**UNDP-GEF: TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR MIDTERM REVIEW**

**STRENGTHENING PROTECTED AREA NETWORK IN MONGOLIA PROJECT**

1. **INTRODUCTION**

In accordance with the UNDP and GEF M&E policies and procedures, a mid-term review of the full-size project SPAN “Strengthening Protected Area Network in Mongolia” implemented through the Ministry of Environment and Green Development is to be undertaken in 2013. The project started on the January 1st, 2011 and is in its third year of implementation. This Terms of Reference (TOR) sets out the expectations for this mid-term review.

The essentials of the project to be reviewed are as follows:

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Project Title: | Strengthening of the Protected Area Network in Mongolia | | | |
| UNDP Project ID: | PIMS 4180 | **Project financing** | *at endorsement (Million US$)* | *at MTE (Million US$)* |
| ATLAS Project ID: |  | GEF financing: | 1,363,630 |  |
| Country: | Mongolia | IA/EA own: | 700,000 |  |
| Region: | Central Asia | Government: | 500,000 |  |
| Focal Area: | Biodiversity | Other: | GTZ: 1,000,000  Denver Zoological Society: 500,000  WWF Mongolia: 222,858 |  |
| GEF Focal Area Strategic Program | **Sustainable Financing of Protected Area Systems at the National Level (SP 1)** | Total co-financing: | 2,922,858 |  |
| Executing Agency: | Ministry of Environment and Green Development (MEGD) | Total Project Cost **in cash**: | 2,063,630 |  |
| Other Partners involved: |  | ProDoc Signature (date project began): | | 6 September 2010 |
|  | Planned closing date:  1 December 2015 | Revised closing date:  1 December 2015 |

### PROJECT BACKGROUND INFORMATION AND OBJECTIVES

Located at the crossroads of the Central Asian Steppes, the Siberian Tundra and the Gobi Desert, Mongolia hosts a range of globally important biodiversity. Unfortunately, the country’s biodiversity is also under significant pressure- especially from the region’s economic growth, hunting, logging, land degradation, and increasingly mining and climate change. The protected areas of Mongolia have been significantly expanded, with the numbers reaching more than 90, totalling 28 mill. ha, or 17.8% of the country’s surface. However, capacities and resources for protected area (PA) management have not kept pace with the expansion of PAs, resulting in a situation where most PAs in Mongolia suffer from inadequate resources to conserve important species and habitats they are supposed to protect.

To improve the effective management and financing of the PA system, Mongolia’s Ministry of Environment and Green Development (MEGD) is cooperating with UNDP on a PA network strengthening project. The project works towards overcoming staff, institutional and systemic financial and operational barriers, and developing and deploying new management and budget models, allowing for improved management and resource administration of the PA system. Demonstration models are being piloted in two protected areas, one Nature Reserve and one National Park covering 3 Aimags (provinces); Dornogovi, Uvurkhangai and Arkhangai. On the national level the project supports MEGD to develop improved policies on PA management and financing, including revision of PA and buffer zone laws, and other PA related policy and programmes, and development and adoption of guidelines on management and business plan development. Local governments, civil society organizations, and academia are also involved in the project in order to improve coordination, collaboration, planning and financing of PAs.

The **Project Objective** is to catalyze the management effectiveness and financial sustainability of Mongolia’s PAs system. The current annual revenues to the National PA system is approximately US$2.5million. The project will develop the management and financial capacity of MEGD and strengthen the partnerships between PA authorities and local communities, local government, NGOs and the private sector to achieve the long-term sustainability of PA financing to allow Mongolia to cover the financing gap. The current gap in funding requirements for the Mongolia PA system would range from US$5 million to US$7.5 million.

**Three outcomes will contribute to this objective:**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Objective / Outcomes** | **Indicators:** | **Target by end of project with the baseline as 2009 (unless specified otherwise),** |
| **Objective:** To catalyze the management effectiveness and financial sustainability of Mongolia’s protected areas system. | UNDP Financial Scorecard | Total Score: 40%[[1]](#footnote-1) |
| UNDP Capacity Scorecard | Total Score: 70% |
| Level of financing for PA system | Total PA system level financing increases by at least $3 million/year (>100% increase).  At least 1 meaningful system wide finance mechanism in place (e.g. landing fee, mining mitigation) combined with optimized PA site level revenues. |
| **Outcome 1:** Strengthened National policy, legal and institutional frameworks for sustainable management and financing of national PA system | UNDP Financial Scorecard component 1: “Legal, regulatory and institutional frameworks” | Score (percentage) at the end of the project is at least 45% |
| UNDP Capacity Scorecard components related to: “Capacity to conceptualize and formulate policies, legislations, strategies and programmes” | Score (numeric) at the end of the project is at least 7.0 (approx. 75%) |
| **Outcome 2:** Institutional and staff capacity and arrangements are in place to effectively manage and govern the national PA system. | UNDP Capacity Scorecard components related to: “Capacity to implement policies, legislation, strategies and programmes” | Score (numeric) at the end of the project is at least 30.0 (approx 60%) |
| **Outcome 3:** Sustainable financing mechanisms and innovative collaboration approaches demonstrated at 2 PA demonstration sites. | UNDP Financial Scorecard component 3: “Tools for revenue generation” | Score (percentage) at the end of the project is at least 35% |
| Management Effectiveness of PAs totalling approximately 850,000 ha (METT) | Scores at (percentage) the end of the project are at least:  Ikh Nart: 75%  Orkhon: 55% |

**3. OBJECTIVES OF THIS MID-TERM REVIEW (MTR)**

The objective of the MTR is to gain an independent analysis of the progress of the project so far. The MTR will identify potential project design problems, assess progress towards the achievement of the project objective, identify and document lessons learned (including lessons that might improve design and implementation of other UNDP-GEF projects), and make recommendations regarding specific actions that should be taken to improve the project. The MTR will assess early signs of project success or failure and identify the necessary changes to be made. The project performance will be measured based on the indicators of the project’s logical framework (see Annex 1) and various Tracking Tools.

The MTR must provide evidence based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The review team is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with government counterparts, in particular the GEF operational focal point, UNDP Country Office, project team, UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based in the region and key stakeholders. The review team is expected to conduct field missions to Ulaanbaatar, Mongolia, including the following project sites as Orkhon Valley National Park and Ikh Nart Nature reserve*.* Interviews will be held with the following organizations and individuals at a minimum:

1. UNDP staff who have project responsibilities;
2. Executing agencies (including but not limited to senior officials and task team/ component leaders: MEGD, PAAD, target PAAs, target aimag and soum authorities, key experts and consultants in the subject area, PB members;
3. The Chair of Project Board
4. The NPD and ANPD of SPAN project
5. Project stakeholders, to be determined at the inception meeting; including academia, local government and CBOs

The team will review all relevant sources of information, such as the project document, project reports – including Annual APR/PIR, project budget revisions, progress reports, GEF focal area tracking tools, project files, national strategic and legal documents, and any other materials that the team considers useful for this evidence-based review. A list of documents that the project team and UNDP Country Office will provide to the team for review is included in Annex 2 of this Terms of Reference.

# SCOPE OF THE MTR

The review team will assess the following three categories of project progress. For each category, the review team is required to rate overall progress using a six-point rating scale outlined in Annex 3:

* 1. **Progress towards Results**

Project design:

* Review the problem addressed by the project and the underlying assumptions. Review the effect of any incorrect assumptions made by the project. Identify new assumptions.
* Review the relevance of the project strategy and assess whether it provides the most effective route towards results.
* Review how the project addresses country priorities.
* Review the baseline data included in the project results framework and GEF Tracking tool and suggest revisions as necessary.

Progress:

* Assess the outputs and progress toward outcomes achieve so far and the contribution to attaining the overall objective of the project.
* Examine if progress so far has led to, or could in the future lead to, 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.
* Examine whether progress so far has led to, or could in the future lead to, potentially adverse environmental and/or social impacts/risks that could threaten the sustainability of the project outcomes. Are these risks being managed, mitigated, minimized or offset? Suggest mitigation measures as needed.
* Review the extent to which the implementation of the project has been inclusive of relevant stakeholders and to which it has been able to create collaboration between different partners. Identify opportunities for stronger substantive partnerships.
  1. **Adaptive management**

Work Planning

1. Are work planning processes result-based? If not, suggest ways to re-orientate work planning to focus on results.
2. Examine the use of the project document logical/results framework as a management tool and review any changes made to it since project start. Ensure any revisions meet UNDP-GEF requirements and assess the impact of the revised approach on project management?

Finance and co-finance:

1. Consider the financial management of the project, with specific reference to the cost-effectiveness of interventions.
2. Complete the co-financing monitoring table (see Annex 4).
3. Review the changes to fund allocations as a result of budget revisions and assess the appropriateness and relevance of such revisions.

Monitoring Systems.

1. Review the monitoring tools currently being used: Do they provide the necessary information? Do they involve key partners? Do they use existing information? Are they efficient? Are they cost-effective? Are additional tools required?
2. Ensure that the monitoring system, including performance indicators, meet GEF minimum requirements. Apply SMART indicators as necessary.
3. Ensure broader development and gender aspects of the project are being monitored effectively. Develop SMART indicators, including disaggregated gender indicators as necessary;
4. Review the mid-term GEF Tracking Tool (s) as appropriate and comment on progress made, quality of the submission, and overall value of the GEF Tracking Tool.
5. Examine the financial management of the project monitoring and evaluation budget. Are sufficient resources being allocated to M&E? Are these resources being allocated effectively?

Risk Management

1. Validate whether the risks identified in the project document, APR/PIRs and the ATLAS Risk Management Module are the most important and whether the risk ratings applied are appropriate. If not, explain why?
2. Describe any additional risks identified and suggest risk ratings and possible risk management strategies to be adopted.

Reporting

1. Assess how adaptive management changes have been reported by the project management, and shared with the Project Board.
2. Assess how lessons derived from the adaptive management process have been documented, shared with key partners and internalized by partners.
   1. **Management arrangements**
3. 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.
4. Review the quality of execution of the project Implementing Partners and recommend areas for improvement.
5. Review the quality of support provided by UNDP and recommend areas for improvement.
6. ***MID TERM REVIEW DELIVERABLES***

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Deliverable** | **Content** | **Timing** | **Responsibilities** |
| Inception Report | Review team clarifies timing and method of review | No later than 2 weeks before the review mission | Review team submits to UNDP Country Office |
| Presentation | Initial Findings | End of review mission | To project management and UNDP Country Office |
| Draft Final Report | Full report (as template in annex 5) with annexes | Within 3 weeks of the review mission | Sent to UNDP CO, reviewed by RTA, PCU, GEF OFP… |
| Final Report | Revised report with audit trail detailing how all received comment have (and have not) been addressed in the final review report). | Within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft | Sent to UNDP CO. |

Above deliverables are joint reports of international and national consultant thus for the national consultant all deliverables should be submitted to PIU in Mongolian.

1. ***IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS***

The principal responsibility for managing this review resides with the UNDP Country Office (UNDP CO) in Ulaanbaatar, Mongolia. The UNDP CO will contract the consultants and ensure the timely provision of per diems and travel arrangements within the country for the review team. The SPAN project team will be responsible for liaising with the review team to set up stakeholder interviews, arrange field visits with missions to the Orkhon Valey and Ikh Nart reserve.

In preparation for the review mission, the project manager, with assistance from UNDP country office, will arrange for the completion of the tracking tools (METT, Financial and Capacity scorecards for mid-term stage). The tracking tools will be completed/endorsed by the relevant implementing agency or qualified national research /scientific institution, and not by the international consultant or UNDP staff. The tracking tools will be submitted to the mid-term review team for comment. These comments will be addressed by the project team, and the final version of the Tracking tools will be attached as annexes to the Mid-term evaluation report.

1. ***TIMEFRAME***

The total duration of the review will be 23 working days within 1 months starting 18 May 2013 according to the following plan:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Activity** | **Timeframe** |
| Preparation (desk review, evaluation mission plan, outline of the report) | 18 - 21 May (4 work days) |
| Evaluation mission and debriefing | 23 May – 4 June (12 work days) |
| Draft evaluatioin report and submission | 2 - 10 June (4 work days, plus 3 days during mission) |
| Finalisation of final report | 17 - 19 June (5 work days) |

1. **TEAM COMPOSITION**

A team of two independent reviewers will conduct the review - one international team leader and one national expert. The consultants will not have participated in the project preparation and/or implementation and should not have conflict of interest with project related activities. The team should have prior experience in reviewing or evaluating similar projects. Experience with GEF financed projects is an advantage.

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

* Recent experience with result-based management evaluation methodologies;
* Experience applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios;
* Competence in Adaptive Management, as applied to conservation or natural resource management;
* Demonstrable analytical skills;
* Work experience in relevant technical areas for at least 10 years;
* Excellent English communication skills.
* Project evaluation experiences within United Nations system will be considered an asset;
* Experience working in Central Asia region.

1. **PAYMENT MODALITIES AND SPECIFICATIONS**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **%** | **Milestone** |
| **50** | **Upon approval of 1st draft mid-term review report** |
| **50%** | **Upon approval of final mid-term review report** |

1. **APPLICATION PROCESS**

All applications including [P11 form](http://www.undptkm.org/files/vacancy/p11.doc), CV, technical and financial proposals should be directly posted on **jobs.undp.org** This email address is being protected from spam bots, you need Javascript enabled to view it by **18:00 15 March 2013.** Incomplete applications will be excluded from further consideration. For further information please contact via [bids.mn@undp.org](mailto:bids.mn@undp.org)

**Recommended Presentation of Proposal:** Introduction about the consultant/CV; Proposed methodology and workplan (max 1 page); Financial proposal, including proposed fee and all other travel related costs (such as flight ticket, per diem, etc)..

**Criteria for Evaluation of Proposal:** The selection will be made based on the educational background and experience on similar assignments. The price proposal will weigh as 30% of the total scoring

**Annex 1: SPAN Project logframe**

| Project Strategy | Objectively verifiable indicators | Baseline | Target | Sources of verification | Assumptions |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Objective:  To catalyze the management effectiveness and financial sustainability of Mongolia’s protected areas system. | UNDP Financial Scorecard | Total Score: 19.4% | Total Score: 40% | Completed UNDP Financial Scorecards | GOM maintains political will and operational commitment to refine and support the National Programme on Protected Areas and Law on Special Protected Areas.  GoM maintains budget allocation level for PAA system and supports capacity improvements.  Stated project co-financing commitments are maintained. |
| UNDP Capacity Scorecard | Total Score: 49.5% | Total Score: 70% | Completed UNDP Capacity Scorecards |
| Level of financing for PA system | Low - PA revenue limited to State Budget funds and limited site revenues from entrance fees, fines and related sources. Donor funds for short term projects in some PAs | Total PA system level financing increases by at least $3 million/year (>100% increase).  System finance mechanism (e.g. arrival fee, mining mitigation) combined with new revenues at PAs. | Revenue reports and financial mechanism plans (also, see reference to business plans below) |
| Outcome 1:  Strengthened National policy, legal and institutional frameworks for sustainable management and financing of national PA system | UNDP Financial Scorecard component 1: “Legal, regulatory and institutional frameworks” | 21.1% | Score (percentage) at the end of the project is at least 45% | Score card assessment |  |
| UNDP Capacity Scorecard components related to: “Capacity to conceptualize and formulate policies, legislations, strategies and programmes” | 4.92 (approx. 55%) | Score (numeric) at the end of the project is at least 7.0 (75%) | Score card assessment |
| Output 1.1: Design and effective use of PA management plan and financing/ budgeting requirements to be applied consistently across the National PA system. This approach is enshrined in national legislation. | Approved policy and legislation related to management plans, budgets, and revenue retention and land fees. | Integrated management plan and financial (budget) framework not legally required.  Existing laws conflict or vague about revenue generation options and retention, and also land fee assessment and use for PAs. | National Programme on PAs and Law on SPA require PA management planning and budgeting.  PAs retain substantial proportion (75% or more) of site-based revenues. | Management plans and budgets.  Revenue retention / allocation records.  Land fee law and records. | Regulations are approved and institutional capacity and frameworks to implement are in place |
| Output 1.2: Consistent management and budget plans are utilized at demonstration PA sites and introduced to all PAA directors/offices, and integrated with formal budgets and innovative revenue plans. | UNDP Financial Scorecard component 2: “Business planning and tools for cost-effective management”  Entrance fee levels and collection rates. | 21.3%  System-wide entrance fee rates are low.  Entrance fees are not consistently collected. | Score at the end of the project is at least 44%  Total PA revenues from entrance fees increase by $150,000 (>100% over baseline) | Score card assessment  Entrance fee schedules  Entrance fee revenue records |  |
| Output 1.3: Institutional arrangements in place that enable MNET to undertake appropriate analysis and provide national support for PA financing, and to coordinate actions of all relevant actors | Detailed system-wide financial needs analysis.  Existence of Mongolian PA Forum to coordinate lobbying/advocacy and donor funds, among other things. | PA system financial analysis (for all 61 PAs) does not exist.  PA system coordination and dialogue between stakeholders (including MNET and aimag and soum agencies) is ad hoc at best and no such PA forum exists. | PA system financial analysis clarifies financial needs and priorities by year 2  Accounting systems in place track revenues, expenditures and performance by year 3.  PA Forum facilitated by SPAN and MNET. | Analysis  PA system-wide accounting system  PA Forum meeting minutes. | Such an analysis will be completed against PA and PAA management plans for the PA system |
| Outcome 2:  Institutional and staff capacities are in place to effectively manage and govern the national PA system. | UNDP Capacity Scorecard components related to: “Capacity to implement policies, legislation, strategies and programmes” | 24.26 (approx. 50%) | Score (numeric) at the end of the project is at least 30.0 (60%) | Score card assessment | GoM commits to capacity development. |
| Output 2.1: PA staff have access to training facilities at national, PAA and site levels for skills related to management planning, business planning, or budgeting, allowing PAs to meet objectives | Proportion of PA managers and staff trained in essential skills. | MNET does not have a capacity building or training program.  No PA managers trained in issues such as management planning, business planning, or budgeting. | MNET has a formal capacity building and training program at all levels.  Staff at 50% of PAs trained in key skills by year 3; by end of the project this is 70%. | Project reports/ training reports  Training materials and program. | Training and mentoring needs assessed and understood  Skills development through a blend of training, mentoring, knowledge sharing missions |
| Output 2.2: Financial specialists and data management systems in place improving resource use across PA system. | Presence of MNET PAA Department Finance Capacity specialists / unit with skills and capacity to manage PA system.  Resource allocation properly allocated based on clear need and priority as determined by management plans. | Current staff within MNET PAA Department are not focused on effective management or financial planning.  Allocations are not based on need. | PA management and finance experts hired in year 1of SPAN project.  PA system budgets based on need outlined in approved management plans. | Staff hired.  Budget allocation records and management plan requests. | GoM commits to maintain new staff as part of a Capacity unit to manage the capacity building programs for MNET (including PA planning, budgeting and tourism management at PA sites) and arrangements. |
| Presence of M&E system and data / information management system supports effective and adaptive management of PAs | No M&E system exists.  No knowledge-based data management system in place. | Effective M&E and system is in place.  Operational and cost comparisons between sites allow for continued improvement of resource allocations. | M&E system and assessment results.  Databases.  Operational and cost comparisons among PAs. |
| Output 2.3: Management, incentive and reporting systems in place | Performance evaluations in place to encourage continuous improvements in management. | No performance evaluations or incentives in place for revenue generation or otherwise. | Annual performance evaluations for MNET staff provide incentives and increases staff retention. | Performance reviews. |  |
| Outcome 3:  Demonstration of Sustainable financing mechanisms and innovative collaboration approaches demonstrated at 2 PA demonstration sites lead to better conservation outcomes | Core zones of at least 150,000 ha protected from overgrazing by domestic animals’ in demonstration PAs | 0% | 100% | PA management plan effectiveness reviews | Demonstrations are an effective way of supporting the development of new policy and procedures  New national policies allow increased revenue and retention at PA level  Local political support for demonstrations |
| Increase in argali population at demonstration sites | To be established at project inception | 10% | Population studies |
| UNDP Financial Scorecard component 3: “Tools for revenue generation” | 15.5% | Score (percentage) at the end of the project is at least 35% | Score card assessment |
| Management Effectiveness of PAs totalling approximately 850,000 ha (METT) | Ikh Nart: 61 (60%)  Orkhon: 38 (37%) | Scores at (percentage) the end of the project are at least:  Ikh Nart: 75%  Orkhon: 55% | Application and use of METT in line with the monitoring and evaluation component of the project |
| Output 3.1: Approved Management Plans, Budget Plans, and PA Business Plans in 2 PA demonstration sites. | Presence of approved and integrated management plans and budget plans | Management plans exist for approximately 25-30% of PAs (6 PAAs)  Management plans not integrated with budgets plans | 2 demo PAs complete and submit annual and 5-year management and budget plans by year 3.  Approved PA budgets based on management plans and common criteria. | Management and budget plans | System-wide data exists in order to conduct an initial system wide analyses (draft management plans, etc)  Improvements in PA financial projections provide information on financial needs.  Business plans for effective management and financing include assessing new financing mechanisms, including sustainable tourism plans, as well as revenue plans and projections. |
| Presence of PA business plans. | No PA business plans, nor related needs and revenue assessments, in place. | Business plans for 2 demo PAs by year 3.  Lessons, methods and approaches are shared across the PA system | Business plans, feasibility studies, income statements. |
| Output 3.2: New or improved financing mechanisms demonstrated PA level resulting in increased revenues. | Presence of Financing mechanisms.  Increased resources and investment. | PAs rely on a mix of state budgets, entrance fees and various other fees and donor aid (most receive little, many realize none)  Limited traditional finance mechanisms exist.  No feasibility or valuation studies in place for PA system. | The 2 demo PAs identify finance mechanisms by end of year 1; design and implement best option(s) by year 3 (with positive net returns).  Grant facility for finance mechanism proposals from non-demo PAs in place by end of year 1; award 1-3 grants per year by end of year 2.  PA valuation studies guide new financing mechanisms (i.e. mining royalties, departure taxes, etc). | Mechanisms in place  Feasibility / valuation studies  Grant facility | System-level funding mechanisms support site level budget increases and revenue retention.  New revenue sources and mechanisms do not diminish state budget allocations (which are maintained or raised). |
| Output 3.3: Collaborative approaches between PAs and partners (communities, NGOs, etc) demonstrating improved PA management and cost sharing. | Collaboration opportunity assessments.  Collaborative management approaches. | Long term partnerships with institutions and communities are rare and underutilized.  Establishment of PA management boards in 2 demonstration PAs to improve collaboration and PA management. | 2 demonstration PAs actively collaborating with communities and institutions for relevant conservation activities  PA Management Boards in place at 2 demo sites improve coordination with stakeholders | Collaboration agreements.  PA management board records.  Relevant laws and regulations refined to support improved collaboration and management of PAs by NGOs, etc. | Collaboration and PA management boards are facilitated and supported by MNET and local governments |

**Annex 2: List of Documents**

1. Project Document
2. Project implementation reports (APR/PIR’s)
3. Quarterly progress reports and work plans of the various implementation task teams
4. Audit reports
5. METT Tools; GEF BD TT; Financial scorecards
6. The Mission Reports and Lessons learnt study
7. M & E Operational Guidelines, all monitoring reports prepared by the project; and
8. Financial and Administration guidelines.

The following documents will also be available:

1. Project operational guidelines, manuals and systems
2. Minutes of PAAD and SPAN Meetings
3. Minutes of target PAA and SPAN Meetings
4. Minutes of the SPAN Project Board Meetings
5. Maps
6. The GEF Completion Report guidelines; and
7. UNDP Monitoring and Evaluation Frameworks.

**Annex 3: Mid-term Review Rating Scale**

**Progress towards results: use the following rating scale**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Highly Satisfactory (HS)** | Project is expected to achieve or exceed all its major global environmental objectives, and yield substantial global environmental benefits, without major shortcomings. The project can be presented as “good practice”. |
| **Satisfactory (S)** | Project is expected to achieve most of its major global environmental objectives, and yield satisfactory global environmental benefits, with only minor shortcomings. |
| **Moderately Satisfactory (MS)** | Project is expected to achieve most of its major relevant objectives but with either significant shortcomings or modest overall relevance. Project is expected not to achieve some of its major global environmental objectives or yield some of the expected global environment benefits. |
| **Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)** | Project is expected to achieve its major global environmental objectives with major shortcomings or is expected to achieve only some of its major global environmental objectives. |
| **Unsatisfactory (U)** | Project is expected not to achieve most of its major global environment objectives or to yield any satisfactory global environmental benefits. |
| **Highly Unsatisfactory (U)** | The project has failed to achieve, and is not expected to achieve, any of its major global environment objectives with no worthwhile benefits. |

**Adaptive management AND Management Arrangements: use the following rating scale**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Highly Satisfactory (HS)** | The project has no shortcomings and can be presented as “good practice”. |
| **Satisfactory (S)** | The project has minor shortcomings. |
| **Moderately Satisfactory (MS)** | The project has moderate shortcomings. |
| **Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)** | The project has significant shortcomings. |
| **Unsatisfactory (U)** | The project has major shortcomings. |
| **Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)** | The project has severe shortcomings. |

**Annex 4: Co-financing table**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Sources of Co-financing[[2]](#footnote-2) | Name of Co-financer | Type of Co-financing[[3]](#footnote-3) | Amount Confirmed at CEO endorsement / approval | Actual Amount Materialized at Midterm | Actual Amount Materialized at Closing |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | **TOTAL** |  |  |  |

Explain “Other Sources of Co-financing”:

**Annex 5: Table of Contents for the Mid-term Review Report**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **i.** | Opening page:   * Title of UNDP supported GEF financed project * UNDP and GEF project ID#s. * Review time frame and date of review report * Region and countries included in the project * GEF Operational Program/Strategic Program * Implementing Partner and other project partners * Review team members * Acknowledgements |
| **ii.** | Executive Summary   * Project Summary Table * Project Description (brief) * Review Rating Table * Summary of conclusions, recommendations and lessons |
| **iii.** | Acronyms and Abbreviations |
| **1.** | Introduction   * Purpose of the review * Scope & Methodology * Structure of the review report |
| **2.** | Project description and development context   * Project start and duration * Problems that the project sought to address * Immediate and development objectives of the project * Baseline Indicators established * Main stakeholders * Expected Results |
| **3.** | Findings |
| **3.1** | Progress toward Results:   * Project Design * Progress |
| **3.2** | Adaptive Management:   * Work planning * Finance and co-finance * Monitoring systems * Risk management * Reporting |
| **3.3** | Management Arrangements:   * Overall project management * Quality of executive of Implementing Partners * Quality of support provided by UNDP |
| **4.** | Conclusions, Recommendations & Lessons   * 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 * Best and worst practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance and success |
| **5.** | Annexes   * ToR * Itinerary * List of persons interviewed * Summary of field visits * List of documents reviewed * Questionnaire used and summary of results * Relevant mid-term tracking tools (METT, FSC, Capacity scorecard) * Co-financing table |

1. The SPAN team worked with MNET and other stakeholders to complete a comprehensive Financial Sustainability Scorecard (UNDP) assessment for the Mongolia National PA system. The outcomes revealed that the current score is 20% across all issues assessed. It was further estimated that the SPAN project could advance the sustainability of the National PA system and allow it to achieve approximately 40% within 5 years. In real terms this would result in significant improvements in both management and financial sustainability of the National PA system, while leaving much room for continued improvement going forward. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Sources of Co-financing may include: Bilateral Aid Agency(ies), Foundation, GEF Agency, Local Government, National Government, Civil Society Organization, Other Multi-lateral Agency(ies), Private Sector, Other [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Type of Co-financing may include: Grant, Soft Loan, Hard Loan, Guarantee, In-Kind, Other [↑](#footnote-ref-3)