

**MID-TERM REVIEW TERMS OF REFERENCE**

# Position Information

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Post Title: | Expert to conduct Project Mid Term Review |
| Practice Area: | Environment and Livelihoods |
| Post Level: | A team of two independent consultants (one international team leader and one national consultant) |
| Duration of the assignment: | Maximum 25 working days during the period of 15 August – 30 November 2020 |
| Duty station: | Thimphu, with travel to the target field sites (about 10 working days) |
| Cluster/Project: | Environment &Livelihood Portfolio |
| Supervisor: | Portfolio Manager, Environment &Livelihood Portfolio |

# INTRODUCTION

This is the Terms of Reference (ToR) for the UNDP-GEF Midterm Review (MTR) of the *full* -sized project titled **“*Enhancing Sustainability and Climate Resilience of Forest and Agriculture Landscape and Community Livelihoods in Bhutan”***(PIMS 5713) implemented through the *Gross National Happiness Commission (GNHC)*, which is to be undertaken in *2017-2023*. The project started on the *October 30, 2017* and is in its *third* year of implementation. In line with the UNDP-GEF Guidance on MTRs, this MTR process was initiated after 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/mid-term/Guidance_Midterm%20Review%20_EN_2014.pdf).*

# PROJECT BACKGROUND INFORMATION

In order to reduce climate change vulnerabilities and improve the sustainability of local livelihoods and biodiversity of the country, the Royal Government of Bhutan requested support from the Global Environment Facility (GEF) through UNDP for a full-size project titled ***“Enhancing Sustainability and Climate Resilience of Forest and Agricultural Landscape and Community Livelihoods in Bhutan.”*** The project was designed to operationalize an integrated landscape-based approach to climate change adaptation and biodiversity conservation. It seeks to do so through: (a) improvement of institutional capacity at national, sub-national and local levels to manage forest and agricultural landscapes sustainably for enhanced climate resilience; (b) emplacement of governance system for biological corridors and operationalization of conservation management system in the pilot corridors; and (c) development of climate-resilient livelihood options for the local communities.

The project will deliver simultaneous global benefits, in terms of improved conservation, reduced land degradation, reduced loss of carbon stocks and reduced GHG emissions, as well as improved local livelihoods.

The objective of this project is to operationalizing an integrated landscape approach through strengthening of biological corridors, sustainable forest and agricultural systems, and building climate resilience of community livelihoods. The results will increase forest cover, its quality, wildlife population, and make agriculture and livelihood climate resilient. It will also increase community participation in conservation and enhance capacity of personnel from National to grassroots level to monitor, analyse, plan and manage Protected Areas (PAs), Biological Corridors (BCs) and agriculture landscape. By increasing carbon sink it also contribute in carbon sequestration.

The project has Four main components:

**Component 1** Enhanced institutional capacity for integrated landscape management (ILM) and climate change resilience

**Component 2** Emplacement of biological corridor system governance and management system at pilot corridors

**Component 3** Climate Adaptative communities

**Component 4** Knowledge Management and Monitoring & Evaluation

The project implementing partner is the Gross National Happiness Commission (GNHC). Other ministries, like the Ministry of Agriculture and Forests (MoAF), the Ministry of Works and Human Settlements (MoWHS), NGOs, Local Governments (Districts) and community groups are also involved in implementation process. The collaborative arrangement has been set up at the technical level through the designation of focal persons in the line ministries and departments.

The project interventions focus on three landscapes covering 38 gewogs/blocks across 12 dzongkhags/districts in the central belt of the country, focusing on four Biological Corridors (BCs) and three Protected Areas (PAs). The project has a total budget of USD 56,597,424 comprising of a grant from GEF resources of USD 13, 967, 124 and co-finance from UNDP CO and the government of USD 42,630,300.

The project implementation was slightly delayed in the first two quarters of 2020 due to COVID-19. With the first case of COVID-19 detected on March 5, 2020, the government put in several restrictions on travel and public gatherings. While there wasn’t complete lockdown given that all 87 cases till date are imported, travel restriction and restriction on gatherings hampered implementation of some activities particularly those activities that required community consultations. Further, lockdown in India also slightly affected the project as most materials are imported from India. Despite this, government’s focus on economic contingency plan on agriculture sector provided required impetus to even frontload livelihood related activities besides extension of all possible support in ensuring effective project implementation.

# 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.

* The main purpose of the MTR is to assess whether the project is on course in line with its project strategic target setting and UNDP Country Programme Document(?)), and make recommendation to enhance and improve the project performance as well as suggestion for future improvement (i.e. in the areas related to the appropriate project design, process of implementation, effectiveness, efficiency, partnership and sustainability).
* Using the results findings and lessons learnt to improve the project document and framework to reflect on the current project context and situation with strong connection to the Country Programme Action Plan (CPAP) / Country Programme Document and related current strategic country focused areas.

# 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]](#footnote-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]](#footnote-2) Stakeholder involvement should include interviews with stakeholders who have project responsibilities, including but not limited to *(list of stakeholders*); executing agencies, senior officials and task team/ component leaders, key experts and consultants in the subject area, Project Board, project stakeholders, academia, local government and CSOs, etc. Considering the COVID-19 situation, the MTR team should consider using technologies and tools to effectively engage stakeholder virtually. Additionally, the MTR team may require conducting field missions to three project landscapes along central Bhutan, including the following project sites[[3]](#footnote-3).

* **Landscape I**, covering Jigme Khesar Strict Nature Reserve and Biological Corridor 1, in the western part of the country (Paro and Haa districts including 4 gewogs/blocks).
* **Landscape II**, covering Jigme Singye Wangchuck National Park and Biological Corridors 2 and 8, in the central-west part (Punakha, Sarpang, Thimphu, Trongsa, Tsirang, Wangdiphodrang and Zhemgang including 23 gewogs/blocks all together).
* **Landscape III**, covering Phrumsengla National Park and Biological Corridor 4, in the central-east part (Bumthang, Lhuntse, Mongar and Zhemgang including 10 gewogs/blocks altogether).

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.

As of 11 March 2020, the World Health Organization (WHO) declared COVID-19 a global pandemic as the new coronavirus rapidly spread to all regions of the world. Travel to the country has been restricted since 6th March, 2020 and travel within the country was also restricted but now lifted. Considering international travel restriction in the country due to COVID-19, the international consultant may not be able to travel to Bhutan. However, national consultant can still travel within the country unless there is community transmission and government impose lockdown. If it is not possible to travel to or within the country for the MTR mission then the MTR team should develop a methodology that takes this into account the conduct of the MTR virtually and remotely, including the use of remote interview methods and extended desk reviews, data analysis, surveys and evaluation questionnaires. This should be detailed in the MTR Inception Report and agreed with the Commissioning Unit.

If all or part of the MTR is to be carried out virtually then consideration should be taken for stakeholder availability, ability or willingness to be interviewed remotely. In addition, their accessibility to the internet/computer may be an issue as many government and national counterparts may be working from home. These limitations must be reflected in the final MTR report.

If a data collection/field mission is not possible then remote interviews may be undertaken through telephone or online (skype, zoom etc.). International consultants can work remotely with national evaluator’s support in the field if it is safe for them to operate and travel. No stakeholders, consultants or UNDP staff should be put in harm’s way and safety is the key priority.

A short validation mission may be considered if it is confirmed to be safe for staff, consultants, stakeholders and if such a mission is possible within the MTR schedule. Equally, qualified and independent national consultants can be hired to undertake the MTR and interviews in country as long as it is safe to do so.

# DETAILED SCOPE OF THE MTR

The MTR team will assess the following four categories of project progress. See the *[Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects](http://web.undp.org/evaluation/documents/guidance/GEF/mid-term/Guidance_Midterm%20Review%20_EN_2014.pdf)* for extended descriptions.

### Project Strategy

**Project design:**

* Review the problem addressed by the project and the underlying assumptions. Review the effect of any incorrect assumptions or changes to the context to achieving the project results as outlined in the Project Document.
* Review the relevance of the project strategy and assess whether it provides the most effective route towards expected/intended results. Were lessons from other relevant projects properly incorporated into the project design?
* Review how the project addresses country priorities. Review country ownership. Was the project concept in line with the national sector development priorities and plans of the country (or of participating countries in the case of multi-country projects)?
* Review decision-making processes: were perspectives of those who would be affected by project decisions, those who could affect the outcomes, and those who could contribute information or other resources to the process, taken into account during project design processes?
* Review the extent to which relevant gender issues were raised in the project design. See Annex 9 of *Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects* for further guidelines.
* If there are major areas of concern, recommend areas for improvement.

### Results Framework/Logframe:

* Undertake a critical analysis of the project’s logframe indicators and targets, assess how “SMART” the midterm and end-of-project targets are (Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Relevant, Time-bound), and suggest specific amendments/revisions to the targets and indicators as necessary.
* Are the project’s objectives and outcomes or components clear, practical, and feasible within its time frame?
* Examine if progress so far has led to or could in the future catalyse beneficial development effects (i.e. income generation, gender equality and women’s empowerment, improved governance etc...) that should be included in the project results framework and monitored on an annual basis.
* Ensure broader development and gender aspects of the project are being monitored effectively. Develop and recommend SMART ‘development’ indicators, including sex-disaggregated indicators and indicators that capture development benefits.

### ii. Progress Towards Results

**Progress Towards Outcomes Analysis:**

* Review the logframe indicators against progress made towards the end-of-project targets using the Progress Towards Results Matrix and following the *Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects*; colour code progress in a “traffic light system” based on the level of progress achieved; assign a rating on progress for each outcome; make recommendations from the areas marked as “Not on target to be achieved” (red).

**Table. Progress Towards Results Matrix (Achievement of outcomes against End-of-project Targets).**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Project Strategy** | **Indicator[[4]](#footnote-4)** | **Baseline Level[[5]](#footnote-5)** | **Level in 1st PIR (self- reported)** | **Midterm Target[[6]](#footnote-6)** | **End-of-project Target** | **Midterm Level & Assessment[[7]](#footnote-7)** | **Achievement Rating[[8]](#footnote-8)** | **Justification for Rating** |
| **Objective:** | Indicator (if applicable): |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Outcome 1:** | Indicator 1: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Indicator 2: |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Outcome 2:** | Indicator 3: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Indicator 4: |  |  |  |  |  |
| Etc. |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Etc.** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**Indicator Assessment Key**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Green= Achieved | Yellow= On target to be achieved | Red= Not on target to be achieved |

**In addition to the progress towards outcomes analysis:**

* Review the project’s alignment/transition to GEF Core Indicators in accordance with the GEF 2019 Guidelines on Core Indicators and Sub-indicators
* Compare and analyse the GEF Tracking Tool/Core Indicator 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.[[9]](#footnote-9)

Recommendations should be succinct suggestions for critical intervention that are specific, measurable, achievable, and relevant. A recommendation table should be put in the report’s executive summary. See the *Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects* for guidance on a recommendation table.

The MTR 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 “Enhancing Sustainability and Climate Resilience of Forest and Agriculture Landscape and Community Livelihoods in Bhutan” Project

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Measure** | **MTR Rating** | **Achievement Description** |
| **Project Strategy** | N/A |  |
| **Progress Towards Results** | Objective Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale) |  |
| Outcome 1 Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale) |  |
| Outcome 2 Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale) |  |
| Outcome 3 Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale) |  |
| Etc. |  |
| **Project Implementation & Adaptive Management** | (rate 6 pt. scale) |  |
| **Sustainability** | (rate 4 pt. scale) |  |

# TIMEFRAME

The MTR consultancy will be approximately 25 working days over a time period of 8 weeks starting August 2020 and shall not exceed FOUR months from when the consultant is hired. The tentative MTR timeframe is as follows:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **TIMEFRAME** | **ACTIVITY** |
| 9th August 2020 | Application closes |
| 10th August 2020 | Select MTR Team |
| 21st August 2020 | Prep the MTR Team (handover of Project Documents) |
| 28th August 2020 [4 days] | Document review and preparing MTR Inception Report |
| 4th September 2020 [3 days] | Finalization andValidation of MTR Inception Report- latest start of MTR mission10 |
| 29th September 2020 [10-13 days] | MTR mission: stakeholder meetings, interviews, field visits[[10]](#footnote-10) |
| 19th October 2020 | Mission wrap-up meeting & presentation of initial findings- earliest end of MTR mission |
| 2nd November 2020 [10 days] | Preparing draft report |
| 12th November 2020 [2 days] | Incorporating audit trail from feedback on draft report/Finalization of MTR report (note: accommodate time delay in dates for circulation and review of the draft report) |
| 20th November 2020 | Preparation & Issue of Management Response |
| 25th November 2020 | (optional)Concluding Stakeholder Workshop (not mandatory for MTR team) |
| 30th November 2020 | Expected date of full MTR completion |

# 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: 25th September 2020 | MTR team submits to the Commissioning Unit and project management |
| **2** | **Presentation** | Initial Findings | End of MTR mission: 19th October 2020 | 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: 2nd November 2020 | 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: 30th November 2020 | 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.

# 7. MTR ARRANGEMENTS

The principal responsibility for managing this MTR resides with the Commissioning Unit. The Commissioning Unit for this project’s MTR is UNDP Bhutan Country office. Supervision and monitoring performance of the consultant shall be provided by Project Technical Specialist. The Portfolio Manager of Environment & Livelihood Cluster will provide overall quality assurance on the draft reports.

The commissioning unit will contract the consultants and ensure the timely provision of per diems and travel arrangements in Bhutan for the MTR team, if the travel is permitted. 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.

The Commissioning Unit and Project Team will provide logistic support in the implementation of remote/ virtual meetings if travel to project site is restricted. An updated stakeholder list with contact details (phone and email) will be provided by the Commissioning Unit to the MTR team.

# TEAM COMPOSITION

A team of two independent consultants will conduct the MTR - one international team leader (with experience and exposure to projects and evaluations in other regions globally) and one local expert 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 national consultant will work closely with the International Consultant in supporting any work that needs to be undertaken as laid out in this ToR, and other tasks, as required. The National Consultant will also act as a focal point for coordinating and working with relevant stakeholders in Bhutan. In the case of international travel restriction and the mission is not possible, the MTR team will use alternative means of interviewing stakeholders and data collection (i.e. Skype interview, mobile questionnaires, etc.) including the field visit by the National Consultant under the International Consultant’s guidance.

The selection of consultants will be aimed at maximizing the overall “team” qualities in the following areas: *(give a weight to all these qualification so applicants know what is the max amount of points they can earn for technical evaluation).*

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 GEF focal areas including Biodiversity, Climate Change Adaptation and Sustainable Forest Management-REDD.
* Experience working with the GEF or GEF-evaluations;
* Experience working in least develop countries particularly in Asia Region);
* Work experience in relevant technical areas for at least 10 years;
* Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender and GEF focal areas such as Biodiversity Conservation, Climate Change Adaptation and Sustainable Forest Management-REDD; 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;
* Experience with implementing evaluations remotely will be considered an asset.
* A Master’s degree in fields of Agriculture, Natural Resource Management, and Climate Change Adaptation, or other closely related field.

### Qualification Criteria

1. **Team Leader/International Consultant**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Education: | Master’s degree or equivalent in fields related to Agriculture, Natural Resource Management, and Climate Change Adaptation and relevant field. |
| Experience: | Strong technical background in biodiversity conservation, protected areas management, livelihoods, or related areas of natural resource management in Bhutan. A minimum of 10 years of relevant experience is required.  Substantive experience in reviewing and evaluating similar projects, preferably those involving UNDP/GEF or other United Nations development agencies or major donors; |
| Competencies: | Demonstrate ability to assess complex situations, succinctly distills critical issues, and draw forward-looking conclusions and recommendations;  Ability and experience to lead multi-disciplinary and national teams, and deliver quality reports within the given time;  Highly knowledgeable of participatory monitoring and evaluation processes, and experience in evaluation of technical assistance projects with major donor agencies;  Familiarity with the challenges developing countries face in adapting to climate change; and Familiarity with Bhutan or similar countries;  Excellent interpersonal, coordination and planning skills, and ability to work in a team.  Ability and willingness to travel to districts; and  Computer literate (MS Office package). |
| Language Requirements: | Excellent English writing and communication skills |

### National Consultant

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Education: | Master’s degree or equivalent in in fields related to Agriculture, Natural Resource Management, and Climate Change Adaptation and relevant field. |
| Experience: | Strong technical background in biodiversity conservation, protected areas management, livelihoods, or related areas of natural resource management in Bhutan. A minimum of 5 years of relevant experience is required.  Substantive experience in reviewing and evaluating similar projects, preferably those involving UNDP/GEF or other United Nations development agencies or major donors; |
| Competencies: | Demonstrate ability to assess complex situations, succinctly distills critical issues, and draw forward-looking conclusions and recommendations;  Ability and experience to lead multi-disciplinary and national teams, and deliver quality reports within the given time;  Highly knowledgeable of participatory monitoring and evaluation processes, and experience in evaluation of technical assistance projects with major donor agencies;  Familiarity with the challenges developing countries face in adapting to climate change;  Excellent interpersonal, coordination and planning skills, and ability to work in a team.  Ability and willingness to travel to districts; and  Computer literate (MS Office package). |
| Language Requirements: | Excellent English writing and communication skills, familiarity with local dialects will be advantage. |

# 10. PAYMENT MODALITIES AND SPECIFICATIONS

*First payment:* 20% of the contract lump-sum amount will be paid within 15 days after submission and acceptance of the consultancy inception report which includes work-plan, key milestones and approach of conducing the assignment consistent with the Terms of Reference.

*Second payment:* 30% of the contract lump-sum amount will be paid within 15 days after submission the draft evaluation report and draft revised RRF.

*Last payment:* 50% of the contract lump-sum amount will be paid within 15 days after submission and acceptance of the final evaluation report and final revised RRF.

Every payment is subject to receipt of certification of payment and performance evaluation for last payment duly completed and signed by Portfolio Manager, Environment and Livelihood Cluster, UNDP – Bhutan.

In line with the UNDP’s financial regulations, when determined by the Commissioning Unit and/or the consultant that a deliverable or service cannot be satisfactorily completed due to the impact of COVID-19 and limitations to the MTR, that deliverable or service will not be paid.

Due to the current COVID-19 situation and its implications, a partial payment may be considered if the consultant invested time towards the deliverable but was unable to complete to circumstances beyond his/her control.

# 11. APPLICATION PROCESS

### Recommended Presentation of Proposal:

a) Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability using the template[[11]](#footnote-11) provided by UNDP;

b) CV or a Personal History Form (P11 form[[12]](#footnote-12));

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 address (UNDP Country Office, Bhutan) in a sealed envelope indicating the following reference “Consultant for (Enhancing Sustainability and Climate Resilience of Forest and Agriculture Landscape and Community Livelihoods in Bhutan) Midterm Review” or by email at the following address ONLY: ([procurement.bt@undp.org](mailto:procurement.bt@undp.org)) by (12.00 pm and August 9, 2020). 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.

**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
6. Inception Report
7. All Project Implementation Reports (PIR’s)
8. Quarterly progress reports and work plans of the various implementation task teams
9. Audit reports
10. The proposed Core Indicator mid-term values (and adjusted baselines if possible)
11. Finalized GEF Climate Change Adaptation Tracking Tools at CEO endorsement and midterm *(Updated CCA TT and METT)*
12. Oversight mission reports
13. All monitoring reports prepared by the project
14. Financial and Administration guidelines used by Project Team
15. The following documents will also be available:
16. Project operational guidelines, manuals and systems
17. UNDP country/countries programme document(s)
18. Minutes of the ***(project title)*** Project Steering Committee Meetings and other meetings (i.e. Project Appraisal Committee meetings)
19. Project site location maps

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

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **i.** | Basic Report Information (for opening page or title page)   1. Title of UNDP supported GEF financed project 2. UNDP PIMS# and GEF project ID# 3. MTR time frame and date of MTR report 4. Region and countries included in the project 5. GEF Operational Focal Area/Strategic Program 6. Executing Agency/Implementing Partner and other project partners 7. MTR team members 8. Acknowledgements | | |
| **ii.** | Table of Contents | | |
| **iii.** | Acronyms and Abbreviations | | |
| **1.** | 1. Executive Summary (3-5 pages) 2. Project Information Table 3. Project Description (brief) 4. Project Progress Summary (between 200-500 words) 5. MTR Ratings & Achievement Summary Table 6. Concise summary of conclusions 7. Recommendation Summary Table | | |
| **2.** | Introduction (2-3 pages)   1. Purpose of the MTR and objectives 2. Scope & Methodology: principles of design and execution of the MTR, MTR approach and data collection methods, limitations to the MTR 3. Structure of the MTR report | | |
| **3.** | Project Description and Background Context (3-5 pages)   1. Development context: environmental, socio-economic, institutional, and policy factors relevant to the project objective and scope 2. Problems that the project sought to address: threats and barriers targeted 3. Project Description and Strategy: objective, outcomes and expected results, description of field sites (if any) 4. Project Implementation Arrangements: short description of the Project Board, key implementing partner arrangements, etc. 5. Project timing and milestones 6. 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  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 CCA tracking tools  Annexed in a separate file: GEF-**UNDP Co-financing template for MTR-TE** | | |

ToR ANNEX C: Midterm Review Evaluative Matrix Template

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Evaluative Questions** | **Indicators** | **Sources** | **Methodology** |
| **Project Strategy: To what extent is the project strategy relevant to country priorities, country ownership, and the best route towards expected results?** | | | |
| Is the project a good idea given the situation needing improvement? | Extent to which project objectives and outcomes relates to | * Project documents, project staff, project partners, * Data collected throughout the MTR mission, etc.) * Annual and Quarterly Reports * Field Reports from project personnel * National/Ministerial policy documents*/strategic plans* * Media articles/reports | * Individual interviews * Document analysis/ Desk reviews * Reports * FGDs * Other |
| **Progress Towards Results: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved thus far?** | | | |
| How have the project beneficiaries been satisfied with the project deliverables and outcomes? Does it deal with target group priorities? Why or why not? | Project indicators relating to percentage of households and communities that have stable or increased food security in the face of climate change and enhanced early warning system.  Project indicators relating to number of project beneficiaries (includes people engaged in training, awareness-raising and education, pilot villages, delivery of project initiatives, stakeholder meetings and project governance) | * Project documents, project staff, project partners, * Data collected throughout the MTR mission, etc.) * Annual and Quarterly Reports * Field Reports from project personnel * National/Ministerial policy documents*/strategic plans* * Media articles/reports | * Individual interviews * Document analysis/ Desk reviews * Reports * FGDs * Other |
| **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?** | | | |
| * Are inputs (resources and time) used in the best possible way to achieve the outcomes? | GoK provides annual financial support (in-kind and grant) to maintain national adaptation and monitoring tool | * Project documents, project staff, project partners, * Data collected throughout the MTR mission, etc.) * Annual and Quarterly Reports * Field Reports from project personnel * National/Ministerial policy documents*/strategic plans*   Media articles/reports | * Individual interviews * Document analysis/ Desk reviews * Reports * FGDs * Other |
| How are the realised outputs delivered or why did expected outputs fail in some cases? | * Extent to which monitoring, evaluation and reporting is maintained and contributes towards adaptive management. | * Project documents, project staff, project partners, * Data collected throughout the MTR mission, etc.) * Annual and Quarterly Reports * Field Reports from project personnel * National/Ministerial policy documents*/strategic plans* * Media articles/reports | * Individual interviews * Document analysis/ Desk reviews * Reports * FGDs * Other |
| **Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, socio-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?** | | | |
| To what extent is the project contributing towards its longer-term goals? What unanticipated positive or negative consequences is the project having? Why did they arise? | * Extent of adaptive management employed by project management | * Project documents, project staff, project partners, * Data collected throughout the MTR mission, etc.) * Annual and Quarterly Reports * Field Reports from project personnel * National/Ministerial policy documents*/strategic plans* * Media articles/reports | * Individual interviews * Document analysis/ Desk reviews * Reports * FGDs * Other |
| * What has been put in place to ensure continuity of the project (financial, institutional arrangements, socio-economic programs)? * What are the remaining risks to project sustainability? | * Status of risk logs and risk monitoring mechanisms * Status of sustainability plans and exit strategy | * Project documents, project staff, project partners, * Data collected throughout the MTR mission, etc.) * Annual and Quarterly Reports * Field Reports from project personnel * National/Ministerial policy documents*/strategic plans* * Media articles/reports |  |
| **COVID-19 impact in project implementation** | | | |
| * How did COVID impacted project implementation? * What issues and challenges did the project encountered due to COVID? * What are some of the key project milestone affected (delayed, deferred, cancelled) due to COVID? * What mechanisms are put in place to tackle issues and challenges related to COVID impact? | * Status of financial delivery and physical progress | * Standard Progress Reports | **Interviews**  **Desk Review** |

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

**Evaluators/Consultants:**

1. Must present information that is complete and fair in its assessment of strengths and weaknesses so that decisions or actions taken are well founded.
2. Must disclose the full set of evaluation findings along with information on their limitations and have this accessible to all affected by the evaluation with expressed legal rights to receive results.
3. Should protect the anonymity and confidentiality of individual informants. They should provide maximum notice, minimize demands on time, and respect people’s right not to engage. Evaluators must respect people’s right to provide information in confidence and must ensure that sensitive information cannot be traced to its source. Evaluators are not expected to evaluate individuals and must balance an evaluation of management functions with this general principle.
4. Sometimes uncover evidence of wrongdoing while conducting evaluations. Such cases must be reported discreetly to the appropriate investigative body. Evaluators should consult with other relevant oversight entities when there is any doubt about if and how issues should be reported.
5. Should be sensitive to beliefs, manners and customs and act with integrity and honesty in their relations with all stakeholders. In line with the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights, evaluators must be sensitive to and address issues of discrimination and gender equality. They should avoid offending the dignity and self-respect of those persons with whom they come in contact in the course of the evaluation. Knowing that evaluation might negatively affect the interests of some stakeholders, evaluators should conduct the evaluation and communicate its purpose and results in a way that clearly respects the stakeholders’ dignity and self-worth.
6. Are responsible for their performance and their product(s). They are responsible for the clear, accurate and fair written and/or oral presentation of study limitations, findings and recommendations.
7. Should reflect sound accounting procedures and be prudent in using the resources of the evaluation.

**MTR Consultant Agreement Form**

Agreement to abide by the Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN System:

Name of Consultant: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Name of Consultancy Organization (where relevant): \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**I confirm that I have received and understood and will abide by the United Nations Code of Conduct for Evaluation.**

Signed at *\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ (Place)* on *\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ (Date)*

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**ToR ANNEX 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.

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

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

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

1. For ideas on innovative and participatory Monitoring and Evaluation strategies and techniques, see [UNDP Discussion Paper: Innovations in Monitoring & Evaluating Results](http://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/librarypage/capacity-building/discussion-paper--innovations-in-monitoring---evaluating-results/), 05 Nov 2013. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. For more stakeholder engagement in the M&E process, see the [UNDP Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results](http://www.undg.org/docs/11653/UNDP-PME-Handbook-(2009).pdf), Chapter 3, pg. 93. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Note that Travel bans, restrictions and requirements will likely affect the dates and structure of the missions. Flexibility is expected from the selected candidate in terms of the possibility of having alternative mission and consultation arrangements (i.e. desk review, online consultations and data collected remotely, etc.). [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. Populate with data from the Logframe and scorecards [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. Populate with data from the Project Document [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. If available [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. Colour code this column only [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. Use the 6 point Progress Towards Results Rating Scale: HS, S, MS, MU, U, HU [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. Alternatively, MTR conclusions may be integrated into the body of the report. [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. Note that Travel bans, restrictions and requirements will likely affect the dates and structure of the missions. Flexibility is expected from the selected candidate in terms of the possibility of having alternative mission and consultation arrangements (i.e. desk review, online consultations and data collected remotely, etc.). [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
11. <https://intranet.undp.org/unit/bom/pso/Support%20documents%20on%20IC%20Guidelines/Template%20for%20Confirmation%20of%20Interest%20and%20Submission%20of%20Financial%20Proposal.docx> [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
12. <http://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/corporate/Careers/P11_Personal_history_form.doc> [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
13. The Report length should not exceed 40 pages in total (not including annexes). [↑](#footnote-ref-13)
14. [www.undp.org/unegcodeofconduct](http://www.undp.org/unegcodeofconduct) [↑](#footnote-ref-14)