

TERMS OF REFERENCE

CLUSTER: Sustainable Development Cluster

A. GENERAL INFORMATION

Title: Mid term Review

Projects:

- Award No.: 00097946 (A&L Project), Project No. 00101490., Project Name: Adaptive Management and Learning –a child project of the Commodities Integrated Approach Pilot Program, and
- Award No.: 00098209, Project No. 00101611, Project Name: Production – a child project of the Commodities Integrated Approach Pilot (GEF-CIAP)

Type of Contract: Professional Services

Direct Supervisor: GGP Global Project Manager

Modality of Execution: DIM

Duty Station: Home-based with mission travel

Estimated Start Date: May 20, 2019

Duration: 80¹ working days within a 7 months period

B. INTRODUCTION

This is the Terms of Reference (ToR) for the UNDP-GEF Midterm Review (MTR) of two full-sized projects under the Good Growth Partnership, one of the GEF-funded integrated approach pilots (IAP). The first project is *Adaptive Management and Learning for the Commodities IAP (A&L)* (PIMS 5665), a global project implemented by UNDP and WWF-US.

The second project is *Reducing Deforestation from Commodity Production* (PIMS 5664), a global project working in Indonesia, Liberia, and Paraguay. The Indonesia portion of the project is implemented by UNDP Indonesia with WWF-Indonesia and Conservation International as responsible parties, in partnership with the Ministry of Agriculture, the Ministry of Environment and Forestry and the Coordinating Ministry for Economic Affairs; the Liberia portion of the project is implemented by UNDP Liberia with Conservation International as responsible party in partnership with the

¹ “ Note: these are tentative working days and not man days

Ministry of Agriculture, the Forest Development Authority, and the Environmental Protection Agency; and the Paraguay portion is implemented by UNDP Paraguay in partnership with the Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development.

The A&L project started on 3 March 2017, and the Production project began on 15 June 2017 with the Paraguay portion starting on 3 July 2017; both the A&L and Production projects are in their second year of implementation and due to undertake the midterm review in 2019. 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/guidance.shtml#gef>).

C. PROJECT BACKGROUND

The [Good Growth Partnership \(GGP\)](#) is a commodities-focused integrated approach pilot programme, “*Taking Deforestation out of Commodity Supply Chains*,” consisting of 5 GEF-funded child projects working across production, financing, and demand, in Brazil, Indonesia, Liberia, and Paraguay. This programme is advancing an integrated supply chain approach to tackling the underlying root causes of deforestation from beef, palm oil, and soy, which together account for nearly 70% of deforestation globally.

Working with a full range of stakeholders, from small-scale producers to national governments and global corporations, the GGP promotes a holistic approach to sustainability that encompasses entire commodity supply chains and looks at where the layers of the supply chain integrate and overlap to enhance financial incentives and demand for sustainably produced agricultural commodities. By combining forces, the Good Growth Partnership aims to provide a model of wide-scale systemic reform that capitalizes on the strengths of each partner.

The coordination and integration of the partnership are led by the [UNDP Green Commodities Programme \(GCP\)](#) through the **Adaptive Management and Learning (A&L)** project. This child project is instrumental in ensuring that the programme is viewed as a cohesive whole and that it has a clear identity. Component 1 of the A&L project, implemented by UNDP GCP, is coordinated management of the GGP programme, leading to logical technical sequencing, programme-level monitoring and evaluation, and overall resilience. This includes leading Secretariat meetings, supporting the creation of integrated intervention plans, and capturing and disseminating effective adaptive management practices across the programme.

Through Component 2, implemented by WWF-US and executed by ISEAL Alliance, the project contributes to developing a robust and policy-relevant evidence base on the effectiveness and impacts of voluntary sustainability standards (VSS) and VSS-like mechanisms being used to implement deforestation-free and sustainable production and sourcing initiatives. The establishment of a Global Impact Platform (re-branded as “Evidensia”) will fill in key gaps to the evidence base and synthesize and communicate evidence in decision-relevant terms.

Component 3, implemented by UNDP GCP, is on knowledge management, partnership development and communications implemented to maximize learning, foster synergies and promote replication and upscaling of actions to address deforestation in commodity supply chains. This includes supporting an active community of practice – the Green Commodities Community – through which practitioners from GGP projects, countries, and partners as well as the broader sustainable commodities community share knowledge and learn from each other.

The total A&L project budget is USD 9,245,328 including USD 3,978,441 in funding from the GEF and USD 5,266,887 in co-financing. The 4-year project is expected to close in March 2021.

The **Production** child project, implemented globally by UNDP, works to improve the enabling environment for sustainable commodity production through dialogue platforms, policy reform, land use planning, and farmer training and support. In Indonesia UNDP executes the national-level work as well as the provincial level work in 3 provinces (Riau, North Sumatra and West Kalimantan) and landscape-level work in Pelalawan district (in Riau Province), while Conservation International executes the landscape-level work in South Tapanuli district (North Sumatra Province) and WWF-Indonesia in Sintang district (West Kalimantan Province). In Liberia UNDP executes the national-level work with Conservation International leading the landscape-level work in Grand Cape Mount, Bomi, Gbarpolu, and Bong counties (known as the Sime Darby landscape). In Paraguay UNDP executes the national and landscape-level work in the Chaco region.

Component 1 of the project is on dialogue and production and land use related policies, using national commodity platforms, national action plans, and improvements to the enabling environment through regulatory reform. Component 2 covers farmer support extension services and farmer training. Component 3 covers improved land-use planning, zoning, and set-asides, resulting in increased legal protections and reduced carbon emissions. Component 4 is on knowledge management, including increased knowledge of effective strategies and tools for improving production of commodities in ways that do not involve conversion of forested land, and uptake and replication of lessons learned.

The total Production project budget is USD 179,284,671 including USD 14,584,403 in funding from the GEF and USD 164,700,268 in co-financing. The 4-year project is expected to close in June 2021.

The other three child projects of the GGP are Demand, Transactions, and Brazil. The **Demand** project, led globally by WWF-US, helps raise awareness and strengthen demand for sustainably produced beef, palm oil and soy among consumers, policymakers, companies and investors.

Under the **Transactions** project, UN Environment's Finance Initiative (UNEP-FI) and the International Finance Corporation (IFC) work closely with banks and related institutions to help make sustainable financing more accessible for businesses, farmers and producers who require additional capital to invest in more environmentally sound practices.

The **Brazil** project, led by Conservation International, combines the production, demand, and transactions streams into a single project in that country, including national work with a landscape focus of the Matopiba region.

D. OBJECTIVES of SERVICE / ASSIGNMENT

A separate MTR will be conducted for each project according to the objectives and results of that project, but with an understanding of the broader GGP context.

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 realistic 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 and its risks to sustainability.

E. APPROACH AND METHODOLOGY

The MTR must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable, balanced, 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 approach² ensuring close engagement with the Project Team, government counterparts (including the GEF Operational Focal Points in the Production countries), the UNDP Country Offices, UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Advisers, the GEF Sec's Focal Point for GGP and other key stakeholders.

Engagement of stakeholders is vital to a successful MTR.³ Stakeholder involvement should include interviews with stakeholders who have project responsibilities, including but not limited to members of the project management units with UNDP GCP, UNDP-Indonesia, UNDP-Liberia, UNDP-Paraguay, WWF-Indonesia, Conservation International-HQ, Conservation International-Indonesia, Conservation International-Liberia, senior officials and task team/ component leaders, key experts and consultants in the subject area for the GGP Production project and UNDP GCP, WWF-US, Conservation International-HQ, Conservation International-Brazil, UNEP-FI, IFC, and ISEAL Alliance for GGP A&L project; as well as Project Board, project stakeholders, academia, local government and CSOs, etc. for both projects where relevant. Additionally, for the Production project the MTR team is expected to conduct field missions to Indonesia, Liberia, and Paraguay including the following project sites Pelalawan, Sintang, South Tapanuli (Indonesia), Sime Darby landscape (North West Liberia), and the Chaco region (Paraguay). No mission is required for MTR of the A&L project. However, it would be extremely beneficial for the Team Leader (or another relevant member of the team) to attend the Good Growth Conference scheduled for May 13-17 in Peru. That will allow the team member to get well acquainted up-front with the concepts, approaches and concrete work involved in these projects, and already allow for contacts with many of the relevant stakeholders.

The MTR team should spend enough time to get acquainted with the evolution of the political economy in the four countries, and remain mindful of it in the recommendations they produce.

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.

F. DETAILED SCOPE OF WORK

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 participating countries?

² For ideas on innovative and participatory Monitoring and Evaluation strategies and techniques, see [UNDP Discussion Paper: Innovations in Monitoring & Evaluating Results](#), 05 Nov 2013.

³ 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 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 ⁴	Baseline Level ⁵	Level in 1 st PIR (self-reported)	Midterm Target	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

⁴ Populate with data from the Logframe and scorecards

⁵ Populate with data from the Project Document

⁶ Colour code this column only

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

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 cognizant of political contexts and succinct suggestions for critical interventions 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 *Reducing Deforestation from Commodity Production*⁹

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)	

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

⁹ Each project must have its own report with each of these requirements. For A&L the table should read “MTR Ratings & Achievement Summary Table for *Adaptive Management and Learning for the Commodities IAP*.”

	Outcome 3 Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale)	
	Etc.	
Project Implementation & Adaptive Management	(rate 6 pt. scale)	
Sustainability	(rate 4 pt. scale)	

G. TIMEFRAME AND DURATION

The total duration of the MTR will be approximately 100 days over a time period of 31 weeks starting May 20, 2019, and shall not exceed seven months from when the consultant(s) are hired. The tentative MTR timeframe is as follows:

TIMEFRAME	ACTIVITY
29 March	Application closes
3 May	Contract MTR Team
7 May (1 Day)	Prep the MTR Team (handover of Project Documents)
14-18 May	MTR Team member attends good growth conference as part of their preparation work
31 May (8 days)	<i>A&L and Production:</i> Document review and preparing MTR Inception Reports
14 June (3 days)	<i>A&L and Production:</i> Finalization and Validation of MTR Inception Report
28 June (10 days)	<i>A&L:</i> Preparing draft report <i>Production:</i> Latest start of MTR mission
9 Aug (2 days)	<i>A&L:</i> Incorporating audit trail from feedback on draft report/Finalization of MTR report
6 Sep (1 day)	<i>A&L:</i> Preparation & Issue of Management Response
20 Sep (3 days)	<i>A&L:</i> Expected date of full MTR completion
2 Aug (35 days)	<i>Production:</i> MTR missions (stakeholder meetings, interviews, field visits) – Missions to happen in June (Paraguay) and July (Indonesia and Liberia) - earliest end of MTR mission
9 Aug (1 days)	<i>Production:</i> Mission wrap-up meeting & presentation of initial findings
26 Aug (10 days)	<i>Production:</i> Preparing draft report
27 Sep (2 days)	<i>Production:</i> Incorporating audit trail from feedback on draft report/Finalization of MTR report
18 Oct (1 day)	<i>Production:</i> Preparation & Issue of Management Response
29-31 Oct ^{Nov} (3 days)	<i>Production:</i> Expected date of full MTR completion

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

H. EXPECTED OUTPUTS / DELIVERABLES					
#	Deliverable	Description	Timing	Responsibilities	Review and Approval
1	Production MTR Inception Report	MTR team clarifies objectives and methods of Midterm Review	31 May	MTR team submits to the Commissioning Unit and project management	GGP Global Project Manager
2	A&L MTR Inception Report	MTR team clarifies objectives and methods of Midterm Review	31 May	MTR team submits to the Commissioning Unit and project management	GGP Global Project Manager
3	A&L Draft Final Report	Full report (using guidelines on content outlined in Annex B) with annexes	No later than 1 month after inception report (no MTR mission for A&L): 28 June	Sent to the Commissioning Unit, reviewed by RTA, Project Coordinating Unit, GEF OFP	GGP Global Project Manager
4	A&L Final Report	Revised report with audit trail detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final MTR report	Within 2 weeks of receiving UNDP comments on draft: 20 Sep	Sent to the Commissioning Unit	GGP Global Project Manager
5	Production Presentation	Initial Findings	End of MTR mission: 9 Aug	MTR Team presents to project management and the Commissioning Unit	GGP Global Project Manager
6	Production Draft Final Report	Full report (using guidelines on content outlined in Annex B) with annexes	Within 4 weeks of the MTR mission: 26 Aug	Sent to the Commissioning Unit, reviewed by RTA, Project Coordinating Unit, GEF OFP	GGP Global Project Manager
7	Production Final Report¹⁰	Revised report with audit trail detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final MTR report	Within 2 weeks of receiving UNDP comments on draft: 29-31 Nov Oct	Sent to the Commissioning Unit	GGP Global Project Manager
H. INSTITUTIONAL ARRANGEMENTS					

¹⁰ 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.

The principal responsibility for managing this MTR resides with the Commissioning Unit. The Commissioning Unit for this project's MTR is the UNDP Regional Bureau for Latin America and the Caribbean.

The commissioning unit will contract the company. The company will be responsible for their travel arrangements to and within Indonesia, Liberia, and Paraguay. The cost of travel will have to be included into their financial proposal, for which they will receive a lumpsum covering all costs (daily fees, travel, per diem, insurances, etc.). The Project Team will be responsible for liaising with the MTR team to provide all relevant documents, provide stakeholder contact details and support setting-up stakeholder interviews, and arranging field visits.

I. TEAM COMPOSITION AND QUALIFICATIONS OF THE SUCCESSFUL CONTRACTOR

The MTR team will be comprised of one team leader (with experience and exposure to projects and evaluations in the focus regions) one international agricultural commodities expert and, depending on the experience of the team leader and the international agricultural commodities expert, at least one country specialist (typically national consultants that can help provide the local context and knowledge) to support the Production project related in-country missions. 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 team leader will be responsible for coordinating activities with the agricultural commodities experts and the country specific consultants.

We anticipate the following composition and length of the field missions:

- Indonesia: team leader, agricultural commodities expert, Indonesia specialist; 15 days including at least 9 days in the landscapes (3 in each landscape).
- Liberia: team leader, agricultural commodities expert, Liberia specialist; 5 days
- Paraguay: team leader, agricultural commodities expert, Paraguay specialist; 7 days including at least 3 in the landscape

Organization Experience:

- At least 5-8 years of relevant experience in result-based management evaluation methodologies;
- At least 5-8 years of experience working in agriculture, agricultural commodities, deforestation, sustainable forest management, ecosystems and biodiversity, climate change mitigation, or multi-focal area projects;
- Experience applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios;
- Experience working with the GEF or GEF-evaluations;
- Experience working in Latin America, West or Central Africa, and Asia;
- Firm that can mobilize a team of highly qualified experts with the profile described below;
- Project evaluation/review experiences within United Nations system will be considered an asset.

Key Personnel Experience:

1. Team leader

- A Master's degree in international affairs, agriculture, forestry, environmental studies, natural sciences, social sciences, or other closely related field;

- At least 10 years of experience in project design, monitoring and/or evaluation in sustainable development with international organizations;
- Recent experience with result-based management evaluation methodologies;
- Competence in adaptive management, as applied to agriculture, sustainable forest management, ecosystems and biodiversity, climate change mitigation, or multi-focal area projects;
- Proven experience of working on knowledge management;
- Experience working with the GEF or GEF-evaluations;
- Experience leading an evaluation team;
- Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender and agriculture, commodities, value chains, deforestation, or climate change mitigation; experience in gender sensitive evaluation and analysis;
- Experience of engaging with the private sector, government and civil society;
- Excellent report writing and analytical skills;
- Mastery of the English language;
- Project evaluation/review experiences within United Nations system will be considered an asset;
- Experience working in Latin America, West or Central Africa, and Asia will be considered an asset.

2. International Agricultural Commodities Expert

- A Master's degree in business administration, international affairs, agriculture, forestry, environmental studies, natural sciences, social sciences, or other closely related field;
- At least 5 years of experience working on sustainable agricultural commodities, preferably palm oil and beef;
- At least 2 years of experience supporting project evaluations with international organizations;
- Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender and agriculture, commodities, value chains, deforestation, or climate change mitigation; experience in gender sensitive evaluation and analysis;
- Experience working in Latin America, West or Central Africa, and Asia;
- Mastery of the English language;
- Project evaluation/review experiences within United Nations system will be considered an asset.

3. Country Specialists (Indonesia, Liberia and/or Paraguay)

- A Bachelor's degree in international affairs, agriculture, forestry, environmental studies, natural sciences, social sciences, or other closely related field;
- At least 2 years of experience working in the agricultural commodities sector of relevance to the country (palm oil for Indonesia and Liberia, beef for Paraguay) and excellent understanding of the local context especially related to commodities production and deforestation;
- Experience of engaging with the private sector, government and civil society;
- Mastery of the English and relevant national languages (Bahasa Indonesia/Spanish);

I. DUTY STATION

The consultancy will be home based with mission travels.

J. SCOPE OF BID PRICE AND SCHEDULE OF PAYMENTS

#	Deliverable	Percentage of payment	Review and Approval
1	Production MTR Inception Report	5%	GGP Global Project Manager
2	A&L MTR Inception Report	5%	GGP Global Project Manager
3	A&L Draft Final Report	15%	GGP Global Project Manager
4	A&L Final Report	15%	GGP Global Project Manager
6	Production Draft Final Report	30%	GGP Global Project Manager
7	Production Final Report¹¹	30%	GGP Global Project Manager

K. RECOMMENDED PRESENTATION OF TECHNICAL PROPOSAL

The technical proposal should include the following items:

1. Approach to the service
2. Implementation timelines
3. Summary of key personnel competences with CV
4. Subcontracting and Partnership (if any)
5. One or two samples demonstrating the Team Leader's report writing skills

L. ANNEXES

ToR ANNEX A: List of Documents to be reviewed by the MTR Team

1. PIF
2. UNDP Initiation Plan
3. UNDP Project Document
4. UNDP Environmental and Social Screening results
5. Project Inception Report
6. 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/Core Indicators at CEO endorsement and midterm (Commodities IAP multifocal area tool: sustainable forest management, ecosystems & biodiversity, climate change mitigation)
10. Oversight mission reports
11. All monitoring reports prepared by the project
12. Financial and Administration guidelines used by Project Team
13. Electronic copies of project outputs – newsletters, booklets, manuals, technical reports, articles, etc

¹¹ 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.

The following documents will also be available:

14. Project operational guidelines, manuals and systems
15. UNDP country/countries programme document(s)
16. Minutes of the Board Meetings and other meetings (i.e. Project Appraisal Committee meetings)
17. Project site location maps

ToR ANNEX B: Guidelines on Contents for the Midterm Review Report¹²

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

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

- 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.*)

ToR ANNEX C: Midterm Review Evaluative Matrix Template

This Midterm Review Evaluative Matrix must be fully completed/amended by the consultant and included in the MTR inception report and as an Annex to the MTR report.

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 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: _____

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: _____

ToR ANNEX G: Audit Trail Template

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.

¹³ <http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/100>

