Midterm Review Terms of Reference

Standard Template 2: Formatted information to be entered in [UNDP Jobs website](https://jobs.undp.org/)[1]

BASIC CONTRACT INFORMATION

Location: Zimbabwe

Type of Contract: Individual Contract
Post Level: International Consultant
Languages Required: English
Starting Date: May 2021
Duration of Initial Contract: 35 working days
Expected Duration of Assignment: May 2021 – July 2021

BACKGROUND

A.   Project Title

Strengthening Biodiversity and Ecosystems Management and Climate-Smart Landscapes in the Mid to Lower Zambezi Region of Zimbabwe

B.   Project Description

This is the Terms of Reference for the UNDP-GEF Midterm Review (MTR) of the full or medium-sized project titled *Strengthening Biodiversity and Ecosystems Management and Climate-Smart Landscapes in the Mid to Lower Zambezi Region of Zimbabwe* (PIMS-5693) implemented through the UNDP/ Ministry of Environment, Climate, Tourism and Hospitality Industry (MECTHI), which is to be undertaken in 2021. The project started on the 7 August 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 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)*

The Government of Zimbabwe, through the Ministry of Environment, Climate, Tourism and Hospitality Industry (MECTHI), in partnership with the UNDP is implementing a 6-year GEF funded project entitled "Strengthening Biodiversity and Ecosystems Management and Climate-Smart Landscapes in the Mid to Lower Zambezi Region of Zimbabwe." The project is implemented under a National Implementation Modality (NIM) where MECTHI is the Implementing Partner. This is a child project being implemented under a global parent programme entitled "Global Partnership on Wildlife Conservation and Crime Prevention for Sustainable Development." The project seeks to address multiple threats to biodiversity and sustainable community

---

[1] https://jobs.undp.org/

development in the Lower Zambezi which include poaching and associated wildlife trade, retaliatory killing of wildlife, deforestation and associated land degradation due to unsustainable agriculture and firewood consumption, and uncontrolled veld fires. The Zimbabwe project is therefore a multifocal area project whose objective is to promote an integrated landscape approach to managing wildlife resources, carbon and ecosystem services in the face of climate change in the protected areas and communal lands of the Mid to Lower Zambezi Regions of Zimbabwe. The project has 4 components namely: Component 1. Strengthening capacity and governance frameworks for integrated wildlife and woodland management and wildlife/forest crime enforcement in Zimbabwe; Component 2. Strengthening Zimbabwe's PA estate and CAMPFIRE Wildlife Conservancies in areas of global BD significance; Component 3. Mainstreaming BD and ES management, and climate change mitigation, into the wider landscape; and Component 4. Knowledge Management, M&E and Gender Mainstreaming; There are four corresponding outcomes namely: Outcome 1. Increased national capacity for IWT control and integrated wildlife and woodland; Outcome 2. Improved capacity of PA network and CAMPFIRE Wildlife Conservancies to protect globally significant biodiversity of the mid-lower Zambezi region over a total area of 1,616,900 ha; Outcome 3. Increased area under sustainable management and increased benefits for local communities from CBWM, SFM and SLM in established CWCs; and Outcome 4. Lessons learned by the project through participatory M&E and gender mainstreaming are used nationally and internationally.

The project is being implemented in Muzarabani, Mbire and Hurungwe Districts as well as Mana Pools National Park, and Chewore, Sapi, Hurungwe, Dande, Charara and Doma Safari Areas. The total allocated resources for this project is USD 12,025,964. In addition, in-kind co-financing is USD 45,411,000 from the Government of Zimbabwe, Private sector and NGO partners.

The World Health Organization (WHO) declared COVID-19 as a global pandemic on 11th March 2020 as the new coronavirus rapidly spread to all the world. The Zimbabwe government declared the COVID-19 crisis a "national disaster" on 27 March 2020 and began a nationwide lockdown on March 30. The lockdown was later eased but extended indefinitely on 16 May 2020. As of 15 March 2021, there were 36,504 confirmed cases of Covid-19 in Zimbabwe, of which 1,504 were fatalities and 34,051 persons recovered. Covid-19 has spread in all the country's 10 provinces and cities across Zimbabwe. The country has implemented social restrictions including two national lockdowns (30 March 2020 and 5 January 2021) to reduce the spread of the virus. The COVID-19 pandemic has affected the implementation of the project. Most of the project activities, especially those involving gathering groups of people, were postponed or cancelled altogether due to the country-wide lockdown and subsequent movement restrictions that followed. In addition, the project had to revise the annual work plan to respond to the COVID-19 Pandemic. The project had to channel resources towards more patrols as they were reports of increased incursions by poachers in the protected area. Based on the assessment, some work can continue on-schedule, while some might be deferred and likely to delay and some may need readjustment to adapt to the new normal.

C.   MTR Purpose

The project has reached its mid-term according to the implementation period and therefore an independent MTR is due. 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.

Further to this as the project is being implemented during COVID-19, the MTR will assess how the context has changed as a result of covid and how the project has been impacted and how the strategy can incorporate

the COVID-19 risks going forward. The MTR will also look at any project interventions that have contributed directly or indirectly to government's effort of COVID-19 recovery both at the national level and project sites.

DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

D.   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[2] ensuring close engagement with the Project Team, government counterparts (the GEF Operational Focal Point), the UNDP Country Office, the Nature, Climate and Energy (NCE) Regional Technical Advisor, direct beneficiaries, and other key stakeholders.

Engagement of stakeholders is vital to a successful MTR[3]. Stakeholder involvement should include interviews with stakeholders who have project responsibilities, including but not limited to the project Implementing Partner (MECTHI) and Responsible Partners Forestry Commission (FC); CAMPFIRE Association; Environmental Management Agency (EMA); and Zimbabwe Parks and Wildlife Management Authority (ZPWMA) and the CSO partners; the participating Rural District Councils; the senior beneficiary Ministry of Local Government, the Project Board and Technical Working Group, and Private Sector; project stakeholders, academia, and CBOs, other development partners etc. Additionally, the MTR team may require conducting field missions to the project area in Mid to Lower Zambezi Valley, if it is determined safe to do so.

In response to Covid 19, Zimbabwe closed its borders (air and land) to all human traffic except for returning nationals, with the result that tourism activities in the country almost completely stopped. Although the restrictions were eased in March 2021. The Zimbabwe government continues to monitor the situation and may reimpose the restriction if cases begin to rise again. If it is not possible to travel to or within the country for the MTR mission then the MTR team might need to develop a methodology that takes this into account the conduct of the MTR remotely, including the use of remote interview methods and extended desk reviews, data analysis, surveys and evaluation questionnaires. International consultants can work remotely with national evaluator support in the field if it is safe for them to operate and travel. 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

---

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

[3] For more stakeholder engagement in the M&E process, see the UNDP Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results, Chapter 3, pg. 93.

internet/computer may be an issue as many government and national counterparts may be working from home. No stakeholders, consultants or UNDP staff should be put in harm's way and safety is the key priority. These limitations must be reflected in the final MTR report.

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 will be hired to undertake the interviews in-country as long as it is safe to do so, and applying UNDP's Duty of Care guidelines.

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. Considering the COVID-19 situation, the MTR team should consider flexibility in using technologies and tools to effectively engage stakeholder virtually. 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.

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.

E.   Detailed Scope of the MTR

The MTR team will assess the following four categories of project progress. :

1. 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.
- 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?

4

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 and youth empowerment, improved governance, inclusive growth, 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.

- Examine if the Log frame elements needed to be adjusted in light of the COVID-19 situation

2. Progress Towards Results

- Review the logframe indicators against progress made towards the end-of-project targets; populate the Progress Towards Results Matrix, as described in 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 the project objective and each outcome; make recommendations from the areas marked as "not on target to be achieved" (red).

- 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.

- Examine how COVID-19 has affected progress towards results

3. 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.

- 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 and the Technical Committee? What steps have been taken to ensure gender balance in the Project Board and the Technical Committee?

Work Planning

- Review any delays in project start-up and implementation, identify the causes and examine if they have been resolved.
- Have there been any project planning issues and implementation delays caused by Covid 19
- 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. Review the extent to which such revisions have been influenced by Covid 19.
- 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?

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financer	Type of Co-financing	Co-financing amount confirmed at CEO Endorsement (US$)	Actual Amount Contributed at stage of Midterm Review (US$)	Actual % of Expected Amount
Recipient Government	MECTHI, ZPWMA, FC, EMA, CAMPFIRE	In-kind	40,100,000		
CSOs	AWF, Zambezi Society, Takashinga Initiative, WWF	In-kind	2,540,000		
Private Sector	Kariba REDD+ Project Tree Eco Ltd., HKK Safaris, McCallum Safaris, Nzou Safaris	In-kind	2,771,000		

| GEF Agency | UNDP | Grants | 2,000,000 | | |
| | | **TOTAL** | 47,411,000 | | |

- Include the separate GEF Co-Financing template (filled out by the Commissioning Unit and project team) which categorizes co-financing amounts by source as 'investment mobilized' or 'recurrent expenditures'. (This template will be annexed as a separate file)
- Examine the extent to which co-finance materialisation had been, or may be affected by Covid 19?

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.
- Review the extent to which project M&E has been affected by Covid 19 and the measure in place to effectively monitor and evaluate the project.

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?
- How has the stakeholder engagement plan been affected by Covid 19? Review plans in place to sustain stakeholder engagement.

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:
  - The project's overall safeguards risk categorization.
  - The identified types of risks[4] (in the SESP).

---

[4] Risks are to be labelled 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

  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.

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.

<u>Reporting</u>

- Assess how adaptive management changes have been reported by the project management and shared with the Project board.

- Assess how well the Project Team and partners undertake and fulfil GEF reporting requirements (i.e. how have they addressed poorly-rated PIRs, if applicable?)

- Assess how lessons derived from the adaptive management process have been documented, shared with key partners and internalized by partners.

<u>Communications & Knowledge Management</u>

- Review internal project communication with stakeholders: Is communication regular and effective? Are there key stakeholders left out of communication? Are there feedback mechanisms when communication is received? Does this communication with stakeholders contribute to their awareness of project outcomes and activities and investment in the sustainability of project results?

- Review external project communication: Are proper means of communication established or being established to express the project progress and intended impact to the public (is there a web presence, for example? Or did the project implement appropriate outreach and public awareness campaigns?); Review how Covid 19 has effected project communication and knowledge management; and the mechanisms in place to sustain the effectiveness of the strategy.

- 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).

---

4. 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.

---

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.

- 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?
- How has Covid 19 posed risks that may jeopardise project implementation and sustenance of the project?

Conclusions & Recommendations

The MTR consultant/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. The MTR consultant/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 the TOR Annexes for the Rating Table and ratings scales.

F. Expected Outputs and Deliverables

The MTR team shall prepare and submit:

- <u>MTR Inception Report:</u> MTR team clarifies objectives and methods of the Midterm Review no later than 2 weeks before the MTR mission. To be sent to the Commissioning Unit and project management. Completion date: 15 May 2021.
- <u>Presentation</u>: MTR team presents initial findings to project management and the Commissioning Unit at the end of the MTR mission. Completion date: 20 June2021.
- <u>Draft MTR Report</u>: MTR team submits the draft full report with annexes within 3 weeks of the MTR mission. Completion date: 30 June 2021.
- <u>Final Report</u>*: MTR team submits the revised report with annexed and completed Audit Trail detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final MTR report. To be sent to the Commissioning Unit within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft. Completion date: 30 July 2021.

*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.

G.   Institutional Arrangements

The principal responsibility for managing this MTR resides with the Commissioning Unit. The Commissioning Unit for this project's MTR is the UNDP Zimbabwe Country Office.

The UNDP Zimbabwe CO will contract the consultants and ensure the timely provision of per diems and travel arrangements within the country for the MTR team. The Project Team will be responsible for liaising with the MTR team to provide all relevant documents, set up stakeholder interviews, and arrange field visits.

H.   Duration of the Work

The total duration of the MTR will be approximately 35 of days over a period of 8 weeks starting May 2021 and shall not exceed three months from when the consultant(s) are hired. The tentative MTR timeframe is as follows:

-
- 30 April 2021*:* Selection of MTR Team
- 08 May 2021*:* Prep the MTR Team (handover of project documents)
- 12 May 2021, 02 days *(r: 2-4):* Document review and preparing MTR Inception Report
- 15 May 2021 03 days*:* Finalization and Validation of MTR Inception Report- latest start of MTR mission
- 20 May – 10 June 2021 14 days *(r: 7-15):* MTR mission: stakeholder meetings, online interviews
- 20 June 2021*:* Mission wrap-up meeting & presentation of initial findings- earliest end of MTR mission
- 25 June 2021: 05 days *(r: 5-10):* Preparing draft report
- 30 June 2021 01 day *(r: 1-2):* Incorporating audit trail on draft report/Finalization of MTR report
- 12 July 2021*:* Preparation & Issue of Management Response
- 20 July 2021*:* (optional) Concluding Stakeholder Workshop (not mandatory for MTR team)
- 30 July 2021*:* Expected date of full MTR completion

The date start of contract is 1 May 2021.

I. Duty Station

a) The contractor's duty station will be home-based and with possibility of travel to the Zambezi Valley in Zimbabwe, subject to the approval from RR or Head of Unit. If permission to travel is granted the contractor will be expected to visit some areas in the project area that include Hurungwe, Mbire and Muzarabani Districts as well as Mana Pools National Park and surrounding safari areas, among others.

Travel:

- International travel may be required to Zimbabwe during the MTR mission, if travel is permitted;
- The BSAFE training course <u>must</u> be successfully completed <u>prior</u> to commencement of travel; Herewith is the link to access this training: https://training.dss.un.org/courses/login/index.php . These training modules at this secure internet site is accessible to Consultants, which allows for registration with private email.
- Individual Consultants are responsible for ensuring they have vaccinations/inoculations when travelling to certain countries, as designated by the UN Medical Director.
- Consultants are required to comply with the UN security directives set forth under https://dss.un.org/dssweb/
- All related travel expenses will be covered and will be reimbursed as per UNDP rules and regulations upon submission of an F-10 claim form and supporting documents.

REQUIRED SKILLS AND EXPERIENCE

J. Qualifications of the Successful Applicants

A team of two independent consultants will conduct the MTR - one International Consultant as team leader and one National Consultant as technical and stakeholder engagement expert. The team leader will be responsible for the overall design and writing of the MTR report. The team expert will assess emerging trends with respect to regulatory frameworks, budget allocations, capacity building, work with the Project Team in developing the MTR itinerary. The National Consultant will also act as a focal point for coordinating and working with relevant stakeholders in Zimbabwe. If the international travel restriction continues and, in-country 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 field visit by the National Consultant under the International Consultant's guidance.

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.

Education

A Master's degree in Environment, Natural Resources Management, Biodiversity studies, Wildlife Management or other closely related field.

<u>Experience</u>

- Master with more 10 years of professional experience Environment, Natural Resources Management, Biodiversity studies, Wildlife Management or other closely related field.
- Relevant experience with result-based management evaluation methodologies;
- Experience applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios;
- Competence in adaptive management, as applied to Illegal Wildlife Trade/Biodiversity;
- Experience in evaluating projects;
- Experience working in Southern Africa;
- Experience in relevant technical areas for at least 10 years;
- Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender and Illegal Wildlife Trade/Biodiversity; experience in gender sensitive evaluation and analysis.
- Experience with implementing evaluations remotely will be considered an asset.
- Excellent communication skills;
- Demonstrable analytical skills;
- Project evaluation/review experiences within United Nations system will be considered an asset.

<u>Language</u>

- Fluency in written and spoken English.
- Knowledge of local language would be an asset.

K. 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.

L. Schedule of Payments

- 20% payment upon satisfactory delivery of the final MTR Inception Report and approval by the Commissioning Unit
- 40% payment upon satisfactory delivery of the draft MTR report to the Commissioning Unit
- 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

  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.

Compiled by: ___*Uhirara*_____ **Date:** ___03-May-2021_____
             Chipangura Chirara (Project Manager)

Reviewed by: ___*Anne Madzara*_____ **Date:** ___03-May-2021_____
           Anne Madzara (UNDP PRECC Team Leader)

Reviewed by: ___*Blessing Muchemwa*_____ **Date:** ___03-May-2021_____
           Blessing Muchemwa (UNDP CO M&E Specialist)

Approved by: ___*Madelena Monga*_____ **Date:** ___04-May-2021_____
           Madelena Monoja (Deputy Resident Representative)

13

APPLICATION PROCESS

O. Annexes to the MTR ToR

Annexes include: (reference ToR Annexes in Annex 3 of *Guidance for Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects*)

- List of documents to be reviewed by the MTR Team

- Guidelines on Contents for the Midterm Review Report

- Midterm Review Evaluative Matrix Template

- UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluators/Midterm Review Consultants

- MTR Required Ratings Table and Ratings Scales

- MTR Report Clearance Form

- Audit Trail Template

- Progress Towards Results Matrix

- GEF Co-Financing Template (in Word)

Annexes to Midterm Review Terms of Reference

For Standard Template 2

- ToR ANNEX A: List of Documents to be reviewed by the MTR Team
- ToR ANNEX B: Guidelines on Contents for the Midterm Review Report[5]
- ToR ANNEX C: Midterm Review Evaluative Matrix Template
- ToR ANNEX D: UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluators/Midterm Review Consultants[6]
- ToR ANNEX E: MTR Ratings and Achievements Summary Table and Rating Scales
- ToR ANNEX F: MTR Report Clearance Form
- ToR ANNEX G: Audit Trail Template
- ToR ANNEX H: Progress Towards Results Matrix
- ToR ANNEX I: GEF Co-Financing Template (provided as a separate file)

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

(The Commissioning Unit is responsible for compiling these documents prior to the recruitment of the MTR team so that they are available to the team immediately after contract signature.)

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

---

[5] The Report length should not exceed *40* pages in total (not including annexes).
[6] http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/100

9. Finalized GEF focal area Tracking Tools/Core Indicators at CEO endorsement and midterm review 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 Strengthening Biodiversity and Ecosystems Management and Climate-Smart Landscapes in the Mid to Lower Zambezi Region of Zimbabwe Board Meetings and other meetings (i.e. Project Technical Committee meetings)

16. Project site location maps

ToR ANNEX B: Guidelines on Contents for the Midterm Review Report[7]

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)

---

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

- 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
- 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

(Draft questions to be filled out by the Commissioning Unit with support from the Project Team)

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. This is a generic list with sample questions.

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?			
To what extent were the project objectives and outputs aligned with member States' and other project stakeholders' development strategies?			
Were the project's expected accomplishments and			

indicators of achievements properly designed, timebound and achievable?			
Progress Towards Results: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved thus far?			
How effective was the project in building the capacity of policymaker on (…)?			

To what extent does the project contribute to the objective of enhanced capacity of (…) to use the tools and mechanisms developed under this project to (…)?			
Do the project-related activities give the participants adequate access to the benefits and implications of the project?			
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? To what extent has progress been made in the implementation of social and environmental management measures? Have there been changes to the overall project risk rating and/or the identified types of risks as outlined at the CEO Endorsement stage?			
What was the level of involvement of (please insert division name) staff in meeting the requests for technical advice?			
How efficiently were human and financial resources used to deliver activities and outputs, in coordination with stakeholders?			
What were the major factors influencing the			

achievement or non -			
achievement of the project objectives?			
Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, socio-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?			
To what extent has support from other stakeholders, donors, or other multi-lateral or national partners been obtained to take forward positive outcomes resulting from the project?			
Was there adequate ownership of the project by the end-users, beneficiaries, and was there commitment displayed by them?			

ToR ANNEX D: UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluators/Midterm Review Consultants[8]

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.

8. Must ensure that independence of judgement is maintained, and that evaluation findings and recommendations are independently presented.

9. Must confirm that they have not been involved in designing, executing or advising on the project being evaluated.

MTR Consultant Agreement Form

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

Name of Consultant: _____

---

[8] http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/100

Name of Consultancy Organization (where relevant): _____

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

Signed at _____ *(Place)* on _____
(Date)

Signature: _____

ToR ANNEX E: MTR Ratings & Achievement Summary Table + Rating Scales

MTR Ratings & Achievement Summary Table for Strengthening Biodiversity and Ecosystems Management and Climate-Smart Landscapes in the Mid to Lower Zambezi Region of Zimbabwe

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)		

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.

23

1	Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)	The objective/outcome has failed to achieve its midterm targets and is not expected to achieve any of its end-of-project targets.

Ratings for Project Implementation & Adaptive Management: (one overall rating)		
6	Highly Satisfactory (HS)	Implementation of all seven components – management arrangements, work planning, finance and co-finance, project-level monitoring and evaluation systems, stakeholder engagement, reporting, and communications – is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management. The project can be presented as "good practice".
5	Satisfactory (S)	Implementation of most of the seven components is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management except for only few that are subject to remedial action.
4	Moderately Satisfactory (MS)	Implementation of some of the seven components is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management, with some components requiring remedial action.
3	Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)	Implementation of some of the seven components is not leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive, with most components requiring remedial action.
2	Unsatisfactory (U)	Implementation of most of the seven components is not leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management.
1	Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)	Implementation of none of the seven components is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management.

Ratings for Sustainability: (one overall rating)		
4	Likely (L)	Negligible risks to sustainability, with key outcomes on track to be achieved by the project's closure and expected to continue into the foreseeable future
3	Moderately Likely (ML)	Moderate risks, but expectations that at least some outcomes will be sustained due to the progress towards results on outcomes at the Midterm Review
2	Moderately Unlikely (MU)	Significant risk that key outcomes will not carry on after project closure, although some outputs and activities should carry on

1	Unlikely (U)	Severe risks that project outcomes as well as key outputs will not be sustained

ToR ANNEX F: MTR Report Clearance Form

(to be completed and signed by the Commissioning Unit and RTA and included in the final document)

Midterm Review Report Reviewed and Cleared By:

Commissioning Unit (M&E Focal Point)

Name: _____

Signature: _____ Date: _____

Regional Technical Advisor (Nature, Climate and Energy)

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 Strengthening Biodiversity and Ecosystems Management and Climate-Smart Landscapes in the Mid to Lower Zambezi Region of Zimbabwe (UNDP Project ID-PIMS 5693)

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):

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

ToR ANNEX H: Progress Towards Results Matrix

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

Project Strategy	Indicator[9]	Baseline Level[10]	Level in 1st PIR (self- reported)	Midterm Target[11]	End-of-project Target	Midterm Level & Assessment[12]	Achievement Rating[13]	Justification for Rating
Objective: To promote an integrated landscape approach to managing wildlife resources, carbon and ecosystem services in the face of climate change in the protected areas and community lands of the Mid to Lower Zambezi Regions of Zimbabwe	Indicator 1): Number of people benefitting in the project area from CBWM, SFM, and SLM (f/m) (IRRF Indicator 1.3.2a	2016: 3,438 (~f 50%/ m 50%)	The cumulative number of beneficiaries is 4,387 (F 1910/ M 2487), this includes the 3,438 who were already benefitting from CBWM, SFM and SLM in 2016 before project activities commenced. Since project inception, 949 people have benefited directly through trainings on SFM, CBWM and HWC. The project also resuscitated Environmental Sub Committees in the project area. The Committees play an important role in natural resources management in communities. The project's Small Grants component issued 4 grants to CSOs for conservation (SFM and SLM) and livelihood enhancement projects in the 3 districts. The project seeks to establish 6 CAMPFIRE Wildlife Conservancies (CWCs). During the reporting period, communities in all 6 proposed conservancies were consulted and agreed to form Trusts to run the conservancies. The consultation process took more time than planned as they were affected by countrywide lockdown in response to COVID-19 pandemic. The mid-term target is likely to be met once the establishment of the six conservancies has been finalized and more CSOs receive grants for implementation of projects in the three target districts.	>=8,000 (F 4000/ M 4000)	>=14,000 (F 7000/ M 7000)			

---

[9] Populate with data from the Logframe and scorecards
[10] Populate with data from the Project Document
[11] If available
[12] Colour code this column only
[13] Use the 6 point Progress Towards Results Rating Scale: HS, S, MS, MU, U, HU

Project Strategy	Indicator[9]	Baseline Level[10]	Level in 1st PIR (self- reported)	Midterm Target[11]	End-of-project Target	Midterm Level & Assessment[12]	Achievement Rating[13]	Justification for Rating
	Indicator 2: Extent to which legislation and institutional frameworks are in place for conservation, sustainable use, and access and benefit sharing of natural resources, biodiversity and ecosystems: - Updated Wildlife Policy; - Updated Parks and Wildlife Act; - Updated Communal Land Forest Produce Act - Official National Anti-Poaching Strategy	Do not exist	Although none of the policies has yet been completed, there has been significant progress in terms of preparatory procedures, consultations, reviews and initial analyses, as follows: • The process of reviewing wildlife related legislation and institutional frameworks was initiated by conducting nationwide consultations on the Wildlife Policy and Parks and Wildlife Act. Issues of Human-Wildlife Conflict dominated most consultations. The country requires a Human-Wildlife Conflict Management Policy and this will be developed concurrently with the reviews of the Wildlife Policy and the Parks and Wildlife Act. • Updating of the Communal Land Forest Produce Act was initiated by conducting an analysis of gaps in general forestry legislation. The key recommendation from the process was that the Communal Land Forest Produce Act and the Forest Acts should be merged one piece of legislation. The Forest Act was already being amended by Parliament and the review process of the Communal Land Forest Produce Act now awaits approval and guidance from the parent Ministry. • The review of the Draft National Law Enforcement and Anti-Poaching Strategy for the period 2017-2021 has not started. Work towards the reviews is in progress. No legislation has been drafted yet as consultations continue at a slow pace, and based on current progress, the midyear target of having drafts by June 2021 is unlikely to be met. Progress under this indicator has been severely hampered by the restrictions on travel and meetings due to COVID-19 mitigation measures.	Drafted (or updated) and discussed with stakeholders	Officially approved and implemented			

Project Strategy	Indicator[9]	Baseline Level[10]	Level in 1st PIR (self- reported)	Midterm Target[11]	End-of-project Target	Midterm Level & Assessment[12]	Achievement Rating[13]	Justification for Rating
	Indicator 3: Populations of flagship species in the project area: - Lion: - Elephant: - Buffalo:	Lions (2016): 267; Elephants (2014): 11,656 (LC level: 9,398, UC level: 13,915) Buffalo (2014): 6,330 (LC level: 2,552, UC level: 10,107)	There is no new data on populations of flagship species in the project area. The aerial survey that was planned for August 2019 was postponed (due to logistical challenges faced by the selected contractor). The survey will now be conducted between August and October 2020 (it can only be conducted at a particular time of year). The project has re-advertised for a contractor to carry out an aerial survey for elephants and other large herbivores. The terms of reference for the survey are attached in the PIR library. The lion survey is scheduled to be conducted in 2021.	Lions: >=267; Elephants: >=11,656 (LC level: 9,398, UC level: 13,915); Buffalo: >=6,330 (LC level: 2,552, UC level: 10,107)	Lions: >=267; Elephants: >=11,656 (LC level: 9,398, UC level: 13,915); Buffalo: >=6,330 (LC level: 2,552, UC level: 10,107)			

| | Indicator 4: Number of individuals of flagship species poached annually in the project area:
- Lion:
- Elephant:
- Buffalo: | Lions (2016): 1;

Elephants (2016): 38;

Buffalo (2016): 6 | The project is on track to reduce the number of poached elephants and lions.

The target for number of buffalo poached is off-track. Whilst the target to stabilise the number of lions poached was not achieved in 2018, there was an improvement in 2019.

In 2018, 2 lions, 8 elephants and 2 buffalo were poached in the project area.
In 2019, no lions, 16 elephants and 11 buffalo were poached.

Between Jan and June 2020, no lions, 3 elephants and 2 buffalo were poached.

The increased poaching of buffalo is mainly from local people poaching for meat to feed their families. This has been exacerbated by the general economic situation in the country and the worsening problem of joblessness and hunger as a result of the COVID-19 situation.

The project supported 20 game scouts (10 from Muzarabani RDC and 10 from Hurungwe RDC) to undergo training on a basic community ranger course at Mushandike College of Wildlife. Two of the 20 trainees were female. These trainings will help reduce the levels of poaching in the project area including protected areas and CWCs.
ZPWMA rangers and the Zimbabwe National Army (ZNA) officers underwent training in intensive, tactical anti-poaching coxswain skills with the objective of improving their skills to deal with poachers in the project area - given that the entire northern boundary of the project area is formed by the Zambezi-River, patrolling by boat is essential, and trained coxswains with anti-poaching skills will add much-needed capacity.
The project procured all-terrain vehicles to improve on anti-poaching activities in the project area, which involves an extensive river boundary (the Zambezi) and other difficult-to-traverse territory. | Lions (2016): 1;

Elephants (2016): 15;

Buffalo (2016): 4 | Lions (2016): 0;

Elephants (2016): 6;

Buffalo (2016): 2 | | | |

Project Strategy	Indicator[9]	Baseline Level[10]	Level in 1st PIR (self- reported)	Midterm Target[11]	End-of-project Target	Midterm Level & Assessment[12]	Achievement Rating[13]	Justification for Rating
Outcome 1: Increased national capacity for IWT control and integrated wildlife and woodland	Indicator 5: Capacity of National Enforcement Agencies to control IWT (UNDP Capacity scorecard, %): ZPWMA	49%	No data currently available - capacity assessment for law enforcement is planned to be conducted during midterm evaluation in 2021 monitoring and evaluation plan.	60%	70%			
	Indicator 6: Results of IWT law enforcement at national level: - annual number seizures; - annual number of arrests; - annual number of successful prosecutions on poaching and IWT	299 550 331	266 seizures 382 arrests 190 successful prosecutions Percentage increase in law enforcement parameters: -11% seizures -31% arrests -43% successful prosecutions Law enforcement parameters (seizures, arrest and successful prosecution) have not increased compared to 2016 baseline figures for the following reasons: Delays in the process of updating the legislation might be contributing to the low number of successful prosecutions. The number of patrol rangers remains below optimum levels nationwide as low recruitment of rangers means those that leave Parks for various reasons (retirement, resignations, death etc.) are not adequately replaced. The impacts of the COVID-19 situation are also causing a change in the incidence of wildlife crime (with little hard data available as yet to track trends) and on capacity to patrol effectively and apprehend suspects. The absence of tourists in areas such as Mana Pools has also increased the need for patrolling.	Law enforcement parameters increased by at least 15%	Law enforcement parameters increased by at least 30%			

Project Strategy	Indicator[9]	Baseline Level[10]	Level in 1st PIR (self- reported)	Midterm Target[11]	End-of-project Target	Midterm Level & Assessment[12]	Achievement Rating[13]	Justification for Rating
Outcome 2: Improved capacity of PA network and CAMPFIRE Wildlife Conservancies to protect globally significant biodiversity of the mid-lower Zambezi region over a total area of 1,616,900 ha	Indicator 7: Total area under improved CBWM in the project area (established CWC with implemented Wildlife Adaptive Management plans), ha	0	The midterm target is likely to be achieved. The cumulative number of hectares under CBWM is now at 141,875.20 which is only 40,000 ha short of the mid-term target The project is in process of improving water accessibility for wildlife in 4 CWCs - Mavhuradonha, Kanyurira, Mbire North and Mukwichi with a combined total of 141,875.20 ha. The boundary for Karinyanga CWCs in Mbire East was demarcated in 2019 (80 km), and the demarcation is also used as a fire barrier. All the CWCs have cleared a combined total of 37km as firebreaks during the 2019/20 fire season using tractors procured by the project. As a result, it is anticipated that the area burnt by uncontrolled wildfires will be reduced. Using equipment provided by the project in Pfundundu and Mukwichi Kanyurira/Masoka, Mbire North and Karinyanga, 2,472 days of overnight patrols were conducted in all the CWCs. 6 proposed CWCs have been identified and mapped. Communities from 6 CWCs (Mavhuradonha, Pfundundu and Mukwichi) were consulted and are ready to establish trusts that will run the CWCs. The trusts will be used as a vehicle for both wildlife management and for improved livelihoods among the benefiting communities. Proceeds from wildlife-related activities will be used for agreed projects and activities by the trusts. A total of 560 community members were consulted in the two districts, including 424 men and 136 women. The project is encouraging the participation of women during the consultations. The project could not complete the process for Mbire district due to the COVID-19 restrictions that were implemented by the government to curb the spread of the disease.	180,000	334,500			

32

Project Strategy	Indicator[9]	Baseline Level[10]	Level in 1st PIR (self- reported)	Midterm Target[11]	End-of-project Target	Midterm Level & Assessment[12]	Achievement Rating[13]	Justification for Rating
	Indicator 8: METT score for targeted PAs: - Mana Pools NP: -Charara SA: -Hurungwe SA: - Sapi SA: - Chewore SA: - Dande SA: -Doma SA:	 57 43 40 41 48 40 39	No scores available as yet - the METT assessment will be conducted during midterm evaluation in 2021 as guided by the monitoring and evaluation plan. The project is in the process of hiring a consultant to finalize the development of management plans of all the safari areas, and Mana Pools National Park. It is expected that after finalization of management plans the METT score of the Safari Areas and Mana Pools will improve. Staff in all the protected areas have had training through the project. These trainings will improve the capacity/resources to enforce protected area legislation and regulations. The project team is also supporting the development of the next 2021-2025 National Development Strategy (NDS) in which ecosystems integrity/resilience has been suggested as one of the outcomes.	 67 53 50 51 58 50 49	 77 63 60 61 68 60 59			

33

Project Strategy	Indicator[9]	Baseline Level[10]	Level in 1st PIR (self- reported)	Midterm Target[11]	End-of-project Target	Midterm Level & Assessment[12]	Achievement Rating[13]	Justification for Rating
	Indicator 9: Results of IWT law enforcement in the project area: -annual intensity of patrolling (inspector/days) -annual number seizures; -annual number of arrests; -annual number of successful prosecutions on poaching and IWT	- 17,601; - 85; - 42; - 18	Midterm target for improvement in law enforcement parameters is likely to be exceeded and (if this trend is maintained) the project is well on track to achieve the EOP target: Results as at 30 June 2020 are: 42,749 patrolling days 102 seizures 200 arrests 97 successful prosecutions Percentage increase from the baseline figure per each parameter: 143% patrolling days 20% seizures 376% arrests 439% successful prosecutions In response to the COVID-19 pandemic the intensity of patrols increased especially in protected areas such as Mana Pools as there are no tourists hence the park is more vulnerable to poaching activities. The project has put in place an adaptive management plan to enable ZPWMA to increase the capacity for patrols under Covid. With increased patrols the number of wire snares discovered was 1203 in the project area The midterm target is likely to be exceeded.	Law enforcement parameters increased by at least 30%	Law enforcement parameters increased by at least 60%			

Project Strategy	Indicator[9]	Baseline Level[10]	Level in 1st PIR (self- reported)	Midterm Target[11]	End-of-project Target	Midterm Level & Assessment[12]	Achievement Rating[13]	Justification for Rating
Outcome 3 Increased area under sustainable management and increased benefits for local communities from CBWM, SFM and SLM in established CWCs	Indicator 10: Average annual revenue from CBWM, SFM and SLM per target CWC, $US: -Pfundundu: -Mukwichi: -Mbire North: -Karinyanga: -Kanyurira /Masoka: -Mavhuradonha:	 0 0 450,000 56,427 77,083 19,000	Although the 2019 revenue figures surpassed the midterm targets, the gains made cannot be sustained due to the negative impact COVID-19 is having on tourism including safari hunting from which the bulk of revenues are generated. Current figures are: Pfundundu: $24,350 Mukwichi: $ 6,655 Mbire North: $792,398.60 Karinyanga: $281,834 Kanyurira/Masoka: $382,040.50 Mavhuradonha: 0 Percentage revenue increases are far in excess for both the midterm and EOP targets: Pfundundu: N/A Mukwichi: N/A Mbire North: 76% Karinyanga: 399% Kanyurira/Masoka: 396% Mavhuradonha: 0 In Muvhuradonha the safari operator is yet to pay dividends to the community - their capacity to do so may be affected by the impacts of COVID 19 on the industry. It is difficult to predict how long it might take for the sector to recover.	CWC revenue increase by at least 10% for Mbire North, Kanyurira/Maso ka, and Karinyanga At least 10,000 for Pfundundu and Mukwichi each	CWC revenue increase by at least 20% for Mbire North, Kanyurira/Maso ka, and Karinyanga At least 20,000 for Pfundundu and Mukwichi each			
	Indicator 11: Total area of restored woodlands, ha:	0	The target is likely to be surpassed. 9,551 ha have been identified and mapped for restoration. The project has started work on woodland restoration mainly in areas near CWCs. The project is initially targeting areas around CWCs and areas in communities participating in the project for restoration through planting and assisted regeneration. To promote sustainability, woodland restoration will be linked to livelihood enhancement activities like bee keeping under the Small Grants Programme.	2,000	6,000			

| | Indicator 12: Total volume of CO2 mitigated in the project area (tCO2eq) | 0 | The target is likely to be surpassed. 9,551 ha have been identified and mapped for restoration. The project has started work on woodland restoration mainly in areas near CWCs.

The project is initially targeting areas around CWCs and areas in communities participating in the project for restoration through planting and assisted regeneration. To promote sustainability, woodland restoration will be linked to livelihood enhancement activities like bee keeping under the Small Grants Programme.
No data available yet - in the project's monitoring and evaluation plan progress on this indicator is only due to be evaluated at the end of year 3 (2021).

As at June 2020, the estimated emissions reduction (using FAO Ex-Ante Carbon Balance Tool) as a result of the project was 165,764 tCO2eq.
The percentage of area burnt by veld fires has been decreasing since the project started, as follows:

In Hurungwe there was a 37.4% decrease in 2019 compared to 2018 (2018- 103,364.01ha and 2019- 64724.84ha)

In Mbire there was a 62.4% decrease in 2029 compared with area burnt in 2018 (2018-48770.63 ha and 2019- 18363.69)

In Muzarabani district there was a 0.24% decrease in area burnt in 2019 compared with 2018 (2018- 13298.23 ha and 2019- 13266.96 ha).

Increase in patrolling will also reduce forest crimes in protected areas. The project has noted a sudden increase in charcoal production in the project area (this might be due to increased problems with supply of electricity in the country, or people having no money to pay for electric-ty - when it is available - due to general economic hardships, worsened by the COVID-19 situation. Increased demand for charcoal will increase the rate of deforestation, with an associated increase in carbon dioxide emissions. | 300,000 | 834,819 | | | |

36

Project Strategy	Indicator[9]	Baseline Level[10]	Level in 1st PIR (self- reported)	Midterm Target[11]	End-of-project Target	Midterm Level & Assessment[12]	Achievement Rating[13]	Justification for Rating
			Efforts to reduce incidences of fires in the protected areas and CWCs are ongoing. The project procured tractors for construction of firebreaks. Tractors will also be used in the management of fuel load in CWCs to reduce intensity of fires when they do occur.					
	Indicator 13: Number of national and district development plans that address biodiversity and ecosystem management and climate risk management	1	One district plan (for Mbire) has already been updated to incorporate biodiversity and ecosystems management.

The project is in the process of hiring a consultant to develop a landscape-wide management plan including the plans for the Hurungwe and Muzarabani districts, Mana Pools National Park and the surrounding safari areas.
The project is also supporting the development of the next 2021-2025 National Development Strategy in which ecosystems integrity/resilience has been suggested as one of the outcomes - this will ensure that climate risk management and improved ecosystem management are well-integrated into the national development planning agenda. | 2 | 3 | | | |

37

Project Strategy	Indicator[9]	Baseline Level[10]	Level in 1st PIR (self- reported)	Midterm Target[11]	End-of-project Target	Midterm Level & Assessment[12]	Achievement Rating[13]	Justification for Rating
Outcome 4 Lessons learned by the project through participatory M&E and gender mainstreaming are used nationally and internationally	Indicator 14: Number of the lessons on IWT control and CBNRM learned by the project that used in other national and international projects	0	The project is using the small grants approach as a method of engaging civil society and increasing the livelihoods options of communities that reside near protected areas. Having more livelihoods options will reduce pressure on natural resources in the project area. Some of the proposed projects such as bee keeping will assist in the management of woodland resources while at the same time providing a source of livelihood to the benefiting communities. At national level, the GEF 7 proposal being developed by the Ministry of Environment, Climate, Tourism and Hospitality Industry will use the same method in engaging civil society. The project has also shared lessons with international counterparts through participation in the Global Wildlife Programme knowledge sharing webinars and annual conference (2019). The project will meet the midterm target of having 2 lessons being used by other projects at the national and international level.	>=2	>=5			
	Indicator 15: % of women among the project participants directly benefiting from the project activities	0	Under the livelihoods/Small Grants component of the project, two of the NGOs supported have women constituting 60% of target beneficiaries. 20% of trained rangers were women in Muzarabani district. The Akashinga Initiative (an all-women anti-poaching team), though not a brainchild of the project, is empowering women in the project area through training them to be female rangers fighting anti-poaching. The project maintains engagement with the Akashinga. The project is in the process of hiring a consultant to conduct a gender analysis and action plan to facilitate gender mainstreaming in the project. The gender indicators and targets for the project will be refined once the gender action plan has been developed.	>=30%	>=40%			

38

Indicator Assessment Key

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