Midterm Review Terms of Reference

Standard Template 2: Formatted information to be entered in UNDP Jobs website[1]

BASIC CONTRACT INFORMATION

Location: Brazil
Application Deadline: August 15th, 2021
Type of Contract: Individual Contract
Post Level: International Consultant
Languages Required: Portuguese and English.
Starting Date: September 20th, 2021
Duration of Initial Contract: 9 weeks
Expected Duration of Assignment: 47 working days.

BACKGROUND

A.   Project Title

Sustainable, accessible and innovative use of biodiversity and associated traditional knowledge in promising phytotherapic value chains in Brazil (Phytotherapic)

B.   Project Description

This is the Terms of Reference for the UNDP-GEF Midterm Review (MTR) of the full-sized project titled Sustainable, accessible and innovative use of biodiversity and associated traditional knowledge in promising phytotherapic value chains in Brazil (PIMS5792) implemented through the UNDP and the Ministry of Environment, which is to be undertaken in 2021. The project started on December 7th, 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*[2].

The project was designed to: enhance global biodiversity benefits, as well as multiple national and local co-benefits, arising from the sustainable, accessible, and innovative use of medicinal plants in four Brazilian targeted biomes: Amazon, Caatinga, Cerrado, and the Atlantic Forest. It will do so by strengthening promising phytotherapic value chains, based on indigenous and local communities' traditional knowledge, in compliance with the applicable ABS regime, and while adhering to ecological sustainability criteria. The project is being implemented through the following four Outcomes:
1) Sustainable phytotherapic value chains established in indigenous and local communities (ILCs) within Local Productive Arrangements (LPAs);
2) Public and private R&D for the development of native Brazilian herbal medicinal products accelerated through strategic support for more equitable partnerships, ensuring the full engagement of ILCs and ABS compliance;
3) Simplified and ABS-compliant regulations mainstreamed in the national public health system to increase the demand for, and provide broader access to, herbal medicinal products based on native plants; and
4) Knowledge management, monitoring, and evaluation carried out to disseminate information on ABS-compliant and environmentally sustainable phytotherapic value chains and to promote upscaling.

---

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

[2] Available at: http://web.undp.org/evaluation/guidance.shtml#gef.

The Phytotherapic Project was designed to be implemented over a six-year period, from December 2018 to December 2024. The Project has a budget of US$ 5,722,770 (five million, seven hundred and twenty-two thousand, seven hundred and seventy American dollars), financed by GEF. Another US$ 27,726,195 (twenty-seven million, seven hundred and twenty-six thousand, one hundred and ninety-five American dollars) is provided as co-financing by the national Government, which are not included in this budget and are reported by the MMA to the GEF, through reports.

The Project's governance arrangement includes 1) Project Board, composed of UNDP, the Brazilian Agency for Cooperation (ABC), and MMA; 2) Advisory Committee, composed of: MMA, Ministry of Health (MS), Ministry of Regional Development (MDR), Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Food Supply (MAPA), Special Secretary of Familiar Agriculture and Agrarian Development (SEAD), Ministry of Science, Technology, Innovation and Communication (MCTIC), Ministry of Development, Industry and Commerce (MDIC), National Health Surveillance Agency (ANVISA) and UNDP; and 3) ILC's Consultative Commission, composed of representatives from ILC organizations of Traditional Knowledge Owners Sectorial Chamber of the Genetic Heritage Management Council (CGen) and other ILC fora relevant for the project.

The Phytotherapic Project foresees to undertake capacity development and intense field activities targeting traditional and rural communities. During 2020, there were difficulties in contacting ILC members because they were following protection measures related to the Covid-19 pandemic and had restricted internet access. Since March 2020, travel and in-person meetings were suspended, considering the social and sanitary vulnerability of the Project's targeted audience and restrictive measures adopted to contain the disease's outbreak. In this sense, the Project Team has conducted remote meetings and consultations with strategic stakeholders. Although the difficulties of internet access have hampered the accomplishment of the planned activities in the expected time, the remote consultations achieved positive results regarding the engagement of stakeholders and the information gathered.

In terms of the overall national Covid-19 situation, Brazil is currently one of the world's epicenters, having recently reached 540,000 deaths with a high contamination rate. Vaccination is proceeding at a slow pace, and this means that the Project does not foresee field activities until at least the end of the year.

C.   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 and the project's preparation of a strategy for when UNDP-GEF project support ends.

The results of the MTR Report, including the analysis of the indicators and lessons learned, will serve the implementing partner (MMA/Government) and UNDP for the elaboration of adaptive management measures in order to achieve its envisaged results. Considering that 2021 is the Project's third year of implementation, we are aligned with the Commissioning Unit's evaluation plan.

The scope and objectives of the MRT must include aspects such as COVID-19 pandemic-related challenges, delays and impacts, and the changes in government political and economic guidelines that have been affecting the implementation of the project during its lifetime.

DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

D. MTR Approach & Methodology

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

The MTR consultant 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 Project Review/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 consultant will review the baseline GEF focal area (Biodiversity) 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 consultant is expected to follow a collaborative and participatory approach[3] 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.

The engagement of stakeholders is vital to a successful MTR.[4] Stakeholder involvement should include interviews with stakeholders who have project responsibilities, including but not limited to executing agencies, senior officials and task team/ component leaders, key experts and consultants in the subject area, Project Board, Project Advisory Committee, ILC's Consultative Commission, project stakeholders, academia, local government and CSOs, etc.

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. As external field missions are suspended in the Project, the MTR consultant should develop a methodology that takes into account the conduct of the MTR virtually and remotely, including the use of remote interview methods and extended desk reviews, data analysis, surveys, and evaluation questionnaires. This should be detailed in the MTR Inception Report and agreed with the Commissioning Unit.

As the MTR is to be entirely carried out virtually, 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.

Since field mission is not possible, remote interviews may be undertaken through telephone or online (Skype, Zoom, WhatsApp, etc.). No stakeholders, consultants, or UNDP staff should be put in harm's way and safety is the key priority.

The specific design and methodology for the MTR should emerge from consultations between the MTR consultant 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 consultant must, however, 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.

---

[3] For ideas on innovative and participatory Monitoring and Evaluation strategies and techniques, see UNDP Discussion Paper: Innovations in Monitoring & Evaluating Results, 05 Nov 2013.
[4] 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.

The final methodological approach including remote interview schedule and data to be used in the MTR should be clearly outlined in the Inception Report and be fully discussed and agreed upon between UNDP, stakeholders, and the MTR consultant.

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 consultant 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.

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 program 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

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.

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*; color 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 analyze 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.

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? 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, including COVID-19 pandemic-related challenges and delays.
- 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 the 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$)	Actual Amount Contributed at the stage of Midterm Review (US$)	Actual % of Expected Amount
		TOTAL			

- Include the separate GEF Co-Financing template (filled out by the Commissioning Unit and project team) which categorizes co-financing amounts by source 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 the 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, including Covid-19 pandemic-related constraints. 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[5] (in the SESP).

---

[5] 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.

- 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.

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 fulfill 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).

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.
- 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 the 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?

<u>Institutional Framework and Governance risks to sustainability:</u>

- Do the legal frameworks, policies, governance structures, and processes pose risks that may jeopardize the 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.

<u>Environmental risks to sustainability:</u>

- Are there any environmental risks that may jeopardize the sustenance of project outcomes?

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 consultant 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 rating scales.

F.   Expected Outputs and Deliverables

The MTR consultant shall prepare and submit:

#	Deliverable	Description	Responsibilities	Expected due date
1	**MTR Inception Report**	MTR consultant clarifies objectives and methods of Midterm Review	MTR consultant submits to the Commissioning Unit and project management	October 5th, 2021.
2	**Presentation**	Initial Findings	MTR Consultant presents to project management and the Commissioning Unit at the end of MTR mission (virtual/remote meetings and interviews)	October 21st, 2021.
3	**Draft Final Report**	Full report (using guidelines on the content outlined in Annex B) with annexes	Sent to the Commissioning Unit, reviewed by RTA, Project Coordinating Unit, GEF OFP	November 1st, 2021.

#	Deliverable	Description	Responsibilities	Expected due date
4	**Final Report***	Revised report with audit trail detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final MTR report	Sent to the Commissioning Unit	November 23rd, 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 Country Office in Brazil.

The Commissioning Unit and the Project Team will provide support to the operationalization of virtual/remote meetings and will provide the MRT consultant with an updated list of interested parties with contact details (phone and email), in addition to providing all online documentation for the MRT consultant.

H. Duration of the Work

The total duration of the MTR will be approximately *47 working days* over a period of *9 weeks* starting *September 20th, 2021,* and shall not exceed five months from when the consultant(s) are hired. The tentative MTR timeframe is as follows:

- *(August 15th, 2021):* Application closes
- *(September 17th, 2021):* Selection of MTR consultant
- *(September 20th, 2021):* Prep the MTR consultant (handover of project documents)
- *(September 30th, 2021):* Document review and preparing MTR Inception Report
- *(October 4th, 2021):* Finalization and Validation of MTR Inception Report- latest start of MTR mission
- *(October 5th, 2021 to October 18th, 2021):* MTR mission: stakeholder virtual meetings and interviews
- *(October 21st, 2021):* Mission wrap-up virtual meeting & presentation of initial findings- earliest end of MTR mission
- *(November 1st, 2021):* Preparation of MRT draft report
- *(November 1st, 2021):* Circulation of MRT draft report for comments
- *(November 18th, 2021):* Incorporation of comments on MRT draft report into Audit Trail /Finalization of MTR report
- *November 23rd, 2021):* Circulation of final MRT report and approval
- *(November 30th, 2021):* Preparation & Issue of Management Response
- *(December 7th, 2021): Expected* date of full MTR completion.

The date start of the contract is *September 20th, 2021.*

I. Duty Station

The MTR Consultant will work home-based, with the remote support of the Project's Team, who will provide support in the agendas and interviews with stakeholders.

REQUIRED SKILLS AND EXPERIENCE

J.   Qualifications of the Successful Applicants

The international consultant will conduct the MTR with experience and exposure to projects and evaluations in other regions globally. The consultant cannot has participated in the project preparation, formulation, and/or implementation (including the writing of the Project Document) and should not has a conflict of interest with the project's related activities.

The consultant must complain with the following:

Mandatory criteria:
- Minimum 10 years of relevant professional experience in related areas of the TORs;
- Previous experience with results-based monitoring and evaluation methodologies;
- Technical knowledge in the targeted focal area(s);
- Fluency in English with excellent writing skills;
- Fluency in Spanish.

Qualifying criteria:
- Post-Graduate in related areas of the TORs;
- Project evaluation/review experiences within the United Nations system;
- Experience of working on GEF evaluations, preferably with Biodiversity;
- Work experience in evaluations with traditional peoples and communities;
- Experience working in Latin America;
- Experience working in Brazil;
- Fluency in Portuguese.

K.   Ethics
The MTR consultant 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 consultant 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 consultant 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 MTR Report Clearance Form) and delivery of completed MTR 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.

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

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

APPLICATION PROCESS

M.   Presentation of Offer

a) **Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability** using the template provided by UNDP;
b) **CV** (use **Personal History Form** - P11 form);
c) **Brief description of approach to work/technical proposal** of why the individual considers him/herself as the most suitable for the assignment, and a proposed methodology on how they will approach and complete the assignment; (max 1 page)
d) **Financial Proposal** that indicates the total cost of the assignment (in US Dollars), as per template attached to the Letter of Confirmation of Interest template. If an applicant is employed by an organization/company/institution, and he/she expects his/her employer to charge a management fee in the process of releasing him/her to UNDP under Reimbursable Loan Agreement (RLA), the applicant must indicate at this point, and ensure that all such costs are duly incorporated in the financial proposal submitted to UNDP.

The CV (P11 Form) and the Financial Proposal **must be submitted in separate files**. Noncompliance with this provision will cause the application to be disregarded.

UNDP applies a fair and transparent selection process that will take into account the competencies/skills of the applicants as well as their financial proposals. Qualified women and members of social minorities are encouraged to apply.

The evaluator selected should not have participated in the project preparation and/or implementation and should not have a conflict of interest with project-related activities.

All application materials should be submitted by email at the following address ONLY: <mark>(fill email)</mark> indicating the following subject "Consultant for *Phytotherapic Project* Midterm Review" by **August 15th, 2021**. Incomplete applications will be excluded from further consideration.

N.   Evaluation Procedure

The final criteria for this selection process will be **technical capacity** and **price**.

Individual consultants will be evaluated based on a cumulative analysis taking into consideration the combination of the applicants' qualifications and financial proposal. The award of the contract shall be made to the individual **consultant whose offer has been evaluated and determined as:**

CLASSIFICATION OF TECHNICAL QUALIFICATION (CV)

The maximum score in TECHNICAL QUALIFICATION is 100 points.

Analysis of the CV regarding compliance with the mandatory requirements specified in these Terms of Reference. Candidates who do not meet the minimum mandatory criteria described herein will be disqualified at this stage.

About the Evaluation Committee: The Committee should be composed of at least 3 members who will assign individual evaluation grades. The candidate's final score will be the weighted average of the evaluators' individual scores.

The individual scores will be attributed according to the information presented by the candidate in the CV. Therefore, it is important that the candidate clearly indicates in his/her CV the required professional experience, both in the mandatory and qualifying criteria, so that the Evaluation Committee can make the appropriate analysis.

CRITERIA	SCORE	WEIGHT	SUBTOTAL
Post-Graduate in related areas of the TOR			
Doctorate: 03 points; Master: 02 points; Specialization: 01 points	0 to 3	1	3
Experience			
Project evaluation/review experiences within the United Nations system 05 years or more: 05 points; Less than 05 years: 03 points; Less than 02 years: 01 point	0 to 5	3	15
Experience of working on GEF evaluations, preferably with Biodiversity 01 point per evaluation report	0 to 5	3	15
Work experience in evaluations with traditional peoples and communities 01 point per evaluation work experience	0 to 5	4	20

CRITERIA	SCORE	WEIGHT	SUBTOTAL
Experience working in Latin America 04 years or more: 05 points; Less than 04 years: 03 points; Less than 2 years: 01 point	0 to 5	1	5
Experience working in Brazil 02 points per evaluation work experience	0 to 6	2	12
Total			**70**

Candidates who obtain a minimum score of 40 points in the curriculum analysis (Qualifying Criteria) will be interviewed.

Candidates will be evaluated individually by an examining board. The interview will last a maximum of 30 (thirty) minutes per candidate and will consist of oral questioning on themes and practical situations related to the professional exercise and will deal with technical knowledge covering related contents and specific knowledge contained in the terms of reference.

In the technical-situational evaluation, the following criteria will be considered.

CRITERIA	SCORE	WEIGHT	SUBTOTAL
Interview			
Expertise in project evaluation methodologies and tools	0 to 5	1	5
Knowledge of GEF evaluations objectives, rules, and procedures	0 to 5	2	10
Understanding of issues related to biodiversity, especially in regard to its sustainable use by local/traditional communities	0 to 5	1	5
Analytical and communication skills.	0 to 5	1	5
Fluence in Portuguese.	0 to 5	1	5
Total			**30**

* The score in the interview will be assessed in accordance to the following: 5 points – Excellent; 4 points – Very good; 3 points – Good; 2 points – Acceptable; 1 point – Inferior; 0 point - Insufficient

CLASSIFICATION OF FINANCIAL PROPOSALS (PRICE) – FINAL

Only the financial proposals (price) of candidates who attain **a final Score of 70 points or higher in the**

TECHNICAL CLASSIFICATION will be taken into consideration.

The Final Score—FS—of the process will be reached by the sum of the **final Technical Score—TS multiplied by a factor of 0.70**, and the **Price Proposal score—PS—multiplied by a factor of 0.30**, i.e.:

FS = TS x 0.70 + PS x 0.30

The **PS** score will be calculated according to the following formula:

PS = 100 x LPP / Ppe

Where:
PS = score of the price proposal
LPP = lowest price proposal
Ppe = price proposal under evaluation
The lowest price proposal will score one hundred (100).

The proposal achieving the highest final score will be selected.

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

1. PIF
2. UNDP Initiation Plan
3. UNDP Project Document
4. UNDP Social and Environmental Screening Procedure (SESP)
5. Project Inception Report
6. All Project Implementation Reports (PIR's)
7. Quarterly progress reports and work plans of the various implementation task teams
8. Audit reports
9. Finalized GEF focal area Tracking Tools/Core Indicators at CEO endorsement and midterm (*Tracking Tool for GEF-6 Biodiversity Projects/ GEF 7 Core Indicator Worksheet*)
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 *Sustainable, accessible and innovative use of biodiversity and associated traditional knowledge in promising phytotherapic value chains in Brazil* Board Meetings and other meetings (i.e. Project Appraisal Committee meetings)
16. Project site location maps
17. Any additional documents, as relevant.

ToR ANNEX B: Guidelines on Contents for the Midterm Review Report[6]

i.   Basic Report Information *(for the 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 consultant members
- Acknowledgements

ii.   Table of Contents

iii.   Acronyms and Abbreviations

1.   Executive Summary *(3-5 pages)*
- Project Information Table
- Project Description (brief)
- Project Progress Summary (between 200-500 words)
- MTR Ratings & Achievement Summary Table
- Concise summary of conclusions
- Recommendation Summary Table

2.   Introduction *(2-3 pages)*
- Purpose of the MTR and objectives
- Scope & Methodology: principles of design and execution of the MTR, MTR approach and data collection methods, limitations to the MTR
- Structure of the MTR report

3.   Project Description and Background Context *(3-5 pages)*
- Development context: environmental, socio-economic, institutional, and policy factors relevant to the project objective and scope
- Problems that the project sought to address: threats and barriers targeted
- Project Description and Strategy: objective, outcomes and expected results, description of field sites (if any)
- Project Implementation Arrangements: short description of the Project Board, key implementing partner arrangements, etc.
- Project timing and milestones
- Main stakeholders: summary list

4.   Findings *(12-14 pages)*

 4.1   Project Strategy
- Project Design
- Results Framework/Logframe

 4.2   Progress Towards Results
- Progress towards outcomes analysis
- Remaining barriers to achieving the project objective

 4.3   Project Implementation and Adaptive Management
- Management Arrangements
- Work planning
- Finance and co-finance
- Project-level monitoring and evaluation systems
- Stakeholder engagement
- Social and Environmental Standards (Safeguards)
- Reporting

---

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

- 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 (*Tracking Tool for GEF-6 Biodiversity Projects and Core Indicators*)
- *Annexed in a separate file: GEF Co-financing template (categorizing co-financing amounts by source as 'investment mobilized' or 'recurrent expenditure')*

ToR ANNEX C: Midterm Review Evaluative Matrix Template

This Midterm Review Evaluative Matrix must be fully completed/amended by the consultant and included in the MTR inception report and as an Annex to the MTR report.

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?			
(include evaluative question(s))	(i.e. relationships established, level of coherence between project design and implementation approach, specific activities conducted, quality of risk mitigation strategies, etc.)	(i.e. project documents, national policies or strategies, websites, project staff, project partners, data collected throughout the MTR mission, etc.)	(i.e. document analysis, data analysis, interviews with project staff, interviews with stakeholders, etc.)
Progress Towards Results: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved thus far?			
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?			
Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, socio-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?			

ToR ANNEX D: UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluators/Midterm Review Consultants[7]

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: _____

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: _____

---

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

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

MTR Ratings & Achievement Summary Table for *Sustainable, accessible and innovative use of biodiversity and associated traditional knowledge in promising phytotherapic value chains in Brazil* (**PIMS 5792**)

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.
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 consultant 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 *Sustainable, accessible and innovative use of biodiversity and associated traditional knowledge in promising phytotherapic value chains in Brazil* **(UNDP Project ID-PIMS 5792)**

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 consultant 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[8]	Baseline Level[9]	Level in 1st PIR (self-reported)	Midterm Target[10]	End-of-project Target	Midterm Level & Assessment[11]	Achievement Rating[12]	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

ToR ANNEX I: GEF Co-Financing Template (provided as a separate file)

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