### TERMS OF REFERENCE
Ref: PN/FJ/100/20

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consultancy Title</th>
<th>Team Leader (Mid Term Review)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Name:</td>
<td>Fiji Invasive Alien Species Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Fiji and/or Home based</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application deadline</td>
<td>January 10, 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Contract</td>
<td>Individual Contractor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Languages required:</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duration of Initial Contract</td>
<td>24 days commencing no later than February 10 and completion by April 12, 2021</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Consultancy Proposal (CV & Financial proposal Template) should be uploaded on UNDP e-tendering Portal (https://etendering.partneragencies.org) no later than January 28, 2021 (New York Time). Any proposals received after the due date/time will not be accepted. Any request for clarification must be sent in writing, or by standard electronic communication to procurement.fj@undp.org. UNDP will respond in writing or by standard electronic mail and will send written copies of the response, including an explanation of the query without identifying the source of inquiry, to all consultants. Incomplete, late and joint proposals will not be considered and only offers for which there is further interest will be contacted. Failure to submit your application as stated as per the application submission guide (Procurement Notice) on the above link will be considered incomplete and therefore application will not be considered.

**NOTE:**

Proposals must be sent/uploaded through UNDP e-tendering Portal. Candidates need to upload their CV and financial proposal -using UNDP template.

*If the selecteduccessful Candidate is over 65 years of age and required to travel outside his home country; He/She will be required provide a full medical report at their expense prior to issuance to contract. Contract will only be issued when proposed candidate is deemed medically fit to undertake the assignment.*

*Daily rate to be inclusive of Medical insurance cost for the duration of the contract*
1. INTRODUCTION

This is the Terms of Reference (ToR) for the Midterm Review (MTR) of the full-sized UNDP-supported GEF-financed project titled Building Capacities to Address Invasive Alien Species to Enhance the Chances of Long-term Survival of Terrestrial Endemic and Threatened Species on Taveuni Island, Surrounding Islets and Throughout Fiji project (PIMS#5589) implemented through the Biosecurity Authority of Fiji which is to be undertaken in 2020. The project started on the 16 May, 2018 and is in its third year of implementation. This ToR sets out the expectations for this MTR. The MTR process must follow the guidance outlined in the document Guidance on Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects - http://web.undp.org/evaluation/documents/guidance/GEF/midterm/Guidance_Midterm%20Review_EN_2014.pdf

2. PROJECT BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Invasive alien species (IAS) are the greatest threat to biodiversity in the Pacific Islands. The recent introduction of Giant Invasive Iguana – GII (Iguana iguana) – to Fiji represents the first established population of this species in the Pacific and is a potential bridgehead to some of the world’s most isolated island ecosystems. GII have already caused harm throughout the Caribbean where they are spreading fast and have significant detrimental effects, including on native biodiversity, agriculture and tourism. Although there are several national and local-level initiatives to address IAS in Fiji, these efforts, lack adequate capacity and an overall comprehensive strategy to ensure a systematic and effective protection of biodiversity-rich and important areas. An effective, systematic and comprehensive eradication effort against GII, before populations grow beyond the point where they can be controlled is currently lacking and urgently needed.

The objective of the project is to improve the chances of the long-term survival of terrestrial endemic and threatened species on Taveuni Island, surrounding islets and throughout Fiji by building national and local capacity to manage Invasive Alien Species. It is a 5-year project with a total grant of USD 3,502,968 from the Global Environment Facility (GEF).

The overarching objective will be achieved through four interrelated outcomes namely:

- **Component 1**: Strengthened IAS policy, institutions and coordination at the national level to reduce the risk of IAS entering Fiji
- **Component 2**: Improved IAS prevention and surveillance operations on Taveuni, Qamea, Lauca and Matagi
- **Component 3**: Long-term measures for protection of terrestrial ecosystems and their biodiversity in Taveuni, Qamea, Matagi and Lauca
- **Component 4**: Increased awareness of risks posed by IAS and need for biosecurity of local communities, travelling public, tour operators and shipping to invasive alien species and biosecurity

Aside from the GEF grant, the planned parallel co-financing from the Government of Fiji is estimated at USD 26,736,418 and in-kind co-financing from UNDP is estimated at $101,096. Stakeholders participating in this project include the Biosecurity Authority of Fiji, Ministry of Forestry, Ministry of...
Fisheries, Fiji Inland Revenue and Customs Authority, Airports Fiji Limited, Maritime Safety Authority of Fiji, Ministry of I Taukei Affairs, Non-Governmental Organizations (Nature Fiji) and Tertiary Institutions (University of the South Pacific, Fiji National University).

The Biosecurity Authority of Fiji is the project implementing partner and is responsible and accountable for managing this project, including the monitoring and evaluation of project interventions, achieving project outcomes, and for the effective use of UNDP resources.

A National Project board meets at least once annually to approve high level documents including Annual Work Plans and provides strategic support. On a daily basis, a Project Implementation Unit (based at BAF) is responsible for executing activities. A Project Manager and a Project Admin-Finance Officer is based in Suva. At least four Field Eradication Officers and four Temporary Biosecurity Officers are stationed in Taveuni and Qamea. Additional support is provided by consultants which has included a Chief Technical Adviser, and an Eradication Specialist.

Fiji was affected by the COVID 19 pandemic. Between March and April, lockdowns were declared for at least 2 weeks in Lautoka, Labasa and Suva. As a result of these travel restrictions, field work including awareness raising and surveys was temporarily put on hold for at least 2 months. In March, a national wide curfew was put in place by government from 8pm – 5am daily. These have now been relaxed to 11pm – 4am. Social gatherings is now restricted to 100 persons. To date, 35 cases of COVID 19 have been recorded. Most cases are recorded from individuals returning to Fiji and in still in quarantine. Unfortunately, 2 deaths were recorded but these were from inside quarantine zones.

3. MTR PURPOSE

The main purpose of the MTR is intended to identify potential project design problems, assess progress towards the achievement of objectives, assess any cross cutting and gender issues in contribution to achieving the objectives, identify and document lessons learned (including lessons that might improve design and implementation for the remaining period of the project), and to make recommendations regarding specific actions that (who) will be use to improve the project.

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 and its risks to sustainability.

4. MTR APPROACH & METHODOLOGY

The MTR report 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 Social and Environmental Screening Procedure/SESP), the Project Document, project reports including annual PIRs, project budget revisions, 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 Core Indicators/Tracking Tools submitted to the GEF at CEO endorsement, and the midterm GEF focal area Core Indicators/Tracking Tools that must be completed before the MTR field mission begins.
The MTR team is expected to follow a collaborative and participatory approach\(^1\) ensuring close engagement with the Project Team, government counterparts (the GEF Operational Focal Point), the UNDP Country Office(s), UNDP Regional Technical Advisor, direct beneficiaries, and other key stakeholders.

Engagement of stakeholders is vital to a successful MTR. Stakeholder involvement should include interviews with stakeholders who have project responsibilities, including but not limited to Biosecurity Authority of Fiji, Fiji Inland Revenue Customs Authority, Ministry of Agriculture, Fiji Police, Maritime Safety Administration Authority of Fiji, Ministry of Forestry, Ministry of Fishery, National Disaster Management Authority, Ports Authority of Fiji, Provincial Office/Ministry of I Taveki Affairs, Nature Fiji, Ministry of Environment, Airports Fiji Limited, National Trust of Fiji, Ministry of Health, Rural and Maritime Development, Ministry of Defense and National Security, Ports Authority Fiji Limited, Conservation International, University of the South Pacific, Fiji National University, National Fire Authority, Birdlife International, Secretariat of the Pacific Community (Land Resources Division), Rural and Maritime Development, Temporary Biosecurity Eradication Officers, community leaders, community participants, private sector (Matagi Resort, Lacuca Island Resort, Qamea Beach Resort) and UNDP.

Additionally, the MTR team may require to conduct field missions to the following project sites of Qamea, Taveuni, Matagi and Laucala. If travel restrictions are still in-place, the stakeholder consultations with stakeholders will be done by virtual means. All documents will be made available online.

The specific design and methodology for the MTR should emerge from consultations between the MTR team and the above-mentioned parties regarding what is appropriate and feasible for meeting the MTR purpose and objectives and answering the evaluation questions, given limitations of budget, time and data. The MTR team must use gender-responsive methodologies and tools and ensure that gender equality and women’s empowerment, as well as other cross-cutting issues and SDGs are incorporated into the MTR report. Hence, the bidders for this MTR consultancy assignment must be required to present their proposed methodology for the MTR.

The final methodological approach including interview schedule, field visits and data to be used in the MTR must be clearly outlined in the Inception Report and be fully discussed and agreed between UNDP, stakeholders, and the MTR team.

The final MTR report must 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 22\(^{nd}\) March 2020 and travel within the country is managed. For gatherings, there is a limit of 100 persons in total. Currently there are no lock downs in country but daily curfews from 11pm – 4am continue. Individuals entering Fiji are expected to undergo a 14-day quarantine period. Health authorities continue to provide updates and advice.

\(^{1}\) For ideas on innovative and participatory Monitoring and Evaluation strategies and techniques, see UNDP Discussion Paper: Innovations in Monitoring & Evaluating Results, 05 Nov 2013.
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 support in the field if it is safe for them to operate and travel.

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.

5. DETAILED SCOPE OF THE MTR

The MTR team will assess the following four categories of project progress. See the Guidance for Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects for extended descriptions.

i. Project Strategy

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

Results Framework/Log frame:
• Undertake a critical analysis of the project’s log frame 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)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Strategy</th>
<th>Baseline Level(^2)</th>
<th>Level in 1st PIR (self-reported)</th>
<th>Midterm Target(^4)</th>
<th>End-of-project Target</th>
<th>Midterm Level &amp; Assessment(^5)</th>
<th>Achievement Rating(^6)</th>
<th>Justification for Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Objective:</td>
<td>Indicator (if applicable):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 1:</td>
<td>Indicator 1:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indicator 2:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 2:</td>
<td>Indicator 3:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indicator 4:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Indicator Assessment Key

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

In addition to the progress towards outcomes analysis:
• Compare and analyse the GEF Tracking Tool/Core Indicators 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

---

\(^2\) Populate with data from the Logframe and scorecards
\(^3\) Populate with data from the Project Document
\(^4\) If available
\(^5\) Colour code this column only
\(^6\) Use the 6-point Progress Towards Results Rating Scale: HS, S, MS, MU, U, HU

(COVID) MTR ToR for GEF-Financed Projects - Standard Template for UNDP Programme Site - June 2020
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.
- Do the Executing Agency/Implementing Partner and/or UNDP and other partners have the capacity to deliver benefits to or involve women? If yes, how?
- What is the gender balance of project staff? What steps have been taken to ensure gender balance in project staff?
- What is the gender balance of the Project Board? What steps have been taken to ensure gender balance in the Project Board?

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/log frame 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 by the Commissioning Unit and project team, 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?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sources of Co-financing</th>
<th>Name of Co-financer</th>
<th>Type of Co-financing</th>
<th>Co-financing amount confirmed at CEO Endorsement (US$)</th>
<th>Actual Amount Contributed at stage of Midterm Review (US$)</th>
<th>Actual % of Expected Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL
• Include the separate GEF Co-Financing template (filled out by the Commissioning Unit and project team) which categorizes each co-financing amount as ‘investment mobilized’ or ‘recurrent expenditures’. (This template will be annexed as a separate file.)

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?
• Review the extent to which relevant gender issues were incorporated in monitoring systems. See Annex 9 of Guidance for Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects for further guidelines.

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?
• How does the project engage women and girls? Is the project likely to have the same positive and/or negative effects on women and men, girls and boys? Identify, if possible, legal, cultural, or religious constraints on women’s participation in the project. What can the project do to enhance its gender benefits?

Social and Environmental Standards (Safeguards)
• Validate the risks identified in the project’s most current SESP, and those risks’ ratings; are any revisions needed?
• Summarize and assess the revisions made since CEO Endorsement/Approval (if any) to:
  o The project’s overall safeguards risk categorization.
  o The identified types of risks[^7] (in the SESP).
  o The individual risk ratings (in the SESP).
• Describe and assess progress made in the implementation of the project’s social and environmental management measures as outlined in the SESP submitted at CEO Endorsement/Approval (and prepared during implementation, if any), including any revisions to those measures. Such management measures might include Environmental and Social Management Plans (ESMPs) or other management plans, though can also include aspects of a project’s design; refer to Question 6 in the SESP template for a summary of the identified management measures.

[^7]: Risks are to be labeled with both the UNDP SES Principles and Standards, and the GEF’s “types of risks and potential impacts”: Climate Change and Disaster; Disadvantaged or Vulnerable Individuals or Groups; Disability Inclusion; Adverse Gender-Related impact, including Gender-based Violence and Sexual Exploitation; Biodiversity Conservation and the Sustainable Management of Living Natural Resources; Restrictions on Land Use and Involuntary Resettlement; Indigenous Peoples; Cultural Heritage; Resource Efficiency and Pollution Prevention; Labor and Working Conditions; Community Health, Safety and Security.

(COVID) MTR ToR for GEF-Financed Projects - Standard Template for UNDP Procurement Site - June 2020
A given project should be assessed against the version of UNDP’s safeguards policy that was in effect at the time of the project’s approval.

**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 & Knowledge Management:**
- 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.
- List knowledge activities/products developed (based on knowledge management approach approved at CEO Endorsement/Approval).

iv. **Sustainability**

- Validate whether the risks identified in the Project Document, Annual Project Review/PIRs and the ATLAS Risk Register 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?

Lessons learned
The Evaluation will also highlight lessons learned and best and worst practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance and success.

- On the basis of the outcome of the evaluation, detailing recommendations on how implementation of project can be expedited
- The recommended future project strategy is expected to feed into the integrated overall work plan for the project
- Assess possible links to other existing national and regional agencies and provide recommendations for potential areas of partnership
- Opportunities to strengthen project implementation (through staff training, capacity building or networking or improved management systems) should be identified

Conclusions & Recommendations

The MTR team will include a section in the MTR report for evidence-based conclusions, in light of the findings.

Additionally, the MTR consultant/team is expected to make recommendations to the Project Team. 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>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>MTR Rating</th>
<th>Achievement Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Strategy</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progress Towards</td>
<td>Objective</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results</td>
<td>Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Implementation &amp; Adaptive Management (rate 6 pt. scale)</td>
<td>Sustainability (rate 4 pt. scale)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 6. TIMEFRAME

The total duration of the MTR will be approximately **24** working days over a time period of **9** of weeks, and shall not exceed five months from when the consultant(s) are hired. The tentative MTR timeframe is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIVITY</th>
<th>NUMBER OF WORKING DAYS</th>
<th>COMPLETION DATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document review and preparing MTR Inception Report (MTR Inception Report due no later than 2 weeks before the MTR mission)</td>
<td>2 days</td>
<td>19 February 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTR mission: stakeholder meetings, interviews, field visits</td>
<td>9 days</td>
<td>10 March 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation of initial findings- last day of the MTR mission</td>
<td>1 day</td>
<td>18 March 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparing draft report (due within 3 weeks of the MTR mission)</td>
<td>7 days</td>
<td>24 March 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finalization of MTR report/ Incorporating audit trail from feedback on draft report (due within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on the draft)</td>
<td>5 days</td>
<td>12 April 2021</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

### 7. MIDTERM REVIEW DELIVERABLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Deliverable</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Timing</th>
<th>Responsibilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>MTR Inception Report</td>
<td>MTR team clarifies objectives and methods of Midterm Review</td>
<td>No later than 2 weeks before the MTR mission Date: 19 February</td>
<td>MTR team submits to the Commissioning Unit and project management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Presentation</td>
<td>Initial Findings</td>
<td>End of MTR mission <strong>Date:</strong> 10 March 2021</td>
<td>MTR Team presents to project management and the Commissioning Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Draft MTR Report</td>
<td>Full draft report (using guidelines on content outlined in Annex B) with annexes</td>
<td>Within 3 weeks of the MTR mission <strong>Date:</strong> 24 March 2021</td>
<td>Sent to the Commissioning Unit, reviewed by RTA, Project Coordinating Unit, GEF OFP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Final Report*</td>
<td>Revised report with audit trail detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final MTR report</td>
<td>Within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft <strong>Date:</strong> 12 April 2021</td>
<td>Sent to the Commissioning Unit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The final MTR report must be in English. If applicable, the Commissioning Unit may choose to arrange for a translation of the report into a language more widely shared by national stakeholders.

8. MTR ARRANGEMENTS

The principal responsibility for managing this MTR resides with the Commissioning Unit. The Commissioning Unit for this project’s MTR is UNDP Pacific office in Fiji.

The Commissioning Unit will contract the consultants and ensure the timely provision of per diems and travel arrangements within the country for the MTR team, if the travel is permitted, and will provide an updated stakeholder list with contact details (phone and email). 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 meeting if travel to project site is restricted.

9. 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 International Consultant (the team leader) will be responsible for the overall design and writing of the Mid Term Review Report. The consultant cannot have participated in the project preparation, formulation, and/or implementation (including the writing of the Project Document) and should not have a conflict of interest with project’s related activities.

The selection of International Consultant will be aimed at maximizing the overall “team” qualities in the following areas:

**Educational Qualifications:**
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• A Master's degree in conservation, biology, sustainable management, or other closely related fields

Experience

• Experience applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios;
• Experience in evaluating GEF and/or donor funded initiatives;
• Experience working in Pacific region;
• Relevant experience with result-based management evaluation methodologies;
• Experience in relevant technical areas for at least 10 years - biodiversity conservation, climate change/ Invasive Aliens Species management
• Competence in adaptive management, as applied to Biodiversity conservation/
• Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender and; 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.

Language requirements

• Fluency in the English language is required (verbal and written).

COMPETENCIES. The following competencies are required:

• Demonstrates integrity and commitment to UN principles and values and ethical standards;
• Strong interpersonal and communication skills;
• Ability to work well as part of a multi-cultural team and displays gender, religion, race, nationality and age sensitivity and adaptability;
• Ability to work in a team;
• Self-management, emotional intelligence and conflict management;
• Analytical and strategic thinking/results orientation;
• Experience in participating and following the project cycle, creative capacity solving problems;
• Computer literacy (e.g. Microsoft Word, Excel, and Power Point) is a prerequisite;
• Ability to engage various partners and stakeholders and build strong relationships with clients and other stakeholders;
• Demonstrates strong commitment and patience to deal with competing deadlines, demands, and interests.

10. ETHICS
The MTR team will be held to the highest ethical standards and is required to sign a code of conduct upon acceptance of the assignment. This MTR will be conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG ‘Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation’. The MTR team must safeguard the rights and confidentiality of information providers, interviewees and stakeholders through measures to ensure compliance with legal and other relevant codes governing collection of data and reporting on data. The MTR team must also ensure security of collected information before and after the MTR and protocols to ensure anonymity and confidentiality of sources of information where that is expected. The information, knowledge and data gathered in the MTR process must also be solely used for the MTR and not for other uses without the express authorization of UNDP and partners.

11. Payment Schedule

- 20% payment upon satisfactory delivery and approval of MTR Inception Report to the Commissioning Unit by February 19, 2021
- 40% payment upon satisfactory delivery of the draft MTR report to the Commissioning Unit by March 24, 2021
- 40% payment upon satisfactory delivery of the final MTR report and approval by the Commissioning Unit and RTA (via signatures on the TE Report Clearance Form) and delivery of completed TE Audit Trail by April 12, 2021

Criteria for issuing the final payment of 40%:

- The final MTR report includes all requirements outlined in the MTR TOR and is in accordance with the MTR guidance.
- The final MTR report is clearly written, logically organized, and is specific for this project (i.e. text has not been cut & pasted from other MTR reports).
- The Audit Trail includes responses to and justification for each comment listed.

Institutional Arrangement

- The consultant will be monitored, overseen and supervised by UNDP Pacific Fiji in close cooperation with the Biosecurity Authority of Fiji.
- The consultant expected to produce a final report upon successful completion of activities according to the agreed schedules.
- The consultant is expected to provide his/her own computer.

Duration of the Work

The consultancy is for 24 days commencing no later than February 10, 2021 and completion no later than March 17, 2021. The consultant shall be engaged to undertake the consultancy working concurrently according to a planned schedule to be completed by the latest April 12, 2021.

The consultant is expected to propose a work plan, budget and timelines to achieve the expected outputs with the appropriate methodology.

The consultant will be expected to provide support remotely based on the current travel restrictions from COVID 19. The consultant is expected to supply their own computer with appropriate software.

Supervision / Reporting
I The consultant will report directly to UNDP Head of Resilience and Sustainable Development Unit and/or her/his representative and UNDP Regional Technical Specialist/Advisor based in Bangkok, Thailand.

II The consultant is expected to produce a final report upon successful completion of activities according to the agreed schedules. The consultant is expected to provide his/her own computer.

III The consultant is responsible for supervising national consultant who will also support the midterm review.

IV The consultant is responsible for producing the final report.

Institutional Arrangement

- The consultant will be monitored, overseen and supervised by UNDP Pacific Fiji in close cooperation with the Biosecurity Authority of Fiji.
- The consultant is expected to produce a final report upon successful completion of activities according to the agreed schedules.
- The consultant is expected to provide his/her own computer.

Duration of the Work

- The consultancy is for 24 days commencing no later than February 10, 2021 and completion no later than April 12, 2021.
- The CTA shall be engaged to undertake the consultancy working concurrently according to a planned schedule to be completed by the latest April 12, 2021.
- The CTA is expected to propose a work plan, budget and timelines to achieve the expected outputs with the appropriate methodology.

12. APPLICATION PROCESS

An applicant must send a financial proposal based on a Lump Sum Amount. The total amount quoted shall be all-inclusive and include all costs components required to perform the deliverables identified in the TOR, including professional fee, travel costs, living allowance (if any work is to be done outside the consultants duty station) and any other applicable cost to be incurred by the IC in completing the assignment. The contract price will be fixed output-based price regardless of extension of the herein specified duration. Payments will be done upon completion of the deliverables/outputs.

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

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

Cumulative analysis

---

6 Engagement of the consultants should be done in line with guidelines for hiring consultants in the POPP: https://info.undp.org/global/popp/Default.aspx
The award of the contract shall be made to the team of consultants whose offer has been evaluated and determined as a) responsive/compliant/acceptable; and b) having received the highest score out of set of weighted technical criteria (70%), and financial criteria (30%). Financial score shall be computed as a ratio of the proposal being evaluated and the lowest priced proposal received by UNDP for the assignment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Max. Point</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Qualification</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• A Master’s degree in conservation, biology, sustainable management, or other closely related fields</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Experience</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Experience in relevant technical areas for at least 10 years - biodiversity conservation, invasive alien species management, climate change adaptation</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender and; experience in gender sensitive evaluation and analysis</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Experience in evaluating GEF and/or donor funded initiatives</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Experience working in Pacific region</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Only candidates obtaining a minimum of 49 points (70% of the total technical points) would be considered for the Financial Evaluation.

Shortlisted candidates shall be called for an interview which will be used to confirm and/or adjust the technical scores awarded based on documentation submitted.

**Documentation required**

Interested individual consultants must submit the following documents/information to demonstrate their qualifications.

+ **Personal CV** a Personal History Form (P11 form9), indicating all past experience from similar projects, as well as the contact details (email and telephone number) of the Candidate and at least three (3) professional references.

+ **Technical proposal**, including a) a brief description of why the individual considers him/herself as the most suitable for the assignment;

a) **Financial proposal**, using UNDP confirmation of Interest and submission of financial proposal Template. 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. Incomplete

9 [https://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/corporate/Careers/P11_Personal_history_form.doc](https://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/corporate/Careers/P11_Personal_history_form.doc)

(COVID) MTR ToR for GEF-Financed Projects - Standard Template for UNDP Procurement Site - June 2020
proposals may not be considered. Failure to submit these documents may result in disqualification of proposal.

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.

Relevant templates can be obtained from the UNDP Fiji website under the procurement section:
www.pacific.undp.org

Bid Submission Address
https://etendering.partneragencies.org

BU Code: FJI10

Event ID: 000000XXXX

If you have not registered in the system before, you can register now by logging in using:

Username: event.guest
Password: why2change

Please use the bidder’s guide for submission of proposal

For any clarification regarding this assignment please write procurement.fij@undp.org

Women candidates are encouraged to apply.

*The Fiji Office covers Fiji, Kiribati, Marshall Islands, Micronesia, Nauru, Palau, Solomon Islands, Tonga, Tuvalu and Vanuatu

Cleared by:

Name: Floyd Robinson    Signature:    Date: 29/01/21

Name: Winifereti Nainoca    Signature:    Date: 14/11/21
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 Social and Environmental Screening Procedure (SESP)
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 (fill in specific TTs for Biodiversity)
10. Oversight mission reports
11. All monitoring reports prepared by the project
12. Financial and Administration guidelines used by Project Team

The following documents will also be available:
13. Project operational guidelines, manuals and systems
14. UNDP country/countries programme document(s)
15. Minutes of the Fiji IAS Project Board Meetings and other meetings (i.e. Project Appraisal Committee meetings)
16. Project site location maps
17. UNDP Mission Reports
18. Any additional documents, as relevant.
ToR ANNEX B: Guidelines on Contents for the Midterm Review Report

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
      - Management Arrangements
      - Work planning
      - Finance and co-finance

10 The Report length should not exceed 50 pages in total (not including annexes).
• Project-level monitoring and evaluation systems
• Stakeholder engagement
• Social and Environmental Standards (Safeguards)
• Reporting
• Communications & Knowledge Management

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.) or Core Indicators
• Annexed in a separate file: GEF Co-financing template (categorizing co-financing amounts by source as ‘investment mobilized’ or ‘recurrent expenditure’)
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. Include COVID 19 specific questions, as needed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluative Questions</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>Methodology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project Strategy: To what extent is the project strategy relevant to country priorities, country ownership, and the best route towards expected results?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the project relevant to Fiji’s environment policies?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the project relevant to United Nations Pacific Strategy for Fiji and the UNDP Sub Regional Program Document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In what ways is the project engaging stakeholder participation?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In what ways is the project addressing targeted beneficiaries?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the project specifically addressing gender issues?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are stakeholders actively supporting implementation of the project in the northern division (e.g. Taveuni, Qamea, Matagi)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Progress Towards Results: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved thus far?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are activities and outputs of the project consistent with project goals and objectives?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is progress against in terms of expected targets against outcomes?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How was risk managed?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What lessons can be drawn in term of effectiveness?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project Implementation and Adaptive Management:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has the project been implemented efficiently, cost-effectively, and been able to adapt to any changing conditions thus far?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent are project-level monitoring and evaluation systems, reporting, and project communications supporting the project’s implementation?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent has progress been made in the implementation of social and environmental management measures?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>? Have there been changes to the overall project risk rating and/or the identified types of risks as outlined at the CEO Endorsement stage?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, socio-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is the impact of the project in terms of awareness raising and participation in the project?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Were sustainability issues adequately identified at project design?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there evidence of engagement by partners? To what extent are they committed?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What opportunities are there to maximizing partnership and enhancing project delivery?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are the main risks to actions/interventions initiated by the project and how can/are they being addressed?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is the level of influence and visibility of the project in terms of IAS management, including eradication of Giant Invasive Iguanas?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is the level of stakeholder support and commitment towards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>documents like the eradication plan and draft National Invasive Alien Species Strategy Action Plan?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are the activities and outputs consistent with project goals and objectives?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent has the progress been made against achievement of outputs?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What lessons have been learnt?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes could be made in project design to improve effectiveness?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes could be made within remainder of project to improve achievement of objectives?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How could the project be more effective in achieving results?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficiency: was the project implemented efficiently</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was adaptive measures needed and used to ensure efficient use of resources?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Were progress reports produced in a timely manner?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was co-financing leveraged and to what extent?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Were partnerships and networking facilitated amongst stakeholders?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TR Report Clearance Form

(by the Commissioning Unit and RTA and included in the final document)

Report Reviewed and Cleared By:

- Unit (M&E Focal Point)

____________________________________  Date: _______________________

- Technical Advisor (Nature, Climate and Energy)

____________________________________  Date: _______________________


(b) The information is consistent and complete.

This information will be used to assess the project's performance.

(d) The information provided is truthful.

The information will be shared with stakeholders.

(f) The information is accurate.

The information will be kept confidential.

(h) The information is relevant.

The information will be used for decision-making.

(i) The information is timely.

The information will be kept secure.

(j) The information is accessible.

The information will be used for internal review.

(k) The information is reliable.

The information will be used for external communication.

(l) The information is consistent with the project's objectives.

The information will be used for internal reporting.

(m) The information is relevant to the project's stakeholders.

The information will be used for external consultation.

(n) The information is complete.

The information will be used for internal evaluation.

(o) The information is accurate.

The information will be used for external publication.

(p) The information is accessible.

The information will be used for internal assessment.

(q) The information is timely.

The information will be used for external dissemination.

(r) The information is reliable.

The information will be used for internal monitoring.

(s) The information is relevant to the project's objectives.

The information will be used for external reporting.

(t) The information is complete.

The information will be used for internal verification.

(u) The information is accurate.

The information will be used for external validation.

(v) The information is accessible.

The information will be used for internal review.

(w) The information is timely.

The information will be used for external consultation.

(x) The information is reliable.

The information will be used for internal evaluation.

(y) The information is relevant to the project's stakeholders.

The information will be used for external publication.

(z) The information is complete.

The information will be used for internal reporting.

/Date)

Code of Conduct for

/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 \( \text{date} \) from the Midterm Review of \( \text{project name} \) (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 not by the person’s name, and track change comment number ("#" column):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>Para No./ comment location</th>
<th>Comment/Feedback on the draft MTR report</th>
<th>MTR team response and actions taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>