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 "**UNDP-GEF Midterm Review Terms of Reference**

2. INTRODUCTION

This is the Terms of Reference (ToR) for the UNDP-GEF Midterm Review (MTR) of the full-sized project titled "**Strengthening the financial and operational framework of the national PA system in Guinea-Bissau** " (PIMS # 5177) implemented through the Institute for Biodiversity and Protected Areas (IBAP), Secretariat of State for Environment (SEA), Government of Guinea-Bissau, which is to be undertaken in 2018. The project was signed on 18th August 2016 and started in October 2016 and is in its 2nd 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* (http://web.undp.org/evaluation/documents/guidance/GEF/UNDP-GEF-TE-Guide.pdf).

2. PROJECT BACKGROUND INFORMATION

The objective of this project is to strengthen the financial sustainability and management effectiveness of the national protected areas system (SNAP) in Guinea-Bissau. Building upon the results of previous GEF interventions, baseline programs, and projects, and coordinating with ongoing and other donor-funded projects, the project will pursue two interlinked approaches: (i) increasing revenue generation for the SNAP by lifting barriers that impede full functioning of the BioGuinea Foundation (FBG), achieving short-term endowment capitalization targets with project co-financiers and putting in place the foundations for the achievement of medium- and long-term targets; and (ii) strengthening effective protected area (PA) management by the Institute for Biodiversity and Protected Areas (IBAP) to a critically threatened priority PA (Cantanhez National Park, CNP), while developing new operational frameworks that entail enhanced efficiencies through the involvement of the Directorate General for Forests and Fauna (DGFF) and local stakeholders. The project will contribute to the conservation of 952,172 hectares (ha) of critical natural habitats through the long-term financial sustainability of Guinea-Bissau's national network of PAs, which will cover 26% of the country. The extensive and highly productive mangrove ecosystems are critical contributors to the sub-region's marine productivity as they support globally endangered and threatened species and a variety of migratory birds, as well as sequestering significant carbon stocks. The woodland savannah, semi-dry tropical forest, and the critically endangered primary tall sub-humid tropical forests are home to threatened and endangered species of global importance that are typical of the Guinea Savannah Forest Mosaic and play critical roles as biological corridors and migration routes for large mammals. Other global environmental benefits will be derived from achieving strengthened management capacity coupled with financial sustainability at the PA system level. More specifically, by project end the initial capitalization of the endowment of the FBG with USD 7,365,248 will increase the sustainability of the SNAP by providing a flow of stable and sustainable financing equivalent to approximately 30% of the overall annual recurrent funding needs, and by so doing will contribute to the consolidation of the terrestrial PAs of Guinea-Bissau. In addition, collaborative cost-effective management of the critically threatened

priority PA, the CNP and its related forest areas and buffer zones, will improve management effectiveness by 20% and will reduce the loss of threatened West African forest habitats across 105,800 ha.

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. Specifically, it is to:
- Assess the level of achievement of key indicators
- Meet the challenges,
- Draw the lessons learnt during the implementation
- Propose the recommendations for the rest of period of implementation

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 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 (the GEF operational focal point, Tombali Regional Government, State Secretariat for Environment (SEA), Bioguine Foundation Executive Secretariat, Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development (General Directorate/Department of Forestry and Fauna), Ministry of Economy, Planning and Regional Integration (General Directorate of Planning), Project Steering Committee, Project team (capital and field-based), UNDP Country Office, UNDP GEF Ecosystems and Biodiversity Regional Technical Advisor for North and West Africa based in Istanbul, Turkey. Additionally, the MTR team is expected to conduct field missions to Cantanhez National Park sites, namely to its 14th Humid Forests and Buffer zones located in southern Guinea-Bissau where is expected to interview there members of key community based organizations (CBOs) and of Cantanhez National Park Management Counsel.

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

---

[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 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)

		Indicator	Baseline	Target/s (End of Project)	Source of verification
Project Objective Strengthening financial sustainability and management effectiveness of the national PA system in Guinea-Bissau	0	UNDP IRRF 1.3.1.A.1.1. Number of new partnership mechanisms with funding for sustainable management solutions of natural resources, ecosystem services, chemicals and waste at national and/or sub-national level	FBG partly operational and without endowment capital or other income	FBG fully operational, capitalised with at least USD 7,365,248, using also the national financing mechanism – the EU Fisheries Agreement and the REDD carbon sales from CNP	− FBG annual financial reports − Capitalization/ funding agreements − Auditing reports − Project reports
	1	UNDP IRRF 2.5.1.C.1.1: Extent to which institutional frameworks are in place for conservation, sustainable use, and/or access and benefit sharing of natural resources, biodiversity and ecosystems	0	Missing institutional frameworks established	Government institutional decrees, regulations, FBG annual reports and rules & regulations, project reports
	2	Change in the financial sustainability of the SNAP according to that established through the total average score in the UNDP/GEF Sustainability Scorecard	34%	50%	− Updated Financial Sustainability Scorecard Tracking Tool for BD-1) − Updated METT scorecards (Tracking Tool for BD-1) − Annual project evaluation reports − Mid-term and final evaluation reports
	3	Change in the management effectiveness of the CNP as measured through the METT scorecard	57	77 (19.6% increase)	
Outcome 1 Strengthening the financial framework of the national PA system	4	Capitalization of the endowment of the FBG after 4 years	0 USD	At least USD 7,365,248 (21% of overall Endowment of USD 34.88 million [EUR 28 million] envisaged).	− FBG annual financial reports − Capitalization/ funding agreements − Auditing reports − Project reports
	5	Change in the percentage of SNAP recurrent costs supported by endowment revenues	0	30%	− Updated Financial Sustainability Scorecard − SNAP annual financial reports − Project monitoring and evaluation reports: PIR, mid-term and final evaluation reports
	6	Change in the number and variety of revenue sources used across the PA system as measured the UNDP/GEF Sustainability Scorecard (Component 3, Element 1)	33%	50%	

Outputs:
1.1. FBG Board and Executive Secretariat operating effectively and efficiently (including fiduciary and management systems).
1.2. Transparent and internationally recognized auditing and reporting standards/protocols to monitor and evaluate the FBG's achievements against time-bound targets and the use of endowment, sinking, and revolving funds at its disposal..
1.3 – Pre-requisite due diligence and compliance procedures verified and formalised, and the FBG endowment capitalised with an initial investment of USD 7,365,248 through direct investment by the project and its co-financiers, and further enriched in a staggered approach in line with fundraising strategy
1.4. FBG's assets management capacity is optimized to reflect the regular oversight of investment performance, as well as an appropriate risk strategy and balanced diversification of its investments portfolio, ensuring the latter is socially and environmentally responsible (details to be defined by the FBG Board).
1.5. Comprehensive fundraising/ capitalisation strategy in place involving FBG and other key stakeholders, and including inter alia (i) finely-tuned communications/ advocacy plans; (ii) annual donor meetings informed on progress and operational efficiencies of FBG; (iii) targeted in-depth assessments of potential revenue generation mechanisms (e.g., compensation schemes from mining and timber concessions, fines, tourism fees, REDD) and related enabling/ institutional needs.
1.6. Strong communication and public relations strategy implemented, ensuring ongoing conversations with national and international partners (GoGB, donors, and private sector) and minimizing risk of government interference while creating ownership.

Outcome 2 PA and buffer zone management in Cantanhez NP	7	Existence of PA headquarters with functional office facilities and basic equipment and logistics	No functional office facilities	PA headquarter has functional office facilities	– NP annual reports – Project monitoring and evaluation reports: PIR, mid-term and final evaluation reports
	8	Degree of illegal utilisation of key plant species of commercial value as recorded in CNP and its buffer zones per year, to include at least – Red mangrove or "Mangal/Tarafe" (*Rhizophora mangle)* – "Pó de sangue" (*Pterocarpus erinaceus)* – African fan palm or "Cibe" (*Borassus aethiopium)* – African mahogany or "Bissilão" (*Khaya senegalensis)* – "Poilão" (*Ceiba pendandra)*	The final list of species to be considered and the baseline values will be established during the first year of project implementation	Target values will be established during the first year of project implementation	– PA monitoring, control, and surveillance reports – Databases on confiscations, forfeitures and sanctions
	10	Level of poaching recorded in CNP and its buffer zones per year, using as proxy indicators – Campbell's mona monkey or "Macaco Mona" (*Cercopithecus (mona) campbelli*) – Bay duiker or "Cabra de mato" (*Cephalophus dorsalis)* – Bushbuck or "Gazela" (*Tragelaphus scriptus)* – Crested porcupine or "Porco espinho (*Hystrix cristata)* – Warthogs or **"**Porco de Mato" (*Phacochoerus africanus)*	The final list of species to be considered and the baseline values will be established during the first year of project implementation	Target values will be established during the first year of project implementation	– PA Monitoring, control, and surveillance reports – Databases on seizures, forfeitures and sanctions,
	11	Number (or size) of wildlife populations recorded in CNP, to include at least – Leopard (*Panthera pardus)* – West African Manatee or "Pis-Bus/Manatim" (*Trichechus senegalensis)* – West African Red Colobus or "Macaco Fidalgo vermelho" (*Piliocolobus badius temminckii)* – Chimpanzee (*Pan troglodytes*) – Hippopotamus (*Hippopotamus amphibius*) – Buffalo (*Syncerus caffer*)	The final list of species to be considered and the baseline values will be established during the first year of project implementation	Target values will be established during the first year of project implementation	– Robust wildlife census data – NP annual reports

	#	Indicator	Baseline	Target	Means of verification
	12	Number of staff (including women) from IBAP, DGFF, local community members trained for effective oversight of land use and threat reduction in PA buffer zones	0	At least 50	− Data bases with records of the training events − Project monitoring and evaluation reports: technical − reports, PIR, mid-term and final evaluation reports
	13	Existence of PA and buffer zone management bodies which involve key stakeholders: IBAP, DGFF, and local stakeholders (community councils, CSOs, NGOs)	No (Existence of CNP management council but does not address management in buffers zones)	Yes	− Agreements/memorandum of understanding − Data bases with records of the training events − Field/technical verification reports − Socio economic surveys − Project monitoring and evaluation reports: technical reports, PIR, mid-term and final evaluation reports
	14	Level of satisfaction of local community members (differentiated by gender) collaborating with PA and forest management. Indicative assessment categories: − Highly Unsatisfactory − Unsatisfactory − Moderately Unsatisfactory − Moderately Satisfactory − Satisfactory − Highly Satisfactory	Baseline will be established during the first year of project implementation	Target will be established during the first year of project implementation	
	15	Increase in cash or in-kind benefits returned to local communities (beneficiaries differentiated by gender) as a result of biodiversity-friendly economic activities	Baseline will be established during the first year of project implementation	Target will be established during the first year of project implementation	
	15	Management and business plan for CNP and buffer zones updated and under implementation	− Management plan: Outdated − Business plan: Preliminary	− Management plan: Updated − Business plan: Yes	− Approved CNP Management and Business Plans − CNP annual management/business plan implementation reports − Project monitoring and evaluation reports: PIR, mid-term and final evaluation reports

Outputs:

2.1. Operational capacities of CNP consolidated to permit compliance with at least basic functions through (i) primary operational logistics and equipment (ii) training programmes for IBAP staff (involving DGFF and other PA management council members) with special emphasis on PA planning and management, community engagement and conflict resolution techniques, forest management challenges and approaches; iii) underpinning support to IBAP headquarters.

2.2. Strengthened institutional capacity of DGFF and IBAP for effective oversight of land use and threat reduction in PA buffer zones and related forest a Through (i) joint DGFF-IBAP planning and collaboration programming in priority high risk areas; (ii) joint DGFF-IBAP training programmes with emphasis on Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA), law enforcement, licensing and monitoring of economic activities in and around PAs, PA management challenges and approaches.

2.3. Local community involvement in and collaboration with PA and forest management improved by: (i) strengthening PA management council and related public participation and institutional arrangements for negotiating, implementing and monitoring management and collaborative agreements; mechanisms, and community surveillance and enforcement; (iii) the development of biodiversity-friendly economic activities.

2.4. Management and business plans for CNP and connected buffer zones and ecological corridors updated/produced, allowing the coordinated identification, prioritisation of management activities and allocation of funds by IBAP, DGFF, and other institutions with responsibilities for biodiversity conservation, land use planning, and forestry.

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?

<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.[3]

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 B for ratings scales. No rating on Project Strategy and no overall project rating is required.

Table. MTR Ratings & Achievement Summary Table for (Strengthening the financial and operational framework of the national PA system in Guinea-Bissau)

Project Strategy	See Project Document Part II, sections 63 to 65	
Progress Towards Results	Objective Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale)	
	Outcome 1 Achievement	

---

[3] 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 04 of weeks starting on 15th, June 2018, and shall not exceed five months from when the consultant(s) are hired. The tentative MTR timeframe is as follows:

TIMEFRAME	ACTIVITY
(June 8th)	Application closes
(June 15th)	Select MTR Team
(June 25th)	Prep the MTR Team (handover of Project Documents)
(June 26th to 30th) 05 days (recommended: 2-4)	Document review and preparing MTR Inception Report
(July 1st to 2nd) 02 days	Finalization and Validation of MTR Inception Report- latest start of MTR mission
(July 3rd to 10th) 08 days (r: 7-15)	MTR mission: stakeholder meetings, interviews, field visits
(July 11th)	Mission wrap-up meeting & presentation of initial findings- earliest end of MTR mission
(July 12th to 20th) 10 days (r: 5-10)	Preparing draft report
(July 21st to 23rd) 03 days (r: 1-2)	Incorporating audit trail from feedback on draft report/Finalization of MTR report
July 20th to 30th)	*Preparation & Issue of Management Response*
(August 2nd 2018)	*Expected date of full MTR completion*

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 the MTR mission	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 UNDP Country Office/Guinea-Bissau.

The commissioning unit will contract the consultants and ensure the timely provision of per diems and travel arrangements into the project's sites 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 expert, usually from the country of the project. The consultants cannot have participated in the project preparation, formulation, and/or implementation (including the writing of the Project Document) and should not have a conflict of interest with project's related activities.

The 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 conversation or natural resource management;
- Experience working with the GEF or GEF-evaluations;
- Experience working in West Africa;
- Work experience in relevant technical areas for at least 10 years;
- Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender and Biodiversity, including biodiversity Trust Funds setting and capitalization; 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;

Qualifications of Team Leader (International Consultant)

1. Have a master in development studies, economics, environment or fields related to biodiversity. A minimum of 10 years of relevant experience is required
2. Substantive experience in evaluating similar projects, preferably those involving UNDP/GEF or other United Nations development agencies or major donors;
3. Excellent Portuguese and English/French writing and communication skills.
4. Highly knowledgeable of participatory monitoring and evaluation processes, and experience in evaluation of technical assistance projects with major donor agencies;
5. Ability and experience to lead multi-disciplinary and national teams, and deliver quality reports within the given time;
6. Familiarity with Guinea-Bissau or other countries in West Africa is an asset; and
7. Excellent in human relations, coordination, planning and team work.

The team leader will take the overall responsibility for the quality and duly submission of the final evaluation report in English. Specifically, the international consultant (team leader) will perform the following tasks:
1. Lead and manage the evaluation mission
2. Design the detailed evaluation scope and methodology (including the methods for data collection and analysis)
3. Decide the division of labor within the evaluation team
4. Conduct an analysis of the results, outcomes and outputs
5. Draft related parts of the evaluation report; and
6. Finalize the whole evaluation report in French/English and submit it to UNDP Guinea-Bissau.

Qualifications of a team expert (National Consultant)
1. Advanced university degree (License diploma) in social science, environment, and biodiversity or in fields related to Climate Change Adaptation. A minimum of 5 years of working experience in the development sector in Guinea-Bissau is required;
2. Have an extensive knowledge of the country situation and development issues related to climate change adaptation.
3. Demonstrated skills and knowledge in participatory monitoring and evaluation processes;
4. Experience in monitoring and evaluation of conservation and development projects, supported by UN agencies (including UNDP/GEF) and/or major donor agencies;
5. Proficient in writing and communicating both in Portuguese and English. Knowledge of French is an asset.
6. Ability to interpret to the international counterpart from Creole/Fulla to Portuguese as needed (e.g., in the field) and also to translate necessary written documents from French to Portuguese.
7. Excellent in human relations, coordination, planning and team work.

The national consultant will perform the following tasks with a focus on a specific analysis:
1. Liaise with Bissau-Guinean project authorities; collect and translate, when necessary, project materials
2. Introduce Bissau-Guinean background information to international consultant
3. Review project documents and data gathering
4. Participate in the design of the evaluation methodology
5. Facilitate the interviews with stakeholders and fields mission to villages taking the appointment
6. Conduct an analysis of the results, outcomes and outputs
7. Participate in the drafting and finalization the mi-term evaluation report

10. PAYMENT MODALITIES AND SPECIFICATIONS

20% of payment upon approval of the final MTR Inception Report
30% upon submission of the draft MTR report
50% upon finalization of the MTR report

11. APPLICATION PROCESS[4]

Potential candidates will be selected from the available roster make available by the RBA and those selected will be invited to submit their proposal following the following
Recommended Presentation of Proposal:

a) **Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability** using the template[5] provided by UNDP;
b) **CV** and a **Personal History Form** (P11 form[6]);
c) **Brief description of approach to work/technical proposal** of why the individual considers him/herself as the most suitable for the assignment, and a proposed methodology on how they will approach and complete the assignment; (max 1 page)
d) **Financial Proposal** that indicates the all-inclusive fixed total contract price and all other travel related costs (such as flight ticket, per diem, etc.), supported by a breakdown of costs, as per template attached to the Letter of Confirmation of Interest template. If an applicant is employed by an organization/company/institution, and he/she expects his/her employer to charge a management fee in the process of releasing him/her to UNDP under Reimbursable Loan Agreement (RLA), the applicant must indicate at this point, and ensure that all such costs are duly incorporated in the financial proposal submitted to UNDP.

All application materials should be submitted to the following address u**maro.seidi@undp.org** by **18h GMT on June 08th 2018**. Incomplete applications will be excluded from further consideration.

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

---

[4] 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
[5]
https://intranet.undp.org/unit/bom/pso/Support%20documents%20on%20IC%20Guidelines/Template%20for%20Confirmation%20of%20Interest%20and%20Submission%20of%20Financial%20Proposal.docx
[6] http://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/corporate/Careers/P11_Personal_history_form.doc

Annexe A: Matrice d'évaluation à mi-parcours

Questions d'évaluation	Indicateurs	Sources	Méthodologie
Stratégie du projet : dans quelle mesure la stratégie du projet est-elle adaptée aux priorités du pays, à l'appropriation nationale et au meilleur moyen d'atteindre les résultats escomptés ?			
• Quelle a été la qualité et la pertinence générale du processus de formulation ?	Objectif du projet Résultats attendus Qualité du PRODOC Logique d'intervention	PRODOC Cadre logique Rapport de l'atelier de démarrage du projet Equipe du projet PNUD Membres du comité de pilotage	Revue des documents Entretiens individuels
• Quelle est la pertinence de la logique d'intervention du projet et ses indicateurs ?	Indicateurs d'objectifs et d'effet du projet Hypothèses de l'intervention	PRODOC	Revue des documents
• Quel est l'état actuel des risques et des hypothèses formulées dans le PRODOC ?	Risques et hypothèses identifiés dans le PRODOC Nouveaux risques	PRODOC PIF Gouvernement Equipe du projet PNUD Membres du comité de pilotage	Revue des documents Entretiens individuels et collectifs
• Le projet est-il toujours pertinent au vu du contexte politique Bissau-Guinéen ?	UNDP Coutry Program UNDAF objectives	UNDAF, UNDP documents Gouvernement PNUD	Revue documentaire Entretiens individuels et collectifs
Progrès réalisés vers les résultats : dans quelle mesure les réalisations et les objectifs escomptés du projet ont-ils été atteints jusqu'ici ?			
• Quels sont les progrès dans l'atteinte des objectifs et des effets du projet ?	Activités mises en oeuvre	PTA, PIR Equipe de projet	Revue documentaire Entretiens individuels et collectifs
• Le projet a-t-il suivi les guidelines et procédures pertinentes durant sa mise en œuvre ?	Reporting Composition du Comité de Pilotage Fréquence des réunions	Documents de reporting	Revue documentaire

Mise en œuvre du projet et gestion réactive : le projet a-t-il été mis en œuvre avec efficience et dans un bon rapport coût-efficacité ? Le projet a-t-il été en mesure de s'adapter à de nouvelles circonstances, le cas échéant ? Dans quelle mesure les systèmes de suivi et d'évaluation relevant du projet, la communication de données et la communication liée au projet favorisent-ils la mise en œuvre du projet ?			
• Les structures de gestion du projet et les plans de travail annuels contribuent-ils à une mise en œuvre effective et efficiente du projet ?	Indicateur S&E Activités Baseline	PRODOC PTA, PIR	Revue documentaire
• Des partenariats appropriés sont-ils en place et fonctionnels ?	Stratégie de partenariat	PRODOC Equipe de projet	Revue des documents Entretiens individuels et collectifs
• Des mécanismes de suivi-évaluation du projet ont-ils été mis en place ?	Procédures de S&E	PTA, PIR Equipe de projet	Revue documentaire Entretiens individuels et collectifs
Durabilité : dans quelle mesure existe-t-il des risques financiers, institutionnels, socio-économiques et/ou environnementaux pour la durabilité des résultats du projet à long terme ?			
• Le projet permet-il d'améliorer les capacités des bénéficiaires ?	Nombre de bénéficiaires du projet Nombre de formation Connaissance du projet d'AP par les communautés Changements significatifs dans la vie des communautés	Reporting Communautés locales	Revue des documents Entretiens individuels et collectifs Visites de site
• Quelle est la probabilité que les activités et les effets atteints par le projet perdurent après la fin de sa mise en œuvre ?	Diffusion des bonnes pratiques Documents de capitalisation Connaissance accrue des personnels	Reporting Rapports techniques Equipe du projet et de l'IBAP	Revue des documents Entretiens individuels
• Quels sont les risques financiers, institutionnels, socio-économiques et environnementaux qui pourraient affecter la durabilité du projet ?	Evaluation des risques	Données de l'évaluation	Evaluateur

Annexe B: Grilles d'évaluation à mi-parcours

Évaluation des progrès vers la réalisation des résultats : (une évaluation pour chaque réalisation et pour chaque objectif)		
6	Très satisfaisant (HS)	L'objectif/la réalisation devrait atteindre ou dépasser toutes les cibles de fin de projet, sans présenter d'insuffisance majeure. Les progrès réalisés vers l'objectif/la réalisation peuvent être un exemple de « bonnes pratiques ».
5	Satisfaisant (S)	L'objectif/la réalisation devrait atteindre la plupart des cibles de fin de projet, et ne présente que des insuffisances mineures.
4	Assez satisfaisant (MS)	L'objectif/la réalisation devrait atteindre la plupart des cibles de fin de projet mais présente des insuffisances importantes.
3	Assez insatisfaisant (HU)	L'objectif/la réalisation devrait atteindre la plupart des cibles de fin de projet mais présente des insuffisances majeures.
2	Insatisfaisant (U)	L'objectif/la réalisation ne devrait pas atteindre la plupart des cibles de fin de projet.
1	Très insatisfaisant (HU)	L'objectif/la réalisation n'a pas atteint les cibles à mi-parcours, et ne devrait atteindre aucune des cibles de fin de projet.

Evaluation de la mise en œuvre du projet et de la gestion réactive : (une seule évaluation globale)		
6	Très satisfaisant (HS)	La mise en œuvre des sept composantes – dispositions relatives à la gestion, planification des activités, financement et cofinancement, systèmes de suivi et d'évaluation au niveau du projet, participation des parties prenantes, communication des données et communication – permet la mise en œuvre efficace et efficiente du projet et de la gestion réactive. Le projet peut être un exemple de « bonnes pratiques ».
5	Satisfaisant (S)	La mise en œuvre de la plupart des sept composantes permet la mise en œuvre efficace et efficiente du projet et de la gestion réactive, à l'exception de quelques composantes faisant l'objet de mesures correctives.
4	Assez satisfaisant (MS)	La mise en œuvre de certaines des sept composantes permet la mise en œuvre efficace et efficiente du projet et de la gestion réactive, mais certaines composantes nécessitent des mesures correctives.
3	Assez insatisfaisant (MU)	La mise en œuvre de certaines des sept composantes permet la mise en œuvre efficace et efficiente du projet et de la gestion réactive, mais la plupart des composantes nécessitent des mesures correctives.
2	Insatisfaisant (U)	La mise en œuvre de la plupart des sept composantes ne permet pas la mise en œuvre efficace et efficiente du projet et de la gestion réactive.
1	Très insatisfaisant (HU)	La mise en œuvre d'aucune des sept composantes ne permet la mise en œuvre efficace et efficiente du projet et de la gestion réactive.

Évaluation de la durabilité : (une seule évaluation globale)		
4	Probable (L)	Risques négligeables pour la durabilité ; les principales réalisations sont sur le point d'être atteintes à la clôture du projet et devraient être maintenues dans un avenir prévisible
3	Assez probable (ML)	Risques modérés ; certaines réalisations au moins devraient être maintenues, étant donné les progrès vers les résultats des réalisations observés lors de l'examen à mi-parcours
2	Assez improbable (MU)	Risques importants que les principales réalisations ne soient pas maintenues après la clôture du projet, à l'exception de certains produits et activités
1	Improbable (U)	Risques forts que les réalisations du projet et les principaux produits ne soient pas maintenus