**Terms of Reference for ICs and RLAs through /GPN ExpRes**

**Services/Work Description:** Mid Term Review for Palau Biodiversity Safeguards and Conservation

**Project/Programme Title:** Biodiversity Safeguards and Conservation in Palau

**Consultancy Title:** Team Leader – Palau Biodiversity Project

**Duty Station:** Home Based **(**travel to Palau prohibited by Government restrictions)

**Duration:** 30 days from 7 April till July, 2021

**Expected start date:** 7 April

1. **BACKGROUND**

|  |
| --- |
| The project was designed to protect Palau’s biodiversity by mainstreaming national environmental legislation and policies into practices on the ground and into State government development plans and private business plans. Through the GEF6 Project, the Ministry will protect biodiversity and natural resources by improving National-State communication and coordination and expanding partnerships between the National, State, Nonprofit, and Business sectors. Activities include: 1) Landscape, Seascape, and Master Planning; 2) Biosecurity and management of Invasive Alien Species; 3) Use of Best Practices in agriculture, aquaculture, fisheries, forestry, housing, and sustainable tourism; 4) Improved surveillance and enforcement; and 5) Gender and social mainstreaming and inclusivity.  **Brief project description:** Palau’s economy is projected to become increasingly dependent on tourism that is rising by 30% annually, necessitating new tourism infrastructure and service industries. Agriculture and fisheries, even though contributing barely 4% to Gross Domestic Product (GDP) continues to provide the main livelihood for about 20% of Palau’s population. Local food security is a national priority, given the heavy reliance on food imports, and these three sectors (agriculture, fisheries and tourism) are now growing in line with Palau’s national development policies and plans. However, increasing pressures from tourism and agriculture and fisheries development activities are also resulting in rapidly increasing pressures on the country’s natural resources and biodiversity; and the rich terrestrial and marine natural resources, on which tourism (and agriculture and fisheries) depend, are especially vulnerable to such pressures.  **This project aims** to address the negative impacts of unsustainable sector-led development practices on biodiversity-rich landscapes of Palau, including its productive coastal and marine ecosystems, while taking into account climate change adaptation needs and inclusive and equitable social and economic development for dependent communities, as well as safeguarding against threats to biodiversity and the introduction and spread of Invasive Alien Species through the tourism and related sectors.  **The objective of** the project is to mainstream biodiversity conservation into integrated land and seascape governance, planning and management in Palau.  The project recognizes the fact that these land and seascapes underpin the lives and livelihoods of a large number of local communities and that implementation of a coherent strategy to promote sustainable, biodiversity-friendly livelihood options is an integral part of the solution. The project objective is to be achieved through the implementation of four inter-related and mutually complementary Components (Project Outcomes) that are focussed on addressing existing barriers. The four Outcomes of the project are:   * **Outcome 1:** Enhanced national institutional framework for integrated planning and management of land and seascapes; * **Outcome 2:** Integrated multi-sector land and seascape planning and management operational in Babeldaob states to reduce threats to biodiversity and improve ecosystem services to benefit communities and state economies; * **Outcome 3:** Integrated multi-sector planning and management operational in 264,686 ha of seascapes and coastal areas in the Southern Lagoon to reduce threats to biodiversity and improve ecosystem services to benefit communities and state economies; and * **Outcome 4:** Knowledge management, monitoring and evaluation support, equitable gender benefits and biodiversity conservation in Palau.   Since the global Covid 19 pandemic in first quarter 2020, many countries including Palau responded immediately by implemented strict travel restrictions, and so far Palau is covid-free. Palau’s border is effectively closed to all except essential workers and approved returning Palauan citizens and residents. In March 2020 the Palau government instituted a nationwide lockdown period, including school closures, which had a negative impact on the project, resulting in delays to implementation for at least 2 months. Most affected were women, who were generally responsible for child care during the lockdown. The shift to online Zoom meetings was not successful in country. Although the lockdown was lifted, several partners remain heavily impacted by safety and economic considerations. Some partners are responsible for two-week quarantines for incoming passengers (24 hours/day for 14 days every month) and for disinfection of the quarantine vehicles and sites, some partners have taken on the risk of inspecting incoming vessels (air freight and ships, 3-4 per week), and other partners are dealing with drastic reductions in revenues due to a complete lack of tourists. Despite the impacts of the border closure and covid risks, the project did continue with activities and implemented adaptive management (such as switching from international consultants to local hires) and was back to near 100% implementation by August 2020. To date, there are no known cases of Covid-related deaths in Palau. Government officials continue to monitor the situation and provide regular updates. Palau has started to vaccinate its population with the goal of reaching 100% of eligible residents. |

1. **SCOPE OF WORK, RESPONSIBILITIES AND DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSED WORK**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **MTR PURPOSE**  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. The MTR will also reflect on lessons learnt on this project to inform and be shared with other Projects in Palau and related projects in the Pacific. The MTR is also part of the UNDP Pacific Office in Fiji’s evaluation plan (2018-2022) and will be facilitated by the Commissioning Unit, Monitoring and Evaluation Officer with support from terminal evaluation team.  **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, including the Project website, weekly emailed newsletter, and Social Media channels. 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]](#footnote-1) ensuring close engagement with the Project Team, government counterparts (the GEF Operational Focal Point), the UNDP Country Office(s), the Nature, Climate and Energy (NCE) 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 defined project responsibilities:   1. Project Board 2. Executing agency representatives (the Ministry), senior officials and task team/ component leaders 3. State Government Representatives on State Planning or Implementation Teams for the 10 States on Babeldaob, Koror, and Peleliu 4. Agencies and partners with signed MOUs:    1. Bureau of Agriculture,    2. Bureau of Tourism,    3. Bureau of Marine Resources    4. Division of Fish and Wildlife (MOJ)    5. Environmental Quality Protection Board (EQPB)    6. Palau Automated Land and Resource Information System (PALARIS)    7. National Invasive Species Committee Coordinator (NISC)    8. Palau Conservation Society,    9. Bureau of Aging, Disability, and Gender (BADG)   Additional stakeholders and partners to be consulted may include the Palau Small Grants Programme (SGP), CRRF, PICRC, BNM, and PCC-CRE.  The MTR Team Leader will participate in virtual and digital meetings as necessary with stakeholders, and will oversee and guide a National Consultant who will meet with stakeholders in person. The Team Leader will oversee analysis of input information. The National Consultant will need to conduct team visits to multiple states on Babeldaob, Koror, and possibly Peleliu, if representatives cannot be visited in Koror, and then provide concise information to the Team Leader.  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. Many project partners are women who are responsible for families, and child care needs must be considered in the approach.  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.   * **Additional Text to incorporate into this section, as relevant (please adjust as needed):**   *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 03/2020. It is not possible to travel to the country for the MTR mission. Travel within the main archipelago of Palau is open and allowed and safe. The MTR team should develop a methodology that takes this into account and conduct the MTR partially virtually and remotely, including the use of remote interview methods and extended desk reviews, data analysis, surveys and evaluation questionnaires, in partnership with a National Consultant who travels within country. 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. A National Consultant must be able to travel to Babeldaob States, hamlets in Koror, and Peleliu and should incorporate these costs into the MTR Inception Report.*  *Remote interviews may be undertaken through telephone or online (skype, zoom etc.). International consultants can work remotely with national evaluator support in the field. No stakeholders, consultants or UNDP staff should be put in harm’s way and safety is the key priority.*  *A validation mission is not possible within the MTR schedule. Qualified and independent national consultants can be hired to undertake the MTR interviews in country instead.*  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.   + 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/Logframe:   * Undertake a critical analysis of the project’s logframe indicators and targets, assess how “SMART” the midterm and end-of-project targets are (Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Relevant, Time-bound), and suggest specific amendments/revisions to the targets and indicators as necessary. * Are the project’s objectives and outcomes or components clear, practical, and feasible within its time frame? * Examine if progress so far has led to, or could in the future catalyse beneficial development effects (i.e. income generation, gender equality and women’s empowerment, improved governance etc...) that should be included in the project results framework and monitored on an annual basis. * Ensure broader development and gender aspects of the project are being monitored effectively. Develop and recommend SMART ‘development’ indicators, including sex-disaggregated indicators and indicators that capture development benefits.   **ii. Progress Towards Results**  Progress Towards Outcomes Analysis:   * Review the logframe indicators against progress made towards the end-of-project targets using the Progress Towards Results Matrix and following the *Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects*; colour code progress in a “traffic light system” based on the level of progress achieved; assign a rating on progress for each outcome; make recommendations from the areas marked as “Not on target to be achieved” (red).   Table. Progress Towards Results Matrix (Achievement of outcomes against End-of-project Targets)   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **Project Strategy** | **Indicator[[2]](#footnote-2)** | **Baseline Level[[3]](#footnote-3)** | **Level in 1st PIR (self- reported)** | **Midterm Target[[4]](#footnote-4)** | **End-of-project Target** | **Midterm Level & Assessment[[5]](#footnote-5)** | **Achievement Rating[[6]](#footnote-6)** | **Justification for Rating** | | **Objective:** | Indicator (if applicable): |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | **Outcome 1:** | Indicator 1: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | Indicator 2: |  |  |  |  |  | | **Outcome 2:** | Indicator 3: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | Indicator 4: |  |  |  |  |  | | Etc. |  |  |  |  |  | | **Etc.** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |   **Indicator Assessment Key**   |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | Green= Achieved | Yellow= On target to be achieved | Red= Not on target to be achieved |   In addition to the progress towards outcomes analysis:   * 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**  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/ logframe as a management tool and review any changes made to it since project start.   Finance and co-finance:   * Consider the financial management of the project, with specific reference to the cost-effectiveness of interventions. * Review the changes to fund allocations as a result of budget revisions and assess the appropriateness and relevance of such revisions. * Does the project have the appropriate financial controls, including reporting and planning, that allow management to make informed decisions regarding the budget and allow for timely flow of funds? * Informed by the co-financing monitoring table to be filled out 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** | |  |  |  |  |  |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  | |  |  | **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:   + The project’s overall safeguards risk categorization.   + The identified types of risks[[7]](#footnote-7) (in the SESP).   + 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.  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?   **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. MTR Ratings & Achievement Summary Table for (*Project Title*)   |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | **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) |  | | Outcome 4 Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale) |  | | **Project Implementation & Adaptive Management** | (rate 6 pt. scale) |  | | **Sustainability** | (rate 4 pt. scale) |  |  1. **TIMEFRAME**   The total duration of the MTR will be approximately *(30)* working daysover a time period of *(12* of weeks, and shall not exceed five months from when the consultant(s) are hired. The tentative MTR timeframe is as follows:   |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | **ACTIVITY** | **NUMBER OF WORKING DAYS** | **COMPLETION DATE** | | Document review and preparing MTR Inception Report | *4 days* | *10 April* | | Liaise with, guide, and oversee National Consultant, and review findings from stakeholder meetings and interviews held by National Consultant, feedback to team | *10 days* | *24 April* | | Presentation of initial findings - within 3 days of the last interview (via Zoom/Skype) | *1 day* | *28 April* | | Preparing draft report (due within 3 weeks of completion of National Consultant’s interviews) | *10 days* | *12 May* | | Finalization of MTR report/ Incorporating audit trail from feedback on draft report (due within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on the draft) | *5 days* | *1 June* |   Options for site visits/interviews should be provided in the Inception Report. |

1. **Expected Outputs and deliverables**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **#** | **Deliverable** | **Description** | **Timing** | **Responsibilities** | | **1** | **MTR Inception Report** | MTR team clarifies objectives and methods of Midterm Review | No later than 2 weeks before National Consultant begins interviews  Date: 10 April | MTR team submits to the Commissioning Unit and project management | | **2** | **Presentation** | Initial Findings presented by Team Leader to PMU via Zoom, in collaboration with the National Consultant | No later than 3 days after end of interview period  Date 28 April | MTR Team presents to project management and the Commissioning Unit | | **3** | **Draft MTR Report** | Full draft report (using guidelines on content outlined in Annex B) with annexes | Within 3 weeks of conclusion of National Consultant’s interviews  Date: 12 May | Sent to the Commissioning Unit, reviewed by RTA, Project Coordinating Unit, GEF OFP | | **4** | **Final Report\*** | Revised report with audit trail detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final MTR report | Within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft  Date: June 1 | Sent to the Commissioning Unit | |

1. **Institutional arrangements/reporting lines**

|  |
| --- |
| The principal responsibility for managing this MTR resides with the Commissioning Unit. The Commissioning Unit for this project’s MTR is *the Integrated Results Management Unit, Monitoring and Evaluation of the UNDP Pacific Office in Fiji.*  The Commissioning Unit will contract the consultants 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, conduct digital meetings, liaise the National Consultant with stakeholder interviewees, and assist the National Consultant with field visits. Programme Officer of UNDP will provide support to the project in review of the report, and collation of project information package. |

1. **Experience and qualifications**

|  |
| --- |
| I. Academic Qualifications:   * A Master’s degree in Social Sciences, Environment, Conservation or other closely related field   II. Years of experience:   * Previous experience with a full-size project’s MTR, preferably in a Pacific Island country; * 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 Biodiversity, Land Degradation and Sustainable Forest Management; * Experience in evaluating GEF and/or other donor agency funded projects. At least 5 years of experience is necessary * Experience working in South Pacific. Previous experience in Micronesia is advantageous. * Experience in relevant technical areas for at least 10 years; * Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender, Biodiversity, Land Degradation and Sustainable Forest Management; experience in gender sensitive evaluation and analysis. * Experience in undertaking consultancies and managing teams of consultants * Excellent communication skills including the ability to work remotely and use Zoom, Skype, FaceTime, and other digital technologies; * Ability to outline clear needs from, oversee actions of, and analyze findings from a National Consultant; * Demonstrable analytical skills; * Project evaluation/review experiences within United Nations system will be considered an asset.   III. Language:   * Fluency in written and spoken English.   IV. Competencies:   * Previous experience with a full-size project’s MTR, preferably in a Pacific Island country; * 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 Biodiversity, Land Degradation and Sustainable Forest Management; * Experience in evaluating GEF and/or other donor agency funded projects. At least 5 years of experience is necessary * Experience working in South Pacific. Previous experience in Micronesia is advantageous. * Experience in relevant technical areas for at least 10 years; * Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender, Biodiversity, Land Degradation and Sustainable Forest Management; experience in gender sensitive evaluation and analysis. * Experience in undertaking consultancies and managing teams of consultants * Excellent communication skills including the ability to work remotely and use Zoom, Skype, FaceTime, and other digital technologies; * Ability to outline clear needs from, oversee actions of, and analyze findings from a National Consultant; * Demonstrable analytical skills; * Project evaluation/review experiences within United Nations system will be considered an asset. |

1. **Payment Modality**

|  |
| --- |
| Payment to the individual contractor will be made based on the actual number of days worked, deliverables accepted and upon certification of satisfactory completion by the manager. |

1. For ideas on innovative and participatory Monitoring and Evaluation strategies and techniques, see [UNDP Discussion Paper: Innovations in Monitoring & Evaluating Results](http://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/librarypage/capacity-building/discussion-paper--innovations-in-monitoring---evaluating-results/), 05 Nov 2013. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Populate with data from the Logframe and scorecards [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Populate with data from the Project Document [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. If available [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. Colour code this column only [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. Use the 6 point Progress Towards Results Rating Scale: HS, S, MS, MU, U, HU [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
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. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)