
TERMS OF REFERENCE
(Individual Contractor Agreement)

Title: Project Management Support – Advisor
Project: FSP OP6 Thailand
Duty station: Home Based
Section/Unit: NYSC SDC GMS
Contract/Level: ICS-11/IICA-3
Supervisor: Kirk Bayabos, Head of Cluster

1. General Background

The Sixth Operational Phase of the GEF Small Grants Programme in Thailand has been conceived to engage community organizations in four diverse regions of Thailand to take collective action for adaptive landscape and seascape management for socio-ecological resilience - through design, implementation and evaluation of regular and strategic grant projects for global environmental benefits and sustainable development. It will promote sustainable land management through the strengthening of viable agro-forestry and sustainable agriculture practices and systems that improve soil and water conservation, increase the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity, and enhance the innovative use of renewable energy.

The solution to the problem is for community organizations in rural landscapes and seascapes of key areas of Thailand - the Northern, Northeastern, Western and Southern regions - to develop and implement adaptive landscape management strategies that build social, economic and ecological resilience based on the production of global environmental and local sustainable development, health and well-being benefits. To pursue achievement of the outcomes of these adaptive landscape management strategies, community organizations will implement grant projects reviewed and approved by the SGP National Steering Committee (NSC), supported by multi-stakeholder agreements involving local government, the private sector, NGOs and other partners, and evaluated as part of the broader collective process of adjusting management strategies to new information, knowledge, capacities and conditions. To ensure long-term conservation of ecosystem services, sequestration of carbon, sustainable natural resource management and human well-being, there is an obvious need to involve local communities and provide them with appropriate incentives. A critical long-term solution for this is, therefore, to ensure that sufficient institutional and local capacities are available to harness innovative financing opportunities as incentives to local land users to conserve ecosystem function and resources and sustainably manage landscapes/seascapes.

The project's objectives will be achieved through four outcomes organized around a single component: *Resilient rural landscapes and seascapes for sustainable development and global environmental protection*. These four outcomes will be achieved through delivery of 15 outputs. Individual small grants, strategic grants and other project outputs and activities will be combined to deliver the following four outcomes:

- **Outcome 1:** Multi-stakeholder partnerships the Mae Lao Watershed; Phetchabun Mountains; Kaeng Krachan Forest Complex; and Phang Nga Bay landscapes/seascapes develop and execute adaptive management plans to enhance landscape/seascape and community resilience, and global environmental benefits.

- **Outcome 2:** Community organizations in landscape/seascape level networks build their adaptive management capacities by implementing community level projects and collaborating in managing landscape resources and processes to achieve socio ecological production landscape resiliency.
- **Outcome 3:** Multi-stakeholder landscape and seascape management groups, local policy makers and subnational/national advisors organized in landscape policy platforms discuss potential policy innovations based on analysis of project experience and lessons learned.
- **Outcome 4:** Multi-stakeholder partnerships develop and implement strategic projects to bring adoption of specific successful SGP-supported technologies, practices or systems to a tipping point in each landscape through engagement of potential financial partners, policy makers and national/subnational advisors and institutions, as well as the private sector.

The SGP Country Programme is structured similarly to other SGP Country Programmes worldwide under the SGP Operational Guidelines approved by GEF Council. First and foremost, the Country Programme is governed by a National Steering Committee comprised of rotating representatives of civil society (the majority), as well as government and UNDP. The National Coordinator manages the Country Programme.

2. Purpose and Scope of Assignment

The objective of the Mid Term Review (MTR) is to assess:

- Progress towards the achievement of the project objectives and outcomes, as specified in the Project Document; and,
- 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 also reviews the project's strategy and the risks to its sustainability.

In addition, the MTR findings and responses outlined in the management response will be incorporated as recommendations for enhanced implementation during the final half of the project's duration.

The MTR report must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful.

The Project Management Support – Advisor 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 Project Management Support – Advisor 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 Project Management Support – Advisor is expected to follow a collaborative and participatory approach¹ ensuring close engagement with the Project Team, government counterparts (the GEF Operational Focal Point), the UNDP Country Office(s), UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Advisers, direct beneficiaries, and other key stakeholders.

¹ For ideas on innovative and participatory Monitoring and Evaluation strategies and techniques, see [UNDP Discussion Paper: Innovations in Monitoring & Evaluating Results](#), 05 Nov 2013.

Engagement of stakeholders is vital to a successful MTR. Stakeholder involvement should include interviews with stakeholders who have project responsibilities, including but not limited to CBOs/NGOs grantees; executing agencies, senior officials and task team/ component leaders, key experts and consultants in the subject area, Project Board, project stakeholders, academia, local government and CSOs, etc. Additionally, the Project Management Support – Advisor is expected to conduct field missions to Thailand, including the following project sites in land/seascapes of Mae Lao Watershed, Phetchabun Mountains, Kaeng Krachan Forest Complex and Phang Nga Bay in Southern Region.

The specific design and methodology for the MTR should emerge from consultations between the Project Management Support – Advisor 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 Project Management Support – Advisor 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 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.

The final MTR report should describe the full MTR approach taken and the rationale for the approach making explicit the underlying assumptions, challenges, strengths and weaknesses about the methods and approach of the review. Interviews will be held with the following organizations and individuals at a minimum:

- NSC members and Chair
- National Coordinator
- Grantee representatives in pilot areas
- Project Administrative/Financial Officer
- UNDP Country Office in Bangkok
- UCP Global Coordinator
- Technical Advisor
- UNOPS Programme Manager

3. Monitoring and Progress Controls

The Project Management Support – Advisor 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	Baseline Level ³	Level in 1 st PIR (self-reported)	Midterm Target ⁴	End-of-project Target	Midterm Level & Assessment ⁵	Achievement Rating 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?

² Populate with data from the Logframe and scorecards

³ Populate with data from the Project Document

⁴ If available

⁵ Colour code this column only

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

- 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 risks⁷ (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.

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.

- 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 Project Management Support – Advisor will include a section in the MTR report for evidence-based conclusions, in light of the findings.

Additionally, the Project Management Support – Advisor 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 Project Management Support – Advisor should make no more than 15 recommendations total.

Ratings

The Project Management Support – Advisor 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 *Sixth Operational Phase of the GEF Small Grants Programme in Thailand*

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)	

The total duration of the MTR will be approximately a time period of (8) of weeks from **01 March 2021 – 30 May 2021** and shall not exceed five months from when the consultant(s) are hired. The tentative MTR timeframe is as follows:

ACTIVITY	COMPLETION DATE
Document review and preparing MTR Inception Report (MTR Inception Report due no later than 2 weeks before the MTR mission)	10 March 2021
MTR mission: stakeholder meetings, interviews, field visit (as necessary)	15-26 March 2021
Presentation of initial findings- last day of the MTR mission	2 April 2021
Preparing draft report (due within 3 weeks of the MTR mission)	13 April 2021
Finalization of MTR report/ Incorporating audit trail from feedback on draft report (due within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on the draft) <i>(note: accommodate time delay in dates for circulation and review of the draft report)</i>	30 April 2021

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

Midterm Review Deliverables

#	Deliverable	Description	Timing	Responsibilities
1	MTR Inception Report (25% Lumpsum)	MTR team clarifies objectives and methods of Midterm Review	10 March 2021	MTR team submits to the Commissioning Unit and project management
2	Presentation (25% Lumpsum)	Initial Findings	2 April 2021	MTR Team presents to project management and the Commissioning Unit
3	Draft MTR Report (25% Lumpsum)	Full draft report (using guidelines on content	13 April 2021	Sent to the Commissioning Unit, reviewed by RTA,

		outlined in Annex B) with annexes		Project Coordinating Unit, GEF OFF
4	Final Report* (25% Lumpsum)	Revised report with audit trail detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final MTR report	30 April 2021 or within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft	Sent to the Commissioning Unit

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

4. Team Arrangement and Composition

The principal responsibility for managing this MTR resides with the Commissioning Unit. The Commissioning Unit for this project's MTR is UNOPS. The Commissioning Unit will contract the consultants and ensure the timely provision of the 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 as necessary.

A team of two independent consultants will conduct the MTR – one team leader (with experience and exposure to projects and evaluations in other regions globally) and one team local expert, from Thailand. The International Consultant will be designated as the team leader and will be responsible for the overall design and writing of the MTR report. The National Consultant will assess emerging trends with respect to regulatory frameworks, budget allocations, capacity building, work with the Project Team in developing the MTR itinerary, etc.

The International Consultant cannot have participated in the project preparation, formulation and/or implementation (including the writing of the project document), must not have conducted this project's Terminal Evaluation and should not have a conflict of interest with the project's related activities.

The selection of the International Consultant will be aimed at maximizing the overall "team" qualities in the following areas.

5. Qualifications and Experience

a. Education

Advanced university degree (master or equivalent) with seven years or relevant experience.

b. Work Experience

- Minimum 7 years' experience in environmental management, sustainable development or a related field
- Relevant experience with results-based management evaluation methodologies is desired;
- Experience applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios is desired;

- Competence in adaptive management, as applied to socio-ecological production landscapes and seascapes (SEPLS), biodiversity conservation, climate change mitigation and sustainable land management is desired;
- Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender and socio-ecological production landscapes and seascapes (SEPLS), biodiversity conservation, climate change mitigation and sustainable land management; experience in gender sensitive evaluation and analysis is desired;
- Experience in evaluating UNDP and/or GEF projects is desired;
- Project evaluation/review experiences within United Nations system will be considered an asset.

c. Responsibilities

- Documentation review on achievement and lesson learned resulted in GEF 5 (GEF 5 year 4 funded - projects) implementation and FSP of GEF6.
- Leading the MTR Team in planning, conducting and reporting on the evaluation
- Deciding on division of labour within the Team and ensuring timeliness of reports
- Use of best practice evaluation methodologies in conducting the evaluation
- Leading the drafting and finalization of the Inception Report for the MTR
- Leading presentation of the draft evaluation findings and recommendations in-country
- Conducting the de-briefing for the UNDP Country Office in Thailand and the Core Project Management Team
- Leading the drafting and finalization of the MTR Report

d. Language

- Fluency in written and spoken English is required.

e. Key Competencies



Develops and implements sustainable business strategies, thinks long term and externally in order to positively shape the organization. Anticipates and perceives the impact and implications of future decisions and activities on other parts of the organization.



Treats all individuals with respect; responds sensitively to differences and encourages others to do the same. Upholds organizational and ethical norms. Maintains high standards of trustworthiness. Role model for diversity and inclusion.



Acts as a positive role model contributing to the team spirit. Collaborates and supports the development of others. **For people managers only:** Acts as positive leadership role model, motivates, directs and inspires others to succeed, utilising appropriate leadership styles



Demonstrates understanding of the impact of own role on all partners and always puts the end beneficiary first. Builds and maintains strong external relationships and is a competent partner for others (if relevant to the role).



Efficiently establishes an appropriate course of action for self and/or others to accomplish a goal. Actions lead to total task accomplishment through concern for quality in all areas. Sees opportunities and takes the initiative to act on them. Understands that responsible use of resources maximizes our impact on our beneficiaries.



Open to change and flexible in a fast paced environment. Effectively adapts own approach to suit changing circumstances or requirements. Reflects on experiences and modifies own behaviour. Performance is consistent, even under pressure. Always pursues continuous improvements.



Evaluates data and courses of action to reach logical, pragmatic decisions. Takes an unbiased, rational approach with calculated risks. Applies innovation and creativity to problem-solving.



Expresses ideas or facts in a clear, concise and open manner. Communication indicates a consideration for the feelings and needs of others. Actively listens and proactively shares knowledge. Handles conflict effectively, by overcoming differences of opinion and finding common ground.

Project Authority (Name/Title): Kirk Bayabos Head of Cluster	Contract holder (Name/Title): <div style="text-align: right;">Jon Garcia Banales</div>
Signature _____ Date _____	Signature _____ Date 11/02/2021