakeholder involvement should include interviews with stakeholders who have project responsibilities, including but not limited to

- DAP – Department of Animal Production
- Department of Forestry and Range Resources
- DVS – Department of Veterinary Services
- DCP – Department of Crop Production
- DoT – Department of Tourism
- BTO – Botswana Tourism Organisation
- DEA – Department of Environmental Affairs
- DWMPCC – Department of Waste Management and Pollution Control
- DAR – Department of Agricultural Research
- DOD – DC/ North West District Officer Development
- DWNP – Department of Wildlife and National Parks
- TLB – Tswana Land Board
- DC – District Commissioner
- DWA – Department of Water Affairs.
- UB-ORI – University of Botswana – Okavango Research Institute
- North West District Council
- Tswana Tribal Authorities
- NCONGO – Ngamiland Council of Non-Governmental Organisations
- Community leaders in pilot areas (Haina Veld, Tsodilo and Communities around Lake Ngami).

As 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. Additionally, the MTR team is expected to conduct field missions to Hainaveld and Toteng–Maun ranches, Lake Ngami and surrounding areas, and northern and western Ngamiland.

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 team will assess the following four categories of project progress.

i. Project Strategy

Project design:

¹ For ideas on innovative and participatory Monitoring and Evaluation strategies and techniques, see [UNDP Discussion Paper: Innovations in Monitoring & Evaluating Results](#), 05 Nov 2013.

² For more stakeholder engagement in the M&E process, see the [UNDP Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results](#), Chapter 3, pg. 93.

- 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?
- 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.
- 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 ³	Baseline Level ⁴	Level in 1 st PIR (self-reported)	Midterm Target ⁵	End-of-project Target	Midterm Level & Assessment ⁶	Achievement Rating ⁷	Justification for Rating
Objective:	Indicator (if applicable):							
Outcome 1:	Indicator 1:							
	Indicator 2:							
	Indicator 3:							

³ Populate with data from the Logframe and scorecards

⁴ Populate with data from the Project Document

⁵ If available

⁶ Colour code this column only

⁷ Use the 6 point Progress Towards Results Rating Scale: HS, S, MS, MU, U, HU

Outcome 2:	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/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?

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 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.

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.⁸

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

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 Sustainable Land Management in Rangeland Areas of Ngamiland- District Landscapes for Improved Livelihoods Project

Measure	MTR Rating	Achievement Description
Project Strategy	N/A	
Progress Towards Results	Objective Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale)	
	Outcome 1 Achievement	

⁸ Alternatively, MTR conclusions may be integrated into the body of the report.

	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)	

6. TIMEFRAME

The total duration of the MTR will be approximately **thirty (30) days** over a time period of **8 weeks** starting end-**July 2016**. The tentative MTR timeframe is as follows:

TIMEFRAME	ACTIVITY
30 th July 2016	Application closes
30 th July 2016	Select MTR Team
15 th August 2016	Prep the MTR Team (handover of Project Documents)
30 August 2016: 4 days	Document review and preparing MTR Inception Report
6 th September 2016: 2 days	Finalization and Validation of MTR Inception Report- latest start of MTR mission
20 th September 2016: 15days	MTR mission: stakeholder meetings, interviews, field visits
25 th September 2016	Mission wrap-up meeting & presentation of initial findings- earliest end of MTR mission
20 th September 2016: 10days	Preparing draft report
27 th September 2016: 2 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)
29 th September 2016	Preparation & Issue of Management Response

Options for site visits should be provided in the Inception Report.

7. 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 <i>the MTR mission</i> :	MTR team submits to the Commissioning Unit and project management
2	Presentation	Initial Findings	End of MTR mission:	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:	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:	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.

8. MTR ARRANGEMENTS

The principal responsibility for managing this MTR resides with the Commissioning Unit. The Commissioning Unit for this project's MTR is the **UNDP- Botswana Country Office**.

The commissioning unit will contract the consultants and ensure the timely provision of per diems and travel arrangements within Botswana for the MTR team. 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.

9. TEAM COMPOSITION

One independent consultant will conduct the MTR - with experience and exposure to projects and evaluations in other regions globally. 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.

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 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 land degradation;
- Experience working with the GEF or GEF-evaluations;
- Experience working in Botswana and other SADC countries;
- Work experience in relevant technical areas for at least 10 years;
- Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender and land degradation; 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;
- A Master's degree in natural science, Social Sciences, Project Management, Monitoring and Evaluation, Protected area management or other closely related field or other closely related field.

10. PAYMENT MODALITIES AND SPECIFICATIONS

10% of payment upon approval of the final MTR Inception Report
 30% upon submission of the draft MTR report
 60% upon finalization of the MTR report
 Or, as otherwise agreed between the Commissioning Unit and the MTR team.

11. APPLICATION PROCESS⁹

Recommended Presentation of Proposal:

- a) **Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability** using the [template](#).¹⁰
- b) **CV and a Personal History Form** ([P11 form](#))¹¹
- c) **Brief description of approach to work/technical proposal** of why you consider yourself as the most suitable for the assignment, and a proposed methodology on how you 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 UNDP Resident Representative
 United Nations Development Programme
 P.O. Box 54
 Gaborone, Botswana

in a sealed envelope indicating the following reference ***“Consultancy for Mainstreaming Sustainable Land Management in Rangeland Areas of Ngamiland- District Landscapes for Improved Livelihoods project. Midterm Review”*** or by email at the following address ONLY: procurement.bw@undp.org before **15th July 2016; 1200hrs**. Incomplete applications will be excluded from further consideration.

Evaluation Criteria

Criteria	Weight	Max. Point
<u>Technical Evaluation</u>		
<i>Criteria A:</i> Qualifications (academic & technical, minimum university degree)	10	10

⁹ <https://info.undp.org/global/popp/Pages/default.aspx>

¹⁰

<https://intranet.undp.org/unit/bom/psa/Support%20documents%20on%20IC%20Guidelines/Template%20for%20Confirmation%20of%20Interest%20and%20Submission%20of%20Financial%20Proposal.docx>

¹¹ http://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/corporate/Careers/P11_Personal_history_form.doc

Criteria B: Adequate work experience working with the GEF or GEF-evaluations	20	20
Criteria C: Complete Consultancy package submitted (Technical and Financial Proposal)	10	10
Criteria D: Technical Competence Demonstrated understanding of MTR requirements such as project strategies including evaluation systems, tracking project performance and clarity of analytical methodologies	20	20
Criteria E: Relevant Professional /Work Experience – Experience working in Botswana and other SADC countries, Experience applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios	20	20
Criteria F: Approach - Demonstrated understanding of the assignment; and response to the terms of reference.	10	10
Criteria G: Presentation & Packaging – good writing, interpretation and communication skills.	10	10

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.

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. Finalized GEF focal area Tracking Tools at CEO endorsement and midterm
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:

13. Project operational guidelines, manuals and systems
14. UNDP country/countries Programme document(s)
15. Minutes of the *Mainstreaming Sustainable Land Management in Rangeland Areas of Ngamiland- District Landscapes for Improved Livelihoods project*. Board Meetings and other meetings (i.e. Project Appraisal Committee meetings)
16. Project site location maps

ANNEX B: Guidelines on Contents for the Midterm Review Report¹²

- i. Basic Report Information
 - Title of UNDP supported GEF financed project
 - UNDP PIMS#: 4629 and GEF project ID#: 00088298
 - 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
 - Project Implementation Arrangements: short description of the Project Board, key implementing partner arrangements, etc.
 - Project timing and milestones
 - Main stakeholders: summary list

¹² The Report length should not exceed 40 pages in total (not including annexes).

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 tracking tools (*METT, FSC, Capacity scorecard, etc.*)

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?			
	(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?			

ANNEX D: UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluators/Midterm Review Consultants¹³

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: _____

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.

¹³ www.undp.org/uneqcodeofconduct

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