

Mid-Term Review Terms of Reference

Standard Template 1: Formatted for attachment to [UNDP Procurement Website](#)

1. INTRODUCTION

This is the Terms of Reference (ToR) for the UNDP-GEF Midterm Review (MTR) of the full-sized project titled Conserving biodiversity and reducing land degradation using a Ridge-to-Reef approach in Saint Vincent and the Grenadines (PIMS 5862) implemented through the Ministry of Agriculture, Rural Transformation, Forestry, Fisheries, Industry and Labour, which is to be undertaken in February 2022. The project started on the 15th February 2021, and is in its first year of implementation. In line with the UNDP-GEF Guidance on MTRs, this MTR process was initiated before the submission of the second Project Implementation Report (PIR). This ToR sets out the expectations for this MTR. The MTR process must follow the guidance outlined in the document *Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects* (http://web.undp.org/evaluation/documents/guidance/GEF/mid-term/Guidance_Midterm%20Review%20_EN_2014.pdf).

2. PROJECT BACKGROUND INFORMATION

The main objective of the project Conserving biodiversity and reducing land degradation using a Ridge-to-Reef approach with financing from the Global Environment Facility with support from UNDP is to enhance biodiversity conservation and ecosystem services conservation through an expanded and strengthened PA system and with SLM measures integrated in a ridge to reef approach. The Project objective has been designed by using a multi-focal strategy that includes the development of a national enabling environment (i.e. policy/legal framework, availability and access to information, capacities, technologies, and finance mechanisms) for delivering multiple global environmental benefits in four interrelated outcomes: 1) Strengthened institutional framework for protected areas, biodiversity conservation and SLM/CSA; 2) Effective management of new and existing PAs; 3) Integrated watershed management measures in R2R setting incorporating sustainable livelihood opportunities and; 4) Knowledge management for SLM, CSA and biodiversity conservation. The GEF investment will address the drivers of biodiversity loss (habitat loss, fragmentation and degradation due primarily to unsustainable land use practices and human encroachment, threats that are further compounded by the impacts of climate change and IAS) that will reduce biodiversity loss and land degradation both within PAs and within the mixed-use landscape. The project will deliver global environmental benefits using a participatory approach and ensuring the equal distribution of benefits among men and women, with 346 benefiting from the Project, and resulting in the consolidation and strengthened protection of a 13,214 ha terrestrial PA covering the entire upper watersheds of St Vincent and 7 KBAs, providing landscape connectivity to a 2183 ha marine park through a ridge to reef approach and improving protection of at minimum 63 ha of the sole remaining habitat of a critically endangered (CR) single island endemic.

3. 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, its risks to sustainability.

4. MTR APPROACH & METHODOLOGY

The MTR 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 Environmental & Social Safeguard Policy, the Project Document, project reports including Annual Project Review/PIRs, project budget revisions, lesson learned reports, national strategic and legal documents, and any other materials that the team considers useful for this evidence-based review). The MTR team will review the baseline GEF focal area Tracking Tool submitted to the GEF at CEO endorsement, and the midterm GEF focal area Tracking Tool that must be completed before the MTR field mission begins.

The MTR team 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, and other key stakeholders.

Engagement of stakeholders is vital to a successful MTR.² Stakeholder involvement should include interviews with stakeholders who have project responsibilities, including but not limited to the Programme Manager for Climate Change, Energy and the Environment, Project Coordinator, Project Assistant, 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 MTR team is expected to conduct field missions to St. Vincent and the Grenadines where possible.

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.

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 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.

5. DETAILED SCOPE OF THE MTR

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

i. Project Strategy

Project design:

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.

² 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.

- 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 ³	Baseline Level ⁴	Level in 1 st PIR (self-reported)	Midterm Target ⁵	End-of-project Target	Midterm Level & Assessment ⁶	Achievement Rating ⁷	Justification for Rating
Project Objective: To enhance biodiversity conservation and ecosystem services conservation through an expanded and strengthened PA system and with SLM measures integrated in a ridge to reef approach.	Mandatory Indicator 1: Number of new partnership mechanisms with funding for sustainable management solutions of natural resources, ecosystem services, chemicals and waste at national and/or sub-national level, disaggregated by partnership type.	0		4 Private sector: 1 NGO/CBO: 2 Donor: 1	9 Private sector: 3 NGO/CBO: 4 Donor: 2			

³ Populate with data from the Logframe and scorecards

⁴ Populate with data from the Project Document

⁵ If available

⁶ Colour code this column only

⁷ Use the 6 point Progress Towards Results Rating Scale: HS, S, MS, MU, U, HU

	Mandatory indicator 2: # of direct project beneficiaries (men and women farmers/agricultural labourers, women and men along value chains) benefiting from livelihoods created through sustainable management of natural resources and ecosystem services, in the project prioritized landscapes, disaggregated by sex. (GEF Core Indicator 11)	0		a) Women: 48 (at least 30% of total beneficiaries) b) Men: 112 c) Additional females benefiting from new sustainable livelihoods created: 50 % d) Additional males benefiting from new sustainable livelihoods created: 50 % Note: Target will be confirmed during Year 1 of Project implementation	a) Women: 254 (at least 30% of total beneficiaries) b) Men: 592 c) Additional females benefiting from new sustainable livelihoods created: 50 % d) Additional males benefiting from new sustainable livelihoods created: 50 % Note: Target will be confirmed during Year 1 of Project implementation and monitored throughout project implementation			
	Indicator 3: Number of the following globally threatened endemic species whose populations have remained stable or increased by EOP: <i>Amazona guildingii</i> <i>Chironius vincenti</i> <i>Pristimantis shrevei</i> <i>Catharopeza bishopi</i> <i>Gonatodes daudini</i>	0		0	5 <i>Amazona guildingii</i> , <i>Chironius vincenti</i> , <i>Pristimantis shrevei</i> , <i>Catharopeza bishopi</i> , <i>Gonatodes daudini</i> .			
Component 1: Strengthened institutional framework for Protected Areas, Ecosystem	Indicator 4 # of targeted departments with effective use of centralized database with information for informed decision-making, as indicated by reporting of routine use (of agency outcome indicators) in annual work programme by the agencies	0	Forestry Department Fisheries Department National Parks, Rivers and Beaches Authority Physical Planning	0	5 Forestry Department Fisheries Department National Parks, Rivers and Beaches Authority Physical Planning			

<p>Conservation and Sustainable Land Use in St Vincent and the Grenadines</p> <p>Outcome 1.1 Enhanced multi-departmental access to centralized database system, incorporating biodiversity (BD), ecosystem services, land use / cover, protected areas, climate and soil data, to support natural resource conservation and land use decision making.</p>	<p>Indicator 5 Number of policy, legislative, regulatory and planning instruments developed/ revised (with support for submission to Cabinet) that integrate Sustainable Land Management (SLM), CSA, gender responsiveness and/or biodiversity conservation.</p>	<p>0 Forest Policy PA Policy (revised) PA System Plan (revised) PA Mgt Plan Integrated Watershed Mgt Plan National Land Policy Note: A legislative review will take place during Year 1 to decide what policy legislation, regulations and/or guidelines will be updated/ revised. The above mentioned have been identified by the key government stakeholders.</p>		<p>0 Forest Policy PA Policy (revised) PA System Plan (revised) PA Mgt Plan Integrated Watershed Mgt Plan National Land Policy</p>	<p>6 Forest Policy PA Policy (revised) PA System Plan (revised) PA Mgt Plan Integrated Watershed Mgt Plan National Land Policy</p>			
<p>Outcome 1.2. Institutional frameworks and human resource capacities strengthened for the operationalization of the Forest Policy, PA Policy and PA system</p>	<p>Indicator 6: Change in capacities of key government institutions for biodiversity conservation, PA management and integrated natural resource management</p>	<p>42% (overall score) Capacities to Generate, Access and Use Information and Knowledge: 33% Capacities for Strategy, Policy and Legislation development: 44% Capacities to monitor and evaluate: 33%</p>		<p>+5% (overall score) Capacities to Generate, Access and Use Information and Knowledge: Baseline +5% Capacities for Strategy, Policy and Legislation development: Baseline + 5% Capacities to monitor and evaluate: Baseline + 5%</p>	<p>+20% (overall score) Capacities to Generate, Access and Use Information and Knowledge: Baseline +20% Capacities for Strategy, Policy and Legislation development: Baseline + 15% Capacities to monitor and evaluate: Baseline + 20% Note: End of Project target to be confirmed during inception workshop</p>			

<p>plan as well as for the implementation of related laws and regulations, resulting in improved biodiversity and ecosystem conservation and reduced forest loss and land degradation.</p> <p>Outcome 1.3: Increased capacities for financial sustainability.</p>	<p>Indicator 7: Financial sustainability of the PAs system, as indicated by the rating of the GEF TT Financial Scorecard.</p>	<p>60 (overall score)</p>		<p>+5% (overall score)</p>	<p>+30% (overall score)</p>			
<p>Component 2: National capacity built to provide financial, technical, and information services for CSA production</p> <p>Outcome 2.1: Increased financing for supporting SLM and CSA at the</p>	<p>Indicator 8: Change in management effectiveness of 2 terrestrial and 1 marine PA covering 15,460 ha, as measured by the METT</p> <p>Indicator 9: Number of Priority KBAs and proportion (%) of total SVG KBAs that are integrated/included in the expanded PA estate (as indicated by Cabinet Submission for their legal protection)</p>	<p>Central Mountain Forest Reserve: 51 Chatham Bay: 29 Leeward Coast Marine Park: 27</p> <p>1 KBAs, 7% – Cumberland Forest Reserve</p>		<p>Central Mountain Forest Reserve: 60 Chatham Bay: 35</p> <p>Leeward Coast Marine Park: 35</p> <p>1 KBA, 7% – Cumberland Forest Reserve</p>	<p>Central Mountain Forest Reserve: 70 Chatham Bay: 50 Leeward Coast Marine Park: 50</p> <p>7 KBA, 47% – Cumberland Forest Reserve – Colonarie Forest Reserve – Dalaway Forest Reserve – Kingstown Forest Reserve – La Soufrière National Park – Mount Pleasant Forest Reserve – Richmond Forest Reserve</p>			

<p>national level</p> <p>Outcome 2.2: National level capacities enhanced for CSA production</p>	<p>Indicator 10: Number of the following new marine and terrestrial PAs legally gazetted, as measured by the expansion in the coverage of the national PA estate in ha</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Central Mountain Forest Reserve (13,214 ha) -Chatham Bay (63 ha, tbd) (GEF Core Indicator 1.1) -Leeward Coast Marine Park (2,183 ha) (GEF Core Indicator 2.1) 	<p>0</p>		<p>0</p>	<p>3 PAs covering at minimum 15,460 ha</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Central Mountain Forest Reserve (13,214 ha) - Chatham Bay (63 ha, tbd) - Leeward Coast Marine Park (2,183 ha) 			
--	---	----------	--	----------	--	--	--	--

	<p>Indicator 11: Conservation of critical habitat within the Protected Area targeted by the project:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For est cover at 4 terrestrial PAs, as measured by # of hectares (interpretation of new/current satellite images) • Coral reef health in Marine Park site, as measured by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • - Percent live hard coral cover • - Number of coral recruits (< 5cm) per m² 76 • - Rate of bleaching and disease • - - Prevalence of fleshy microalgae; as measured by % substrate cover • Coverage of healthy seagrass bed, as measured by # of hectares • Health of selected reef 	<p>TBD during Year 1</p> <p>TBD during Year 1</p> <p>TBD during Year 1</p> <p>TBD during Year 1</p> <p>TBD during Year 1</p> <p>TBD during Year 1</p> <p>TBD during Year 1</p> <p>TBD during Year 1</p>		<p>No net loss (in # of hectares)</p> <p>No decrease</p> <p>No decrease</p> <p>No increase</p> <p>No increase</p> <p>No net loss (in # of hectares)</p> <p>No decrease</p> <p>No decrease</p>	<p>No net loss (in # of hectares)</p> <p>No decrease</p> <p>No decrease</p> <p>No increase</p> <p>No increase</p> <p>No net loss (in # of hectares)</p> <p>No decrease</p> <p>No decrease</p>			
--	--	---	--	---	---	--	--	--

	fish populations, as measured by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Abundance per m2 - Species richness 	TBD during Year 1 TBD during Year 1						
<p>Component 3: Integrated watershed management measures in R2R setting to reduce threats to upstream PA and downstream MPA/MMA</p> <p>Outcome 3.1 SLM and Climate Smart Agriculture (CSA) techniques and technologies implemented by local communities in 3 upper watersheds (Buccament, Yambou and Kingstown) covering 1200 ha resulting in threats to ecosystem functions (encroachment, pollution, sedimentation) are reduced in landscapes surrounding the Central Mountain Forest Reserve and downstream</p>	Indicator 12: Nutrient content, as reflected by total nitrogen (TN) in downstream watercourse <i>and</i> Quantity of sediments in downstream watercourses in the Buccament watershed as measured by TSS (Total Suspended Solids - particulate matter)	Baseline to be determined during the 1st year of the project Baseline to be determined during the 1st year of the project		Baseline or < baseline Baseline or < baseline	Baseline - 15% Baseline - 15%			
	Indicator 13: % of farms targeted in watershed with an improved income resulting from applying enhanced CSA and SLM practices	Baseline to be determined in first year of the project		Baseline + 4% Note: TBD during inception Workshop	Baseline + 10% Note: TBD during inception Workshop			

<p>coastal and marine sites</p> <p>Outcome 3.2 Validated SLM practices support ridge to reef management process and provide inputs to national level INRM strategy and regulation</p> <p>Outcome 3.3 Increased diversification of income in households disaggregated by gender</p>	<p>Indicator 14: Area of land restored, disaggregated by land type (agricultural and forest) (GEF Core Indicators 3.1 & 3.2) Landscape area (ha) under improved SLM practices in productive systems in the 3 target watersheds (Buccament, Yambourand Kingstown) (GEF Core Indicators 4.3)</p>	<p>0 ha 0 ha</p>		<p>77 ha restored including 60 ha agricultural land and 17 ha forest land</p> <p>102 ha</p>	<p>514 ha restored including - 396 ha agricultural land and 118 ha forest land</p> <p>686 ha</p>			
<p>Component 4: Knowledge management for SLM, CSA and biodiversity conservation</p> <p>Outcome 4.1: Increased adoption of practices as a result of the dissemination of knowledge and best practices</p>	<p>Indicator 15: Number of lessons/experiences disseminated on experiences in the incorporation of conservation of biodiversity, SLM, and CSA</p>	<p>0</p>		<p>5</p>	<p>10</p>			

developed under this project.	Indicator 16: Number of men and women who practice agriculture (commercial and consistent subsistence use) aware of the importance and benefits of biodiversity conservation and sustainable land management.	Baseline (TBD during 1st 6 months implementation)		Baseline + 10%	Baseline + 25%			
-------------------------------	---	---	--	----------------	----------------	--	--	--

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 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, 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 risks⁸ (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?)

⁸ 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.

- 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 Management Module 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 of the report setting out the MTR’s evidence-based conclusions, in light of the findings.⁹

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.

⁹ Alternatively, MTR conclusions may be integrated into the body of the report.

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 the project titled Conserving biodiversity and reducing land degradation using a Ridge-to-Reef approach in Saint Vincent and the Grenadines

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)	

6. TIMEFRAME

The total duration of the MTR will be approximately 30 days over a time period of 10 weeks starting from the date of contract signature and shall not exceed 5 months from when the consultants are hired. The tentative MTR timeframe is as follows:

ACTIVITY	NUMBER OF WORKING DAYS	COMPLETION DATE
Document review and preparing MTR Inception Report (MTR Inception Report due no later than 2 weeks before the MTR mission)	<i>4 days (recommended: 2-4 days)</i>	<i>November 1, 2021</i>
MTR mission: stakeholder meetings, interviews, field visits <i>NB: The mission is tentative and will depend on the sanitary restrictions due to the COVID-19 pandemic. If it cannot be completed on-site, interviews will be carried out virtually. The stakeholder interviews, if done virtually, may require a longer than usual time</i>	<i>15 days (recommended: 7-15 days)</i>	<i>November 24, 2021</i>

<i>period. Please adjust the number of days and completion date to accommodate this.</i>		
Presentation of initial findings- last day of the MTR mission	<i>1 day</i>	<i>November 29, 2021</i>
Preparing draft report (due within 3 weeks of the MTR mission)	<i>10 days (recommended: 5-10 days)</i>	December 8, 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>	<i>4 days (recommended: 3-4 days)</i>	December 17, 2021

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

7. MIDTERM REVIEW DELIVERABLES

#	Deliverable	Description	Timing	Responsibilities
1	MTR Inception Report	MTR team clarifies objectives and methods of Midterm Review	No later than 1 week before the MTR mission:	MTR team submits to the Commissioning Unit and project management
2	Presentation	Initial Findings	End of MTR mission:	MTR Team presents to project management, the Implementing Partners and the Commissioning Unit
3	Draft Final Report	Full report (using guidelines on content outlined in Annex B) with annexes	Within 2 weeks of the MTR mission:	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 2 weeks 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.

8. MTR ARRANGEMENTS

The principal responsibility for managing this MTR resides with the Commissioning Unit. The Commissioning Unit for this project's MTR is the UNDP Barbados and the OECS Sub-Regional Office.

The Commissioning Unit will contract the consultants and ensure the timely provision of per diems and travel arrangements within St. Vincent and the Grenadines for the MTR team and will provide an updated stakeholder list with contact details (phone and email). The Project Team will be responsible for liaising with the MTR team to provide all relevant documents, set up stakeholder interviews, and arrange field visits.

9. TEAM COMPOSITION

A team of two independent evaluators will conduct the MTR – one team leader (with experience and exposure to projects and evaluations in other regions) and one team expert, usually from the country of the project. The team leader will conduct interviews with local counterparts alongside the local consultant, be responsible for the overall design and writing of key reports and supporting documents (Inception and MTR report), analyze and interpret data collected, present findings (alongside the local consultant), deduce key lessons, insights and recommendations and ensure these are reflected in the relevant reports. The team expert will organize and conduct interviews/meetings with local counterparts, work with the Project Team in developing the MTR itinerary, conduct site visits (if necessary) to verify the achievement of deliverables/completion of key activities, review all draft documents and provide detailed inputs and comments.

The consultants cannot have participated in the project preparation, formulation, and/or implementation (including the writing of the Project Document) and should not have a conflict of interest with project's related activities.

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

Criteria	Maximum score for:	
	Team leader	Team expert
Recent experience with result-based management evaluation methodologies	15	10
Experience applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios	15	10
Competence in adaptive management, as applied to biodiversity	10	15
Experience working with the GEF or GEF evaluations	20	10
Experience working in the Caribbean	5	15
Experience with national, multi-sectoral stakeholder engagement	15	5
Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender, and biodiversity; experience in gender sensitive evaluation and analysis	5	15
Project evaluation/review experience within UN system	10	10
A Master’s degree in natural resources management, environmental science, biodiversity, business, public policy, rural development, or other closely related field	5	10
TOTAL	100	100

Education

- A Master’s degree in in natural resource management, biodiversity conservation, climate change, water resources management, ecosystems/PA/ management, environmental science, public policy, rural development, or related field
- Certification in project management is an asset.

Experience

- 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 conservation
- Experience in evaluating projects;
- Experience working in Saint Vincent and the Grenadines
- Experience in relevant technical areas for at least 10 years;
- Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender and biodiversity conservation. Experience in gender sensitive evaluation and analysis.
- Excellent communication skills;
- Demonstrable analytical skills;
- Project evaluation/review experiences within United Nations system will be considered an asset.

Language

- Fluency in written and spoken English.

10. ETHICS

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

11. PAYMENT SCHEDULE

- 20% payment upon satisfactory delivery 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%¹⁰:

- 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.

12. APPLICATION PROCESS¹¹

Recommended Presentation of Proposal:

- a) **Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability** using the [template](#)¹² provided by UNDP;
- b) **CV and a Personal History Form (P11 form)**¹³;

¹⁰ The Commissioning Unit is obligated to issue payments to the MTR team as soon as the terms under the ToR are fulfilled. If there is an ongoing discussion regarding the quality and completeness of the final deliverables that cannot be resolved between the Commissioning Unit and the MTR team, the Regional M&E Advisor and Vertical Fund Directorate will be consulted. If needed, the Commissioning Unit's senior management, Procurement Services Unit and Legal Support Office will be notified as well so that a decision can be made about whether or not to withhold payment of any amounts that may be due to the evaluator(s), suspend or terminate the contract and/or remove the individual contractor from any applicable rosters. See the UNDP Individual Contract Policy for further details:

https://popp.undp.org/_layouts/15/WopiFrame.aspx?sourcedoc=/UNDP_POPP_DOCUMENT_LIBRARY/Public/PSU_Individual%20Contract_Individual%20Contract%20Policy.docx&action=default

¹¹ Engagement of the consultants should be done in line with guidelines for hiring consultants in the POPP: <https://info.undp.org/global/popp/Pages/default.aspx>

¹²

<https://intranet.undp.org/unit/bom/psa/Support%20documents%20on%20IC%20Guidelines/Template%20for%20Confirmation%20of%20Interest%20and%20Submission%20of%20Financial%20Proposal.docx>

¹³ http://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/corporate/Careers/P11_Personal_history_form.doc

- 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 all-inclusive fixed total contract price and all other travel related costs (such as flight ticket, per diem, etc), supported by a breakdown of costs, as per template attached to the Letter of Confirmation of Interest template. If an applicant is employed by an organization/company/institution, and he/she expects his/her employer to charge a management fee in the process of releasing him/her to UNDP under Reimbursable Loan Agreement (RLA), the applicant must indicate at this point, and ensure that all such costs are duly incorporated in the financial proposal submitted to UNDP.

All application materials should be submitted by email indicating the following reference “Consultant for Midterm Review for Conserving biodiversity and reducing land degradation using a Ridge-to-Reef approach in Saint Vincent and the Grenadines” at the following address ONLY: procurement.bb@undp.org by 23:59 of 8th October, 2021.

Criteria for Evaluation of Proposal: Only those applications which are responsive and compliant will be evaluated. Offers will be evaluated according to the Combined Scoring method – where the educational background and experience on similar assignments will be weighted at 70% and the price proposal will weigh as 30% of the total scoring. The applicant receiving the Highest Combined Score that has also accepted UNDP’s General Terms and Conditions will be awarded the contract.

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

1. PIF
2. UNDP Initiation Plan
3. UNDP Project Document
4. UNDP Environmental and Social Screening results
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 at CEO endorsement and midterm (Biodiversity)
10. Oversight mission reports
11. All monitoring reports prepared by the project
12. Financial and Administration guidelines used by Project Team

The following documents will also be available:

13. Project operational guidelines, manuals and systems
14. UNDP country/countries programme document(s)
15. Minutes of the Project Steering Committee Meetings and the Project Appraisal Committee Meeting
16. Project site location maps

ToR ANNEX B: Guidelines on Contents for the Midterm Review Report¹⁴

- i. Basic Report Information (*for opening page or title page*)
 - Title of UNDP supported GEF financed project
 - UNDP PIMS# and GEF project ID#
 - MTR time frame and date of MTR report
 - Region and countries included in the project
 - GEF Operational Focal Area/Strategic Program
 - Executing Agency/Implementing Partner and other project partners

¹⁴ The Report length should not exceed 40 pages in total (not including annexes).

- MTR team members
- Acknowledgements
- ii. Table of Contents
- iii. Acronyms and Abbreviations
- 1. Executive Summary (3-5 pages)
 - Project Information Table
 - Project Description (brief)
 - Project Progress Summary (between 200-500 words)
 - MTR Ratings & Achievement Summary Table
 - Concise summary of conclusions
 - Recommendation Summary Table
- 2. Introduction (2-3 pages)
 - Purpose of the MTR and objectives
 - Scope & Methodology: principles of design and execution of the MTR, MTR approach and data collection methods, limitations to the MTR
 - Structure of the MTR report
- 3. Project Description and Background Context (3-5 pages)
 - Development context: environmental, socio-economic, institutional, and policy factors relevant to the project objective and scope
 - Problems that the project sought to address: threats and barriers targeted
 - Project Description and Strategy: objective, outcomes and expected results, description of field sites (if any)
 - Project Implementation Arrangements: short description of the Project Board, key implementing partner arrangements, etc.
 - Project timing and milestones
 - Main stakeholders: summary list
- 4. Findings (12-14 pages)
 - 4.1 Project Strategy
 - Project Design
 - Results Framework/Logframe
 - 4.2 Progress Towards Results
 - Progress towards outcomes analysis
 - Remaining barriers to achieving the project objective
 - 4.3 Project Implementation and Adaptive Management
 - Management Arrangements
 - Work planning
 - Finance and co-finance
 - Project-level monitoring and evaluation systems
 - Stakeholder engagement
 - Reporting
 - Communications
 - 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)
 - Conclusions
 - 5.1
 - 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
 - Recommendations
 - 5.2
 - 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

ToR ANNEX C: Midterm Review Evaluative Matrix Template

ToR ANNEX C: Midterm Review Evaluative Matrix Template

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.)
How appropriate/relevant was the project strategy in comparison with the priorities of the country? Did the strategy proposed involve the key elements of government concurrence and ownership?	Evidence of project alignment with national goals and priorities Evidence of concurrence and ownership of the project by national organizations	National Planning documents UNDP Project documents	Document analysis Interviews with project staff and stakeholders
How suitable was the strategy to ensure achievement of expected results?	Evidence of synergy between project strategy and SMART indicators	UNDP Project document Project results framework/logframe Project staff, partners	Document analysis Interviews with project staff and stakeholders

Were the capacities of key partners, including UNDP, well assessed and appropriate to the needs of the programme?	Extent to which the results of capacity assessments were integrated into project design.	Capacity assessments Project governance framework	Document analysis Interviews with project staff and stakeholders
Progress Towards Results: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved thus far?			
Have the outputs been produced as envisioned? Have outputs contributed to the project objectives and associated outcomes as envisioned?	Level of project implementation progress relative to expected level at current stage of implementation • Existence of logical linkages between project outputs and outcomes/impacts	Project documents • Project staff • Project stakeholders	Interviews Desk review
Are the anticipated outcomes likely to be achieved? Are the outcomes likely to contribute to the achievement of the project objective?	Existence of logical linkages between project outcomes and impacts	Project documents • Project staff • Project stakeholders	Interviews Desk review
Are impact level results likely to be achieved?	Level of progress through the project's Theory of Change	Project documents • Project staff • Project stakeholders	Interviews Desk review
Is the project proactively and comprehensively measuring milestones and results and using this process to inform planning and implementation?	Extent to which lessons learned from reporting are reflected in work plans and strategies	Annual Work Plans Risk Log Quarterly Reports Steering Committee Meeting Minutes	Desk Review
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?			
Has project implementation been efficient?	Project activities executed in alignment with resources, timelines and targets	Project Progress reports Interviews with project staff/project M&E	Interviews Desk review
Has the management of project financing (including co-financing) been cost effective?	Efficient management of project resources	Co-financing table Project documents	Interviews Desk review
Has the monitoring and Evaluation of the project been sufficient to ensure the efficient achievement of intended results in a suitable timeframe?	Adequate Monitoring system in place	Project Progress reports Project results framework Interviews with project staff/project M&E	Interviews Desk review
Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, socio-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?			

To what extent are the project results influenced by sociopolitical factors?	Existence of socio political risks to project benefits	Project documents • Project staff • Project stakeholders	Interviews Desk review
To what extent are the project results impacted by institutional frameworks and governance?	• Existence of institutional and governance risks to project benefits	Project documents • Project staff • Project stakeholders	Interviews Desk review
Are there any environmental risks expected to impede the long term results of the project?	Existence of environmental risks to project benefits	Project documents • Project staff • Project stakeholders	Interviews Desk review

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.

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: _____

¹⁵ www.undp.org/unegcodeofconduct

ToR ANNEX E: MTR Ratings

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 by the Commissioning Unit and UNDP-GEF RTA and included in the final document)

Midterm Review Report Reviewed and Cleared By:	
Commissioning Unit	
Name: _____	
Signature: _____	Date: _____
UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Advisor	
Name: _____	
Signature: _____	Date: _____

ToR ANNEX G: Audit Trail Template

Note: The following is a template for the MTR Team to show how the received comments on the draft MTR report have (or have not) been incorporated into the final MTR report. This audit trail should be included as an annex in the final MTR report.

To the comments received on (*date*) from the Midterm Review of (*project name*) (UNDP Project ID-*PIMS #*)

The following comments were provided in track changes to the draft Midterm Review report; they are referenced by institution ("Author" column) and not by the person's name, and track change comment number ("#" column):

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

Midterm Review Terms of Reference

Standard Template 2: Formatted information to be entered in [UNDP Jobs website](https://jobs.undp.org/)¹⁶

BASIC CONTRACT INFORMATION

Location: Home-based (with a mission to Saint Vincent and the Grenadines)

Application Deadline: October 8, 2021

Category: Energy and Environment

Type of Contract: Individual Contract

Assignment Type: International Consultant

Languages Required: English

Starting Date: 24th September 2021

Duration of Initial Contract: N/A

Expected Duration of Assignment: 4 months

BACKGROUND

A. Project Title

B. Project Description

This is the Terms of Reference for the UNDP-GEF Midterm Review (MTR) of the full-sized project titled Conserving biodiversity and reducing land degradation using a Ridge-to-Reef approach in Saint Vincent and the Grenadines (PIMS 5862) implemented through the Ministry of Agriculture, Rural Transformation, Forestry, Fisheries, Industry and Labour, which is to be undertaken in February 2022. The project started on 15th February 2021, and is in its first year of implementation. In line with the UNDP-GEF Guidance on MTRs, this MTR process was initiated before the submission of the second Project Implementation Report (PIR). The MTR process must follow the guidance outlined in the document *Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects* (see Annex).

The main objective of the project Conserving biodiversity and reducing land degradation using a Ridge-to-Reef approach with financing from the Global Environment Facility with support from UNDP is to enhance biodiversity conservation and ecosystem services conservation through an expanded and strengthened PA system and with SLM measures integrated in a ridge to reef approach. The Project objective has been designed by using a multi-focal strategy that includes the development of a national enabling environment (i.e. policy/legal framework, availability and access to information, capacities, technologies, and finance mechanisms) for delivering multiple global environmental benefits in four interrelated outcomes: 1) Strengthened institutional framework for protected areas, biodiversity conservation and SLM/CSA; 2) Effective management of new and existing PAs; 3) Integrated watershed management measures in R2R setting incorporating sustainable livelihood opportunities and; 4) Knowledge management for SLM, CSA and biodiversity conservation. The GEF investment will address the drivers of biodiversity loss (habitat loss, fragmentation and degradation due primarily to unsustainable land use practices and human encroachment, threats that are further compounded by the impacts of climate change and IAS) that will reduce biodiversity loss and land degradation both within PAs and within the mixed-use

¹⁶ <https://jobs.undp.org/>

landscape. The project will deliver global environmental benefits using a participatory approach and ensuring the equal distribution of benefits among men and women, with 346 benefiting from the Project, and resulting in the consolidation and strengthened protection of a 13,214 ha terrestrial PA covering the entire upper watersheds of St Vincent and 7 KBAs, providing landscape connectivity to a 2183 ha marine park through a ridge to reef approach and improving protection of at minimum 63 ha of the sole remaining habitat of a critically endangered (CR) single island endemic.

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.

DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

D. MTR Approach and 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 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 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 approach¹⁷ 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.¹⁸ Stakeholder involvement should include interviews with stakeholders who have project responsibilities, including but not limited to governmental ministry Officials, executing agencies, senior officials, Non-Governmental Organizations 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 MTR team is expected to conduct field missions to Chatham Bay Union Island, Forestry Headquarters, Cumberland Field Station and the Central Water and Sewage Authority(CWSA).

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, 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.

¹⁷ For ideas on innovative and participatory Monitoring and Evaluation strategies and techniques, see [UNDP Discussion Paper: Innovations in Monitoring & Evaluating Results](#), 05 Nov 2013.

¹⁸ 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 interview schedule, field visits and data to be used in the MTR should be clearly outlined in the Inception Report and be fully discussed and agreed between UNDP, stakeholders and the MTR team.

The final MTR report must describe the full MTR approach taken and the rationale for the approach making explicit the underlying assumptions, challenges, strengths and weaknesses about the methods and approach of the review.

E. Detailed Scope of the MTR

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

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; colour code progress in a “traffic light system” based on the level of progress achieved; assign a rating on progress for the project objective and each outcome; make recommendations from the areas marked as “not on target to be achieved” (red).

- Compare and analyse the GEF Tracking Tool 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.
- 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 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 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 risks¹⁹ (in the SESP).

¹⁹ 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.

- 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).

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

Additionally, the MTR consultant/team is expected to make **recommendations** to the Project Team. Recommendations should be succinct suggestions for critical intervention that are specific, measurable, achievable, and relevant. A recommendation table should be put in the report's executive summary. The MTR consultant/team should make no more than 15 recommendations total.

Ratings

The MTR team will include its ratings of the project's results and brief descriptions of the associated achievements in a *MTR Ratings & Achievement Summary Table* in the Executive Summary of the MTR report. See the TOR Annexes for the Rating Table and ratings scales.

F. Expected Outputs and Deliverables

The MTR team shall prepare and submit:

- MTR Inception Report: MTR team clarifies objectives and methods of the Midterm Review no later than 2 weeks before the MTR mission. To be sent to the Commissioning Unit and project management. Completion date: (November 10, 2021)
- Presentation: MTR team presents initial findings to project management and the Commissioning Unit at the end of the MTR mission. Completion date: (November 29, 2021)
- Draft MTR Report: MTR team submits the draft full report with annexes within 3 weeks of the MTR mission. Completion date: (December 8, 2021)
- Final Report*: MTR team submits the revised report with annexed and completed Audit Trail detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final MTR report. To be sent to the Commissioning Unit within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft. Completion date: (December 17, 2021)

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

G. Institutional Arrangements

The principal responsibility for managing this MTR resides with the Commissioning Unit. The Commissioning Unit for this project's MTR is the UNDP Barbados and the OECS Sub-Regional Office.

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

H. Duration of the Work

The total duration of the MTR will be approximately 30 days over a period of 10 weeks starting from the date of contract signature, and shall not exceed five months from when the consultant(s) are hired. The tentative MTR timeframe is as follows:

- *(October 8, 2021): Applications received, sourced from GPN Roster*
- *(October 19, 2021): Selection of MTR Team*
- *(October 26, 2021): Prep the MTR Team (handover of project documents)*
- *(November 1, 2021) 4 days (recommended 2-4): Document review and preparing MTR Inception Report*
- *(November 10, 2021) 8 days: Finalization and Validation of MTR Inception Report- latest start of MTR mission*
- *(November 24, 2021) 10 days (r: 7-15): MTR mission: stakeholder meetings, interviews, field visits*
- *(November 29, 2021): Mission wrap-up meeting & presentation of initial findings- earliest end of MTR mission*
- *(December 8, 2021) 7days (r: 5-10): Preparing draft report*
- *(December 17, 2021) 7 days (r: 1-2): Incorporating audit trail on draft report/Finalization of MTR report (note: accommodate time delay in dates for circulation and review of the draft report)*
- *(December 20, 2021): Preparation & Issue of Management Response*
- *(TBD): (optional) Concluding Stakeholder Workshop (not mandatory for MTR team)*
- *(December 22, 2021): Expected date of full MTR completion*

The date start of contract is 26th October 2021.

I. Duty Station

Travel:

- International travel will be required to St. Vincent and the Grenadines during the MTR mission;
- The BSAFE training course must be successfully completed prior to commencement of travel; Herewith is the link to access this training: <https://training.dss.un.org/courses/login/index.php> . These training modules at this secure internet site is accessible to Consultants, which allows for registration with private email.
- Individual Consultants are responsible for ensuring they have vaccinations/inoculations when travelling to certain countries, as designated by the UN Medical Director.
- Consultants are required to comply with the UN security directives set forth under <https://dss.un.org/dssweb/>

- All related travel expenses will be covered and will be reimbursed as per UNDP rules and regulations upon submission of an F-10 claim form and supporting documents.

REQUIRED SKILLS AND EXPERIENCE

J. Qualifications of the Successful Applicants

A team of two independent evaluators will conduct the MTR – one team leader (with experience and exposure to projects and evaluations in other regions) and one team expert, usually from the country of the project. The team leader will conduct interviews with local counterparts alongside the local consultant, be responsible for the overall design and writing of key reports and supporting documents (Inception and MTR report), analyze and interpret data collected, present findings (alongside the local consultant), deduce key lessons, insights and recommendations and ensure these are reflected in the relevant reports. The team expert will organize and conduct interviews/meetings with local counterparts, work with the Project Team in developing the MTR itinerary, conduct site visits (if necessary) to verify the achievement of deliverables/completion of key activities, review all draft documents and provide detailed inputs and comments.

The consultants cannot have participated in the project preparation, formulation, and/or implementation (including the writing of the Project Document) and should not have a conflict of interest with project’s related activities.

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

Education

- A Master’s degree in natural resource management, biodiversity conservation, climate change, water resources management, ecosystems/PA/ management, environmental science, public policy, rural development, or related field
- Certification in project management is an asset.

Experience

- Recent experience with result-based management evaluation methodologies;
- Experience applying SMART targets and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios;
- Competence in adaptive management, as applied to biodiversity conservation.
- Experience in evaluating projects;
- Experience working in Saint Vincent and the Grenadines
- Experience in relevant technical areas for at least 10 years;
- Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender and biodiversity conservation; experience in gender sensitive evaluation and analysis;
- Excellent communication skills;
- Demonstrable analytical skills;
- Project evaluation/review experiences within United Nations system will be considered an asset.

Language

- Fluency in written and spoken English.

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

Criteria	Maximum score for:	
	Team leader	Team expert

Recent experience with result-based management evaluation methodologies	15	10
Experience applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios	15	10
Competence in adaptive management, as applied to biodiversity	10	15
Experience working with the GEF or GEF evaluations	20	10
Experience working in the Caribbean	5	15
Experience with national, multi-sectoral stakeholder engagement	15	5
Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender, and biodiversity; experience in gender sensitive evaluation and analysis	5	15
Project evaluation/review experience within UN system	10	10
A Master's degree in natural resources management, environmental science, biodiversity, business, public policy, rural development, or other closely related field	5	10
TOTAL	100	100

Consultant Independence:

The consultants cannot have participated in the project preparation, formulation, and/or implementation (including the writing of the Project Document) and should not have a conflict of interest with project's related activities.

K. Ethics

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

L. Schedule of Payments

- 20% payment upon satisfactory delivery of the final MTR Inception Report and approval by the Commissioning Unit
- 40% payment upon satisfactory delivery of the draft MTR report to the Commissioning Unit
- 40% payment upon satisfactory delivery of the final MTR report and approval by the Commissioning Unit and RTA (via signatures on the 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.

APPLICATION PROCESS

M. Recommended Presentation of Offer

- e) **Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability** using the [template](#)²⁰ provided by UNDP;
- f) **CV** and a **Personal History Form** ([P11 form](#)²¹);
- g) **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)
- h) **Financial Proposal** that indicates the all-inclusive fixed total contract price and all other travel related costs (such as flight ticket, per diem, etc), supported by a breakdown of costs, as per template attached to the [Letter of Confirmation of Interest template](#). If an applicant is employed by an organization/company/institution, and he/she expects his/her employer to charge a management fee in the process of releasing him/her to UNDP under Reimbursable Loan Agreement (RLA), the applicant must indicate at this point, and ensure that all such costs are duly incorporated in the financial proposal submitted to UNDP.

All application materials should be submitted by email indicating the following reference “Consultant for Midterm Review for Conserving biodiversity and reducing land degradation using a Ridge-to-Reef approach in Saint Vincent and the Grenadines” at the following address ONLY: procurement.bb@undp.org by 23:59 of 8th October 2021.

N. Criteria for Selection of the Best Offer

Only those applications which are responsive and compliant will be evaluated. Offers will be evaluated according to the Combined Scoring method – where the educational background and experience on similar assignments will be weighted at 70% and the price proposal will weigh as 30% of the total scoring. The applicant receiving the Highest Combined Score that has also accepted UNDP’s General Terms and Conditions will be awarded the contract.

O. Annexes to the MTR ToR

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

- List of documents to be reviewed by the MTR Team
- Guidelines on Contents for the Midterm Review Report
- Midterm Review Evaluative Matrix Template

²⁰

<https://intranet.undp.org/unit/bom/pso/Support%20documents%20on%20IC%20Guidelines/Template%20for%20Confirmation%20of%20Interest%20and%20Submission%20of%20Financial%20Proposal.docx>

²¹ http://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/corporate/Careers/P11_Personal_history_form.doc

- UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluators/Midterm Review Consultants
- MTR Required Ratings Table and Ratings Scales
- MTR Report Clearance Form
- Audit Trail Template
- Progress Towards Results Matrix)
- GEF Co-Financing Template (in Word)

Annexes to Midterm Review Terms of Reference

For Standard Template 2

- **ToR ANNEX A: List of Documents to be reviewed by the MTR Team**
- **ToR ANNEX B: Guidelines on Contents for the Midterm Review Report²²**
- **ToR ANNEX C: Midterm Review Evaluative Matrix Template**
- **ToR ANNEX D: UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluators/Midterm Review Consultants²³**
- **ToR ANNEX E: MTR Ratings and Achievements Summary Table and Rating Scales**
- **ToR ANNEX F: MTR Report Clearance Form**
- **ToR ANNEX G: Audit Trail Template**
- **ToR ANNEX H: Progress Towards Results Matrix**
- **ToR ANNEX I: GEF Co-Financing Template (provided as a separate file)**

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

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

17. PIF
18. UNDP Initiation Plan
19. UNDP Project Document
20. UNDP Social and Environmental Screening Procedure (SESP)
21. Project Inception Report
22. All Project Implementation Reports (PIR's)
23. Quarterly progress reports and work plans of the various implementation task teams
24. Audit reports
25. Finalized GEF focal area Tracking Tools/Core Indicators at CEO endorsement and midterm
26. Oversight mission reports
27. All monitoring reports prepared by the project
28. Financial and Administration guidelines used by Project Team

The following documents will also be available:

29. Project operational guidelines, manuals and systems
30. UNDP country/countries programme document(s)
31. Minutes of the Project's Board Meetings and other meetings (i.e. Project Appraisal Committee meetings)
32. Project site location maps
33. Any additional documents, as relevant.

²² The Report length should not exceed 40 pages in total (not including annexes).

²³ <http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/100>

ToR ANNEX B: Guidelines on Contents for the Midterm Review Report²⁴

- i. Basic Report Information (*for opening page or title page*)
 - Title of UNDP supported GEF financed project
 - UNDP PIMS# and GEF project ID#
 - MTR time frame and date of MTR report
 - Region and countries included in the project
 - GEF Operational Focal Area/Strategic Program
 - Executing Agency/Implementing Partner and other project partners
 - MTR team members
 - Acknowledgements
- ii. Table of Contents
- iii. Acronyms and Abbreviations
1. Executive Summary (*3-5 pages*)
 - Project Information Table
 - Project Description (brief)
 - Project Progress Summary (between 200-500 words)
 - MTR Ratings & Achievement Summary Table
 - Concise summary of conclusions
 - Recommendation Summary Table
2. Introduction (*2-3 pages*)
 - Purpose of the MTR and objectives
 - Scope & Methodology: principles of design and execution of the MTR, MTR approach and data collection methods, limitations to the MTR
 - Structure of the MTR report
3. Project Description and Background Context (*3-5 pages*)
 - Development context: environmental, socio-economic, institutional, and policy factors relevant to the project objective and scope
 - Problems that the project sought to address: threats and barriers targeted
 - Project Description and Strategy: objective, outcomes and expected results, description of field sites (if any)
 - Project Implementation Arrangements: short description of the Project Board, key implementing partner arrangements, etc.
 - Project timing and milestones
 - Main stakeholders: summary list
4. Findings (*12-14 pages*)
 - 4.1 Project Strategy
 - Project Design
 - Results Framework/Logframe
 - 4.2 Progress Towards Results
 - Progress towards outcomes analysis
 - Remaining barriers to achieving the project objective

²⁴ The Report length should not exceed 40 pages in total (not including annexes).

- 4.3 Project Implementation and Adaptive Management
 - Management Arrangements
 - Work planning
 - Finance and co-finance
 - Project-level monitoring and evaluation systems
 - Stakeholder engagement
 - Social and Environmental Standards (Safeguards)
 - Reporting
 - Communications & Knowledge Management
- 4.4 Sustainability
 - Financial risks to sustainability
 - Socio-economic to sustainability
 - Institutional framework and governance risks to sustainability
 - Environmental risks to sustainability
- 5. Conclusions and Recommendations (4-6 pages)
 - 5.1 Conclusions
 - Comprehensive and balanced statements (that are evidence-based and connected to the MTR’s findings) which highlight the strengths, weaknesses and results of the project
 - 5.2 Recommendations
 - Corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project
 - Actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the project
 - Proposals for future directions underlining main objectives
- 6. Annexes
 - MTR ToR (excluding ToR annexes)
 - MTR evaluative matrix (evaluation criteria with key questions, indicators, sources of data, and methodology)
 - Example Questionnaire or Interview Guide used for data collection
 - Ratings Scales
 - MTR mission itinerary
 - List of persons interviewed
 - List of documents reviewed
 - Co-financing table (if not previously included in the body of the report)
 - Signed UNEG Code of Conduct form
 - Signed MTR final report clearance form
 - *Annexed in a separate file:* Audit trail from received comments on draft MTR report
 - *Annexed in a separate file:* Relevant midterm tracking tools or Core Indicators
 - *Annexed in a separate file:* GEF Co-financing template (categorizing co-financing amounts by source as ‘investment mobilized’ or ‘recurrent expenditure’)

ToR ANNEX C: Midterm Review Evaluative Matrix Template

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

ToR ANNEX C: Midterm Review Evaluative Matrix Template

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	(i.e. project documents, national policies or strategies, websites, project staff, project partners, data	(i.e. document analysis, data analysis, interviews with project staff, interviews with stakeholders, etc.)

	activities conducted, quality of risk mitigation strategies, etc.)	collected throughout the MTR mission, etc.)	
How appropriate/relevant was the project strategy in comparison with the priorities of the country? Did the strategy proposed involve the key elements of government concurrence and ownership?	Evidence of project alignment with national goals and priorities Evidence of concurrence and ownership of the project by national organizations	National Planning documents UNDP Project documents	Document analysis Interviews with project staff and stakeholders o
How suitable was the strategy to ensure achievement of expected results?	Evidence of synergy between project strategy and SMART indicators	UNDP Project document Project results framework/logframe Project staff, partners	Document analysis Interviews with project staff and stakeholders
Were the capacities of key partners, including UNDP, well assessed and appropriate to the needs of the programme?	Extent it which the results of capacity assessments were integrated into project design.	Capacity assessments Project governance framework	Document analysis Interviews with project staff and stakeholders
Progress Towards Results: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved thus far?			
Have the outputs been produced as envisioned? Have outputs contributed to the project objectives and associated outcomes as envisioned?	Level of project implementation progress relative to expected level at current stage of implementation • Existence of logical linkages between project outputs and outcomes/impacts	Project documents • Project staff • Project stakeholders	Interviews Desk review
Are the anticipated outcomes likely to be achieved? Are the outcomes likely to contribute to the achievement of the project objective?	Existence of logical linkages between project outcomes and impacts	Project documents • Project staff • Project stakeholders	Interviews Desk review
Are impact level results likely to be achieved?	Level of progress through the project's Theory of Change	Project documents • Project staff • Project stakeholders	Interviews Desk review
Is the project proactively and comprehensively measuring milestones and results and using this process to inform planning and implementation?	Extent to which lessons learned from reporting are reflected in work plans and strategies	Annual Work Plans Risk Log Quarterly Reports Steering Committee Meeting Minuted	Desk Review

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?			
Has project implementation been efficient?	Project activities executed in alignment with resources, timelines and targets	Project Progress reports Interviews with project staff/project M&E	Interviews Desk review
Has the management of project financing (including co-financing) been cost effective?	Efficient management of project resources	Co-financing table Project documents	Interviews Desk review
Has the monitoring and Evaluation of the project been sufficient to ensure the efficient achievement of intended results in a suitable timeframe?	Adequate Monitoring system in place	Project Progress reports Project results framework Interviews with project staff/project M&E	Interviews Desk review
Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, socio-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?			
To what extent are the project results influenced by sociopolitical factors?	Existence of socio political risks to project benefits	Project documents • Project staff • Project stakeholders	Interviews Desk review
To what extent are the project results impacted by institutional frameworks and governance?	• Existence of institutional and governance risks to project benefits	Project documents • Project staff • Project stakeholders	Interviews Desk review
Are there any environmental risks expected to impede the long term results of the project?	Existence of environmental risks to project benefits	Project documents • Project staff • Project stakeholders	Interviews Desk review

ToR ANNEX D: UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluators/Midterm Review Consultants²⁵

Evaluators/Consultants:

8. Must present information that is complete and fair in its assessment of strengths and weaknesses so that decisions or actions taken are well founded.
9. 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.
10. 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.
11. 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.
12. 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.
13. 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.
14. Should reflect sound accounting procedures and be prudent in using the resources of the evaluation.
15. Must ensure that independence of judgement is maintained and that evaluation findings and recommendations are independently presented.
16. 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: _____

²⁵ <http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/100>

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

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)	
	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 Team to show how the received comments on the draft MTR report have (or have not) been incorporated into the final MTR report. This audit trail should be included as an annex in the final MTR report.

To the comments received on **(date)** from the Midterm Review of **(project name)** (UNDP Project ID-**PIMS #**)

The following comments were provided in track changes to the draft Midterm Review report; they are referenced by institution (“Author” column) and not by the person’s name, and track change comment number (“#” column):

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

ToR ANNEX H: Progress Towards Results Matrix

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

Project Strategy	Indicator ²⁶	Baseline Level ²⁷	Level in 1 st PIR (self-reported)	Midterm Target ²⁸	End-of-project Target	Midterm Level & Assessment ²⁹	Achievement Rating ³⁰	Justification for Rating
Project Objective: To enhance biodiversity conservation and ecosystem services conservation through an expanded and strengthened PA system and with SLM measures integrated in a ridge to reef approach.	Mandatory Indicator 1: Number of new partnership mechanisms with funding for sustainable management solutions of natural resources, ecosystem services, chemicals and waste at national and/or sub-national level, disaggregated by partnership type.	0		4 Private sector: 1 NGO/CBO: 2 Donor: 1	9 Private sector: 3 NGO/CBO: 4 Donor: 2			

²⁶ Populate with data from the Logframe and scorecards

²⁷ Populate with data from the Project Document

²⁸ If available

²⁹ Colour code this column only

³⁰ Use the 6 point Progress Towards Results Rating Scale: HS, S, MS, MU, U, HU

	Mandatory indicator 2: # of direct project beneficiaries (men and women farmers/agricultural labourers, women and men along value chains) benefiting from livelihoods created through sustainable management of natural resources and ecosystem services, in the project prioritized landscapes, disaggregated by sex. (GEF Core Indicator 11)	0		a) Women: 48 (at least 30% of total beneficiaries) b) Men: 112 c) Additional females benefiting from new sustainable livelihoods created: 50 % d) Additional males benefiting from new sustainable livelihoods created: 50 % Note: Target will be confirmed during Year 1 of Project implementation	a) Women: 254 (at least 30% of total beneficiaries) b) Men: 592 c) Additional females benefiting from new sustainable livelihoods created: 50 % d) Additional males benefiting from new sustainable livelihoods created: 50 % Note: Target will be confirmed during Year 1 of Project implementation and monitored throughout project implementation			
	Indicator 3: Number of the following globally threatened endemic species whose populations have remained stable or increased by EOP: <i>Amazona guildingii</i> <i>Chironius vincenti</i> <i>Pristimantis shrevei</i> <i>Catharopeza bishopi</i> <i>Gonatodes daudini</i>	0		0	5 <i>Amazona guildingii</i> , <i>Chironius vincenti</i> , <i>Pristimantis shrevei</i> , <i>Catharopeza bishopi</i> , <i>Gonatodes daudini</i> .			
Component 1: Strengthened institutional framework for Protected Areas, Ecosystem	Indicator 4 # of targeted departments with effective use of centralized database with information for informed decision-making, as indicated by reporting of routine use (of agency outcome indicators) in annual work programme by the agencies	0 Forestry Department Fisheries Department National Parks, Rivers and Beaches Authority Physical Planning		0 Forestry Department Fisheries Department National Parks, Rivers and Beaches Authority Physical Planning	5 Forestry Department Fisheries Department National Parks, Rivers and Beaches Authority Physical Planning			

<p>Conservation and Sustainable Land Use in St Vincent and the Grenadines</p> <p>Outcome 1.1 Enhanced multi-departmental access to centralized database system, incorporating biodiversity (BD), ecosystem services, land use / cover, protected areas, climate and soil data, to support natural resource conservation and land use decision making.</p> <p>Outcome 1.2. Institutional frameworks and human resource capacities strengthened for the operationalization of the Forest Policy, PA Policy and PA system</p>	<p>Indicator 5 Number of policy, legislative, regulatory and planning instruments developed/revised (with support for submission to Cabinet) that integrate Sustainable Land Management (SLM), CSA, gender responsiveness and/or biodiversity conservation.</p>	<p>0 Forest Policy PA Policy (revised) PA System Plan (revised) PA Mgt Plan Integrated Watershed Mgt Plan National Land Policy Note: A legislative review will take place during Year 1 to decide what policy legislation, regulations and/or guidelines will be updated/revised. The above mentioned have been identified by the key government stakeholders.</p>		<p>0 Forest Policy PA Policy (revised) PA System Plan (revised) PA Mgt Plan Integrated Watershed Mgt Plan National Land Policy</p>	<p>6 Forest Policy PA Policy (revised) PA System Plan (revised) PA Mgt Plan Integrated Watershed Mgt Plan National Land Policy</p>			
	<p>Indicator 6: Change in capacities of key government institutions for biodiversity conservation, PA management and integrated natural resource management</p>	<p>42% (overall score) Capacities to Generate, Access and Use Information and Knowledge: 33% Capacities for Strategy, Policy and Legislation development: 44% Capacities to monitor and evaluate: 33%</p>		<p>+5% (overall score) Capacities to Generate, Access and Use Information and Knowledge: Baseline +5% Capacities for Strategy, Policy and Legislation development: Baseline + 5% Capacities to monitor and evaluate: Baseline + 5%</p>	<p>+20% (overall score) Capacities to Generate, Access and Use Information and Knowledge: Baseline +20% Capacities for Strategy, Policy and Legislation development: Baseline + 15% Capacities to monitor and evaluate: Baseline + 20% Note: End of Project target to be confirmed during inception workshop</p>			

<p>plan as well as for the implementation of related laws and regulations, resulting in improved biodiversity and ecosystem conservation and reduced forest loss and land degradation.</p> <p>Outcome 1.3: Increased capacities for financial sustainability.</p>	<p>Indicator 7: Financial sustainability of the PAs system, as indicated by the rating of the GEF TT Financial Scorecard.</p>	<p>60 (overall score)</p>		<p>+5% (overall score)</p>	<p>+30% (overall score)</p>			
<p>Component 2: National capacity built to provide financial, technical, and information services for CSA production</p> <p>Outcome 2.1: Increased financing for supporting SLM and CSA at the</p>	<p>Indicator 8: Change in management effectiveness of 2 terrestrial and 1 marine PA covering 15,460 ha, as measured by the METT</p> <p>Indicator 9: Number of Priority KBAs and proportion (%) of total SVG KBAs that are integrated/included in the expanded PA estate (as indicated by Cabinet Submission for their legal protection)</p>	<p>Central Mountain Forest Reserve: 51 Chatham Bay: 29 Leeward Coast Marine Park: 27</p> <p>1 KBAs, 7% – Cumberland Forest Reserve</p>		<p>Central Mountain Forest Reserve: 60 Chatham Bay: 35</p> <p>Leeward Coast Marine Park: 35</p> <p>1 KBA, 7% – Cumberland Forest Reserve</p>	<p>Central Mountain Forest Reserve: 70 Chatham Bay: 50 Leeward Coast Marine Park: 50</p> <p>7 KBA, 47% – Cumberland Forest Reserve – Colonarie Forest Reserve – Dalaway Forest Reserve – Kingstown Forest Reserve – La Soufrière National Park – Mount Pleasant Forest Reserve – Richmond Forest Reserve</p>			

national level	Indicator 10: Number of the following new marine and terrestrial PAs legally gazetted, as measured by the expansion in the coverage of the national PA estate in ha -Central Mountain Forest Reserve (13,214 ha) -Chatham Bay (63 ha, tbd) (GEF Core Indicator 1.1) -Leeward Coast Marine Park (2,183 ha) (GEF Core Indicator 2.1)	0		0	3 PAs covering at minimum 15,460 ha - Central Mountain Forest Reserve (13,214 ha) - Chatham Bay (63 ha, tbd) - Leeward Coast Marine Park (2,183 ha)			
----------------	--	---	--	---	--	--	--	--

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)