UNDP-GEF MIDTERM REVIEW
TERM OF REFERENCE (NATIONAL EVALUATOR)

1. INTRODUCTION

These terms of reference (TOR) sets out the expectations for the Mid-Term Review (MTR) for full-sized project titled Strengthening Capacity and Incentives for Wildlife Conservation in the Western Forest Complex (PIMS#5436), implemented through Department of National Parks, Wildlife and Plant Conservation (DNP), Thailand, which is to be undertaken in 2018. The project started on 15 July 2015 and is in third years of its 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.

PROJECT SUMMARY TABLE

Project Title:	Strengthening Capacity and Incentives for Wildlife Conservation in the Western Forest Complex			
GEF Project ID:	PIMS5436		at endorsement (US$)	At MTR (Million US$)
UNDP Project ID:	00090893	GEF financing:	7,339,450	
Country:	Thailand	UNDP:	500,000	
Region:	Asia-Pacific	Government (DNP):	22,864,427	
Focal Area:	Biodiversity, Climate Change and Multi-Focal Areas	Others: - Wildlife Conservation Society - Seub Nakasathien Foundation	500,000 370,000	
FA Objectives, (OP/SP):	BD-1: Improve sustainability of protected area systems CCM-5: Promote Conservation and Enhancement of Carbon Stocks through Sustainable Management of Land Use, Land Use Change and Forestry SFM/REDD-2	Total co-financing:	24,364,427	
		Total Project Cost:	31,573,877	
Executing Partner:	Department of National Parks, Wildlife and Plant Conservation (DNP), Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment (MNRE)		31,573,877	

Other Partners involved:	- Wildlife Conservation Society (WCS) - Seub Nakasathien Foundation	ProDoc Signature (date project began):		15 July 2015
		(Operational) Closing Date:	Proposed: 14 June 2020	Revised Closing Date: N/A

2. PROJECT BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Situated at the core of the Western Forest Complex (WEFCOM), the Huai Kha Khaeng-Thung Yai Naresuan World Heritage Site (HKK-TY WHS) consists of three contiguous Wildlife Sanctuaries: the Huai Kha Khang (HKK); the Thung Yai Naresuan East (TYE); and the Thung Yai Naresuan West (TYW). Totalling an area of 6,427 km2, the largely intact forest habitats of the HKK-TY WHS provide a protected refuge for approximately half of Thailand's tiger population.

There are no villages within the HKK, but there are 14 formally recognised enclave villages within the TYW (7 villages) and TYE (7 villages). There are further villages, together with mixed forest-agriculture, in a 5km buffer around the HKK-TY WHS with a particular concentration to the east of HKK where there is an estimated 29 villages. Many of the villagers living in the enclave and buffer villages are dependent on the use of forest resources

The most significant threats to tiger survival in and around the HKK-TY WHS includes: i) habitat degradation and fragmentation; ii) poaching of the prey that tiger depend on; and iii) poaching of the tigers themselves. These threats are further exacerbated by limited capacity and insufficient resources to effectively plan and administer the wildlife sanctuaries, and limited working relationships with enclave and buffer communities. The project has been organised into three components, and will be implemented over a period of five years.

The first component of the project is directed towards strengthening and scaling up existing best-practice management activities, and developing and testing innovative approaches to enforcement and compliance, in the HKK-TYN WHS. It will strive to reduce the direct threats to tigers and prey, improve effectiveness of wildlife sanctuary management, and enhance the use of data and information to support key management decision-making.

The second component of the project is focused on linking sustainable livelihood development in the enclave and buffer zone villages with specific conservation outcomes, and improving economic links between the buffer zone and enclave villages and the Wildlife Sanctuaries. It will seek to achieve these linkages by promoting incentives (including technical support and grant funding for sustainable livelihood initiatives, ecotourism development and piloting a REDD+ Wildlife Premium carbon project) for community-based sustainable forest management, environmentally-friendly agricultural practices, nature-based tourism and education and improved wildlife and habitat protection.

The third component of the project is directed towards raising the awareness in communities living in and around the WHS of the need to conserve, and the importance of protecting, the forest landscapes and associated wildlife. With the iterative recognition in these communities of the intrinsic value of the forest habitats and wildlife, work under this component will assist in strengthening the representation of the buffer and enclave communities in each of the Wildlife

Sanctuary's Protected Area Committees (PACs). With improved community-based representation on the PAC, the project will assist in building the capacity (information, knowledge, skills) of each of the community representatives to assure a constructive and meaningful contribution to the co-management of the WSs. The total costs of investment in the project is estimated at US$31,573,877, of which US$7,339,450 constitutes grant funding from GEF and US$24,234,427 comprises co-financing.

3. OBJECTIVES OF THIS MIDTERM REVIEW

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 AND METHODOLOGY

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

The MTR team is expected to follow a collaborative and participatory approach[1] 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 (list); 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 mission to Thailand, including the following project sites: Huai Kha Khaeng-Thung Yai (HKK-TY) World Heritage Site (WHS) and its buffer areas.

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

---

[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.

the methods and approach of the review. Interviews will be held with the following organizations and individuals at a minimum:

- Project Director and Co-Manager
- Project Manager
- Field Coordinators
- Representatives from pilot areas
- Project Administrative/Financial Officer
- Members of Project Board
- UNDP Country Office in Bangkok
- Wildlife Conservation Society
- Seub Nakasathien Foundation

5. DETAILED SCOPE OF THE MTR

The MTR team will assess the following four categories of project progress. See the *Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects* 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.
- 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/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 1st 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:							
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

---

[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

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?

<u>Reporting:</u>
- 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.

<u>Communications:</u>
- 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:

<u>Financial risks to sustainability:</u>
- 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)?

<u>Socio-economic risks to sustainability:</u>
- 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?

<u>Institutional Framework and Governance risks to sustainability:</u>

- 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.

<u>Environmental risks to sustainability:</u>

- 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. See the *Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects* for guidance on a recommendation table.

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

Ratings

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

Table. MTR Ratings & Achievement Summary Table for (*Project Title*)

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)	

---

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

6. TIMEFRAME

The total duration of the contract will be approximately 25 working days over a 10-week timeframe from **11 June 2018 to 28 September 2018**.

Duty Station: home-based with one mission to Bangkok and the project sites in Thailand.
The tentative MTR timeframe is as follows:

TIMEFRAME	ACTIVITY
11 June 2018	Contract begins Prep the MTR Team (handover of Project Documents)
11-13 June 2018 (3 working days)	Project Document Review Submit MTR Inception Report to UNDP for review
2 July 2017 (1 working day)	Finalization of the MTR Inception Report and re-submit to UNDP.
30 July 2017	Arrival in Bangkok of International Evaluation Team Lead
31 July 2018 (1 working days)	Inception meeting at UNDP Country Office Meeting with DNP Team and other stakeholders in Bangkok.
1-10 August 2018 (8 working days for field mission)	MTR mission: stakeholder meetings, interviews and field visits
13-14 August 2018 (2 working days)	Preparation of presentations for wrap-up meeting.
15 August 2018 (1 working days)	Mission wrap-up meeting & presentation of initial findings- earliest end of MTR mission
20-23 August 2018 (4 working days)	Preparing draft report
23 August 2018 (0 working days for consultant)	Circulation of draft report for comments
10-14 September 2018 (max: 5 working days)	Incorporating audit trail from feedback on draft report/Finalization of MTR report Preparation & Issue of Management Response
28 September 2018	Expected date of contract closure

7. MTR DELIVERABLES

#	Deliverable	Description	Timing	Responsibilities
1	**MTR Inception Report**	MTR team clarifies objectives and methods of Midterm Review	14 June 2018	MTR team submits to the Commissioning Unit and project management
2	**Presentation**	Initial Findings	14 August 2018	MTR Team presents to project management and the Commissioning Unit
3	**Draft Final MTR Report**	Full report (using guidelines on content	23 August 2018	Sent to the Commissioning Unit, reviewed by RTA,

		outlined in Annex B) with annexes		Project Coordinating Unit, GEF OFP
4	**Final MTR Report***	Revised report with audit trail detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final MTR report	14 September 2018 (or 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 UNDP Thailand Country Office.

The commissioning unit will contract the consultants and ensure the timely provision of the travel arrangements within the country 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

A team of two independent consultants will conduct the MTR – one team leader (with experience and exposure to projects and evaluations in other regions globally) and one team local expert, from Thailand. 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:

A. <u>INTERNATIONAL CONSULTANT</u>

<u>Profile</u>
- A Master's degree in Natural Sciences, Environmental Management, Environmental Studies, Development studies, Social Sciences and/or other related fields, or other closely related field (20%).
- Minimum of 8 years accumulated and recognized experience in biodiversity conservation and sustainable utilisation areas, and sustainable livelihoods (20%)
- Minimum of 5 years of project evaluation and/or implementation experience in the result-based management framework, adaptive management and UNDP or GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy (20%)
- Very good report writing skills in English (20%)
- Familiarity in similar country or regional situations relevant to that of Strengthening Capacity and Incentives for Wildlife Conservation in the Western Forest Complex is an advantage (10%).
- Some experience working with the GEF or GEF-evaluations is an advantage (10%);

- Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender and biodiversity, experience in gender sensitive evaluation and analysis.
- Excellent communication skills.
- Demonstrable analytical skills.

Responsibilities

o Documentation review
o Leading the TE Team in planning, conducting and reporting on the evaluation
o Deciding on division of labour within the Team and ensuring timeliness of reports
o Use of best practice evaluation methodologies in conducting the evaluation
o Leading the drafting and finalization of the Inception Report for the Terminal Evaluation
o Leading presentation of the draft evaluation findings and recommendations in-country
o Conducting the de-briefing for the UNDP Country Office in Thailand and Core Project Management Team
o Leading the drafting and finalization of the Terminal Evaluation Report

B. National Consultant

Profile
- At least a Master's degree in social development, public policy, environmental studies, development studies, social sciences and/ or other related fields (20%)
- Minimum of five (5) years of supporting project evaluation and/or implementation experience in the result-based management framework, adaptive management (20%).
- Proven communication, facilitation, and writing skills.
- Evaluation skills, including conducting interviews, focus group discussions, desk research, qualitative and quantitative analysis.
- Excellent command of English both writing and speaking (20%)
- Familiarity with Thailand national development policies, programs and projects (20%)
- Some project management experience in biodiversity conservation and sustainable utilisation would be an advantage (10%).
- Some knowledge of UNDP or GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy would be an advantage (10%)

Responsibilities
o Documentation review and data gathering
o Contributing to the development of the review plan and methodology
o Conducting those elements of the evaluation determined jointly with the international consultant and UNDP
o Contributing to presentation of the review findings and recommendations at the wrap-up meeting
o Contributing to the drafting and finalization of the review report

10. PAYMENT MODALITIES AND SPECIFICATIONS

Consultant must send a financial proposal based on **Lump Sum Amount**. The total amount quoted shall be all-inclusive and include all costs components required to perform the deliverables identified in the TOR, including professional fee, travel costs, living allowance (if any work is to

be done outside the IC´s duty station) and any other applicable cost to be incurred by the IC in completing the assignment. The contract price will be fixed output-based price regardless of extension of the herein specified duration. Payments will be done upon completion of the deliverables/outputs and as per below percentages:

%	Milestone
10%	Following submission and approval of Inception Report
40%	Following submission and approval of the draft MTR report
50%	Following submission and approval (UNDP-CO and UNDP RTA) of the final MTR report

In general, UNDP shall not accept travel costs exceeding those of an economy class ticket. Should the IC wish to travel on a higher class he/she should do so using their own resources

In the event of unforeseeable travel not anticipated in this TOR, payment of travel costs including tickets, lodging and terminal expenses should be agreed upon, between the respective business unit and the Individual Consultant, prior to travel and will be reimbursed.

Travel costs shall be reimbursed at actual but not exceeding the quotation from UNDP approved travel agent. The provided living allowance will not be exceeding UNDP DSA rates. Repatriation travel cost from home to duty station in Bangkok and return shall not be covered by UNDP.

11. **APPLICATION PROCESS**[9]

Recommended Presentation of Proposal:
a) **Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability and Financial Proposal** using the template provided by UNDP

b) **CV** and a **Personal History Form** (P11 form) indicating all past experiences from similar projects, as well as the contact details (email and telephone number) of the Candidate and at least three (3) professional references.

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

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

All application materials should be submitted to UNDP by 22 February 2018. The short listed candidates may be contacted and the successful candidate will be notified.

---

[9] 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

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.

Only candidates obtaining a minimum of 70% of the total technical points would be considered for the Financial Evaluation.

TOR ANNEX A: LIST OF DOCUMENTS TO BE REVIEWED BY 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 (SFM/REDD-Plus, BD and CC Mitigation areas)
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 Project Board Meetings and other meetings (i.e. Project Appraisal Committee meetings)
16. Project site location maps

TOR ANNEX B: GUIDELINES ON CONTENTS FOR THE MIDTERM REVIEW REPORT[10]

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

Table of Contents
Acronyms and Abbreviations
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

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

---

[10] The Report length should not exceed *40* pages in total (not including annexes).

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

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

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

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: MTR EVALUATION 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[11]

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:
_____

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

To the comments received on (*date*) from the Midterm Review of (*project name*) (UNDP Project ID-PIMS #)

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

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