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## **Terms of Reference for the Mid-term Review**

***Community-based Forest and Coastal Conservation and Resource Management Project***

Title: International Consultant for the Mid-Term Project Review

Deadline of Application: 22 October 2016

Project: Community-based Forest and Coastal Conservation and Resource Management Project

Duration: 28 days to be completed by 3 February 2017

Supervisor: UNDP PNG Country Office

Duty Station: Port Moresby, Papua New Guinea with field missions to East and West New Britain Provinces

**1. INTRODUCTION**

This is the Terms of Reference (ToR) for the Mid-Term Review (MTR) for the full-sized UNDP/GEF supported project titled *“Community-based Forest and Coastal Conservation and Resource Management in Papua New Guinea (PIMS#:3936)”* implemented through the Conservation and Environment Protected Authority (formerly Department of Environment and Conservation). The project started in August 2012, and is in its fourth year of implementation. This ToR sets out the expectations for this Mid-term Review (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/guidance.shtml#handbook)

**2. PROJECT BACKGROUND**

PNG is one of the world’s 17 most diverse countries, accounting for less than 0.5% of the earth’s surface area and hots 6-8% of the world’s biodiversity containing some of the world’s most biologically diverse ecosystems (Sekhran and Miller, 1995). Todate, obtaining definitive information on the biological richness of the country remains difficult as many areas are poorly studied. With this rich biodiversity, PNG also has vast wealth in natural resources: gold, copper, oil, gas, timber and fisheries. PNG has a maritime Economic Exclusive Zone of 3.1 million square kilometers, which is host to abundant tuna resources and diverse marine fisheries. PNG’s tropical rainforest is third largest in the world (60% of the country’s land) while thirty per cent of the country’s land mass is suitable for agriculture and the soils are generally fertile, with the climate and rainfall sufficient to support a wide range of crops for domestic consumption and export markets.

However, the primary threats to terrestrial biodiversity in PNG are deforestation and degradation (from logging and subsistence agriculture), mining (including pollution and waste runoff) and agricultural conversion (e.g. for oil palm, biofuels, etc.). Not only does forest loss result directly from these activities, but the secondary effects from improved road access makes frontier areas susceptible to ongoing clearing for agriculture and salvage logging. Recent spatial analysis suggested that the average annual rate of deforestation and degradation across all regions of PNG over the 1972-2002 period was 1.4%, almost twice the rate previously recorded. It is estimated that by 2021, 83% of the commercially accessible forest areas will have been cleared or degraded if current trends continue. Much of the logging-related forest loss is concentrated in lowland forest areas; by 2002, lowland forests accessible to mechanized logging were being degraded or cleared at the rate of 2.6% annually. In particular, the islands region (New Britain and New Ireland) has been subject to intense logging activity; the majority (63%) of the 2.8 million ha of accessible lowland forests in these areas had been deforested or degraded by 2002. Logging was initially focused in the islands region because of ease of access, fertile soils and good quality forest, more recently this region has been the centre of intensive oil palm plantation development.

Since 2007, PAs cover remained at 4.1% of the land area and far less than 1% of marine areas – well below the CBD targets. The focus of PA establishment has been on inclusive community-driven models, particularly WMAs. Some local communities have also been declaring ad-hoc community conservation areas (both terrestrial and marine) through the establishment of conservation deeds or conservation contracts under contract law, with the help of grassroots NGOs. However, these community conservation areas are not formally recognized as part of the national PA network. Most existing protected areas in PNG have been designated as WMAs under the Fauna (Protection & Control) Act 1966, since this is the legal structure that most readily accommodates existing community resource management systems. However, this act focuses on faunal resources, and is therefore not an effective legal structure for comprehensive biodiversity conservation at the landscape or ecosystem level.

20.

The overall PA effectiveness in PNG is very low in terms of planning, establishment and support. These weaknesses were recognized several decades ago[[1]](#footnote-1), and the fact that there has been no improvement since was summarized in the recent Rapid Appraisal and Prioritization of Protected Areas Management (RAPPAM)[[2]](#footnote-2), which found that most state-run and community-managed PAs still lack effective management plans, technical capacity and funding support. An analysis of the PA system conducted as part of PNG’s response to the CBD Programme of Work on Protected Areas (PoWPA)[[3]](#footnote-3) came to similar conclusions. The ineffectiveness of current conservation approaches were illustrated by a recent spatial analysis indicating that most PAs in PNG have suffered forest clearance or degradation at rates almost identical with non-PA forest areas (indeed, field surveys in New Britain showed that significant portions several small WMAs have been converted to oil palm by local communities).

For the aforementioned reasons, a viable long-term solution to the increasing threats to PNG’s high conservation value forests is to bring a representative sample of the country’s biodiversity resources under some form of protection. This required recognition of customary tenure as the Government have had limited ability to demarcate conservation areas and the current WMAs are ineffectively managed and supported; certainly few if, can conform even to the minimum management requirements for multi-use PAs under the IUCN Categories V or VI. Moreover, the PAs that do exist largely fail to achieve any strategic coverage of key biodiversity habitats. The challenge is to develop an effective model of protection which recognizes and accommodates the unique resource ownership structure in PNG but offers real economic and/or development incentives for long-term conservation of important habitats. Thus, this project’s long-term vision is to establish a national system built upon existing community-based resource management structures, which conserves a comprehensive, adequate, representative and resilient network of priority biodiversity assets that support sustainable economic growth.

Thus, the Government of Papua New Guinea (GoPNG) through the Conservation and Environment Protection Authority (formerly Department of Environment and Conservation) with the support of United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and financial resources from the Global Environment Facility is currently implementing the “Community-based Forest and Coastal Conservation and Resource Management in Papua New Guinea”.

**3. PROJECT OBJECTIVES AND EXPECTED OUTCOMES**

This project aims to develop a government-supported and driven approach to enabling environment for the establishment and support of community conservation areas in PNG and to develop effective natural resource management and financing systems. The overall objective of the project is to develop and demonstrate resource management and conservation models for landholding communities that effectively incorporate community-managed conservation areas as part of agreed national priorities with industry and government. This involves demonstration of how the acquisition and dissemination of better national conservation policies and biodiversity planning information will improve natural resource management systems to better support and fund community conservation areas.

Thus, with the support of UNDP, this project should enable the Government to scale up the approach initiated at Kokoda by the Conservation and Environment Protection Authority (formerly Department of Environment and Conservation) to establish priority conservation targets and work with local communities, industry and other government agencies to manage economic activities in ways that meet landscape-level biodiversity conservation and sustainable-use objectives.

**4. MID-TERM REVIEW OBJECTIVES**

The Mid-Term Review (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 and challenges with the aim 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.

The purpose of MTR is to examine the performance of the project since the beginning of its implementation. The review will include both the review of the progress in project implementation, measured against planned outputs set forth in the Project Document in accordance with rational budget allocation and the assessment of features related to the process involved in achieving those outputs, as well as the initial and potential impacts of the project. The review will also address underlying causes and issues that contributes to targets not adequately achieved.

The MTR is intended to identify weaknesses and strengths of the project design and to come with recommendations for any necessary changes in the overall design and strategy of the project by evaluating the adequacy, efficiency, and effectiveness of its implementation, as well as assessing the project outputs and outcomes to date. Consequently, the review mission is also expected to make detailed recommendations on the work plan for the remaining project period as well as assess the necessity for any time extension to achieve the expected key results from this project.

The review mission will also identify lessons learnt and best practices from the project which could be applied to future and other on-going GEF-funded projects in the country.

**5. SCOPE OF MID-TERM REVIEW**

The scope of the MTR will cover all activities undertaken in the framework of the project. The reviewer will compare planned outputs of the project to actual outputs and assess the actual results to determine their contribution to the attainment of the project objectives. The evaluation will diagnose problems and suggest any necessary corrections and adjustments. It will evaluate the efficiency of project management, including the delivery of outputs and activities in terms of quality, quantity, timeliness and cost efficiency. The evaluation will also determine the likely outcomes and impact of the project in relation to the specified goals and objectives of the project.

The evaluation will comprise the following elements:

1. Assess whether the project design is clear, logical and commensurate with time and resources available;
2. A review summary of the project and all its major components undertaken to date and a determination of progress towards achievement of its overall objectives;
3. A review of project performance in relation to the indicators, assumptions and risks specified in the logical framework matrix and the project document
4. An assessment of the scope, quality and significance of the projects outputs produced to date in relation to expected results;
5. An analysis of the extent of cooperation on engendered and synergy created by the project in each of its component activities;
6. An assessment of the functionality of the institutional structure established and the role of the Project Advisory Board, Project Management Unit, Implementing Partner, the Technical and Advisory Support Teams or working groups;
7. Identification and, to the extent possible, quantification of any additional outputs and outcomes beyond those specified in the project document;
8. Identification of any programmatic and financial variance and/or adjustments made during the first three years of the project and an assessment of their conformity with decisions of the Project Advisory Board and their appropriateness in terms of overall objectives of the project;
9. A review of project coordination, management and administration provided by the PMU. This review should include specific reference to:
	* Organizational/institutional arrangements for collaboration among the various agencies and institutions involved in project arrangements and execution;
	* The effectiveness of the monitoring mechanisms currently employed by the project managers in monitoring on a day to day basis the progress in project execution;
	* Administrative, operational and/or technical problems and constraints that influenced the effective implementation of the project and present recommendations for any necessary operational changes; and
	* Financial management of the project, including the balance between expenditures on administrative and overhead charges in relation to those on the achievement of substantive outputs.
10. An assessment of the extent to which project outputs to date have either sufficient or poor quality scientific and technical data and knowledge that have influenced the execution of the project activities;
11. A prognosis of the degree to which the overall objectives and expected outcomes of the project are likely to be met;
12. Lessons learned during project implementation;
13. Recommendations regarding any necessary corrections and adjustments to the overall project work plan and timetable for the purposes of enhancing the achievement of project objectives and outcomes.

**6. REVIEW METHODOLOGY**

The international consultant will lead the MTR which will be conducted in a participatory manner working on the basis that its essential objective is to assess the project implementation and impacts in order to provide basis for improvement in the implementation and management.

The MTR must provide evidence based information that is credible, reliable and useful thus the international consultant will provide the overall guidance and lead the review of all relevant sources of information including documents prepared during the preparation phase, the Project Document, project reports including Project Performance Reports/PPRs, project budget revisions, lesson learned reports, national strategic and legal documents, and any other materials that the international consultant considers useful for this evidence-based review).

The MTR International Consultant is expected to lead the engagement with the Project Team, government counterparts, the UNDP Country Office, UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Advisers, and other key stakeholders.

The mission will start with a desk review of project documentation and also take the following process:

1. Desk review of project document, outputs, monitoring reports such as Project Inception Report, Minutes of Project Advisory Board and Technical Support and Advisory Team meetings, Project Implementation Report, Quarterly Progress Reports, mission reports and other internal documents including financial reports and relevant correspondence);
2. Review of specific products including datasets, management and action plans, publications, audio visual materials, other materials and reports;
3. Interviews with the Project Manager, other project staff including those based in the provinces; and
4. Consultations and/or interviews with relevant stakeholders involved, including governments representatives, local communities, NGO’s, private sector.

Engagement of stakeholders is vital to a successful MTR. Stakeholder involvement should include interviews with stakeholders who have project responsibilities, including but not limited to key partners and pilot provinces); 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 is expected to conduct field missions to Port Moresby, Papua New Guinea, including the project sites in East and West New Britain Provinces.

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.

**7. DETAILED SCOPE OF MID-TERM REVIEW**

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

**i. Project Strategy**

Project design:

* Review the problem addressed by the project and the underlying assumptions. Review the effect of any incorrect assumptions or changes to the context to achieving the project results as outlined in the Project Document.
* Review the relevance of the project strategy and assess whether it provides the most effective route towards expected/intended results. Were lessons from other relevant projects properly incorporated into the project design?
* Review how the project addresses country priorities. Review country ownership. Was the project concept in line with the national sector development priorities and plans of the country?
* 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.
* If there are major areas of concern, recommend areas for improvement.

Results Framework/Logframe:

* Undertake a critical analysis of the project’s lograme 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.

**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; 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 1: Progress Towards Results Matrix (Achievement of outcomes against End-of-project Targets)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Project Strategy** | **Indicator[[4]](#footnote-4)** | **Baseline Level[[5]](#footnote-5)** | **Level in 1st PIR (self- reported)** | **Midterm Target[[6]](#footnote-6)** | **End-of-project Target** | **Midterm Level & Assessment[[7]](#footnote-7)** | **Achievement Rating[[8]](#footnote-8)** | **Justification for Rating**  |
| **Objective:**  | Indicator (if applicable): |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Outcome 1:** | Indicator 1: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Indicator 2: |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Outcome 2:** | Indicator 3: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Indicator 4: |  |  |  |  |  |
| Etc. |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Etc.** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**Indicator Assessment Key**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Green= Achieved | Yellow= On target to be achieved | Red= Not on target to be achieved |

In addition to the progress towards outcomes analysis:

* Compare and analyse the Project Results Tracker within the PIR 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.

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?

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?

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?

Reporting:

* Assess how adaptive management changes have been reported by the project management and shared with the Project Advisory Board.
* Assess how well the Project Team and partners undertake and fulfil UNDP/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:

* 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.

**iv. Sustainability**

* Validate whether the risks identified in the Project Document, 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 will include a section of the report setting out the MTR’s evidence-based conclusions, in light of the findings.[[9]](#footnote-9)

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.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Rec #**  | **Recommendation**  | **Entity Responsible**  |
| A  | *(State Outcome 1)* (Outcome 1)  |  |
| A.1  | **Key recommendation:**  |  |
| A.2  |  |  |
| A.3  |  |  |
| B  | *(State Outcome 2)* (Outcome 2)  |  |
| B.1  | **Key recommendation:**  |  |
| B.2  |  |  |
| B.3  |  |  |
| C  | *(State Outcome 3)* (Outcome 3), etc.  |  |
| C.1  | **Key recommendation:**  |  |
| C.2  |  |  |
| C.3  |  |  |
| D  | Project Implementation & Adaptive Management  |  |
| D.1  | **Key recommendation:**  |  |
| D.2  |  |  |
| D.3  |  |  |
| E  | Sustainability  |  |
| E.1  | **Key recommendation:**  |  |
| E.2  |  |  |
| E. |  |  |

The MTR should make no more than 15 recommendations in total.

**Ratings**

The MTR will include its ratings of the project’s results and brief descriptions of the associated achievements in a *MTR Ratings & Achievement Summary Table* in the Executive Summary of the MTR report. See Annex E for ratings scales. No rating on Project Strategy and no overall project rating is required.

**Table. MTR Ratings & Achievement Summary Table for (*Project Title*)**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Measure** | **MTR Rating** | **Achievement Description** |
| **Project Strategy** | N/A |  |
| **Progress Towards Results** | Objective Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale) |  |
| Outcome 1 Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale) |  |
| Outcome 2 Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale) |  |
| Outcome 3 Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale) |  |
| Etc.  |  |
| **Project Implementation & Adaptive Management** | (rate 6 pt. scale) |  |
| **Sustainability** | (rate 4 pt. scale) |  |

**8. CONSULTANCY**

The International Consultant with relevant qualifications and experiences outlined under section 10 shall be engaged to lead the review according to the planned schedule.

The International Consultant should have in-depth understanding of UNDP supported projects including evaluation experience, and s/he will have the overall responsibility of organizing and completing the review, and with contributions, preparing the overall MTR methodology and MTR inception report, and submitting the draft and final MTR reports.

The collection of documents is to be done by PMU prior to commencing the work. The international consultant will sign an agreement with UNDP PNG and will be bound by its terms and conditions set in the agreement.

**9. PROPOSED SCHEDULE**

The consultancy will be for approximately 28 working days and will not exceed five months from when the consultant is hired. The review will include a country mission to PNG as well as a desk review and preparation of an inception report prior to the country mission, and preparation of the draft and final version of the MTR report. The international consultant will be paid in four payments as outlined in part 13 including international and domestic travel and DSA. The international consultant is responsible for submission of the draft Final Report to UNDP for circulation to relevant agencies within three weeks after the completion of the Evaluation mission to PNG. The international consultant will finalize the report within two weeks upon receiving comments and feedback from stakeholders compiled by UNDP.

Options for site visits should be provided in the inception report.

**10. DELIVERABLES**

The report together with the annexes shall be written in English and shall be presented in electronic form in MS Word format.

The tentative MTR schedule of deliverables, responsibilities and timeframes is detailed below:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **#** | **Deliverable** | **Description** | **Timing** | **Due Date** | **Responsibilities** |
| **1** | MTR Inception Report | MTR clarifies objectives and methods of Midterm Review/Inception Report  | No later than 2 weeks before the MTR mission | 15 November 2016  | MTR submits to the Commissioning Unit and project management |
| **2** | Presentation | Initial Findings | End of MTR mission | 9 December  | MTR presents to project management and the Commissioning Unit |
| **3** | Draft Report | Full report (using guidelines on content outlined in Annex B) with annexes | Within 2 weeks of the MTR mission | 23 December  | 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 |  3 February 2017 | 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.

**11.** **MTR ARRANGEMENTS**

The principal responsibility for managing this MTR resides with the Commissioning Unit. The Commissioning Unit for this project’s MTR is UNDP Papua New Guinea Country Office.

The UNDP PNG Country Office will contract the consultant and ensure the timely provision of support for the MTR including provision of per diems and travel arrangements within the country. The UNDP PNG Country Office with the assistance of Project Team will be responsible for liaising with the MTR to provide all relevant documents, set up stakeholder interviews, and arrange field visits.

**12. TEAM COMPOSITION**

The International Consultant will conduct the MTR. The consultant 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 international consultant will be supported by UNDP country office and/or the project team.

**13. REQUIRED QUALIFICATIONS**

The international consultant will have the following qualifications:

The selection of consultant will be aimed at maximizing the overall qualities in the following areas:

Education:

* MSc forest, environment natural resource management or relevant field.

Experience:

* Work experience in relevant technical areas for at least 10 years;
* Recent experience with result-based management and/or evaluation methodologies applied to biodiversity, natural resource management, sustainable forest management or related field
* Experience applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios;
* Competence in adaptive management, as applied to biodiversity conservation;
* Experience working in Papua New Guinea, Pacific Islands, or Developing Countries;
* Familiarity with the challenges developing countries face in sustainable natural resource management and biodiversity conservation particular including communities;
* Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender and biodiversity conservation and/or community-based conservation/natural resource management; experience in gender sensitive evaluation and analysis;
* Experience working with GEF or GEF evaluations;
* Excellent communication skills;
* Demonstrable analytical skills;
* Project evaluation/review experiences within United Nations system will be considered an asset.

**13. PAYMENT MODALITIES AND SPECIFICATIONS**

The international consultant will be paid on a lump sum basis including international and domestic travel and

DSA upon satisfactory delivery.

10% of payment upon approval of the final MTR Inception Report

10% of payment upon approval and presentation of Initial Findings

30% of payment upon submission of the draft MTR report

50% of payment upon finalization and approval of the MTR report

**14. APPLICATION PROCESS[[10]](#footnote-10)**

**Recommended Presentation of Proposal:**

1. **Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability** using the [template](https://intranet.undp.org/unit/bom/pso/Support%20documents%20on%20IC%20Guidelines/Template%20for%20Confirmation%20of%20Interest%20and%20Submission%20of%20Financial%20Proposal.docx)[[11]](#footnote-11) provided by UNDP;
2. **CV** and a **Personal History Form** ([P11 form](http://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/corporate/Careers/P11_Personal_history_form.doc)[[12]](#footnote-12));
3. **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 2 pages);
4. **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.

**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.

**Applications will be evaluated on the following Technical Criteria (Maximum 70 points):**

* Education: MSc on Formal legal background– Maximum 15 points;
* Relevant experience of at least 10 years in project evaluation– Maximum 30 points;
* Recent experience with result-based management and/or evaluation methodologies applied to biodiversity, natural resource management, sustainable forest management or related field – Maximum 25 points

Only candidates obtaining a minimum of 49 points (70% of the total technical points) would be considered for the Financial Evaluation.

All application materials should be submitted to the address UNDP Resident Representative, UNDP PNG, P.O.Box 1041, Port Moresby, Papua New Guinea) in a sealed envelope indicating the following reference “International Consultant for *Community-based Forest Conservation Project* Midterm Review” or by email at the following address ONLY: (registry.pg@undp.org) This email address is being protected from spam bots, you need Javascript enabled to view it by ***5pm, 22 October, 2016.*** Incomplete applications will be excluded from further consideration.

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

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 (PIRs)
7. Quarterly progress reports and work plans of the various implementation task teams
8. Audit reports
9. Finalized BD Tracking Tools at CEO endorsement and midterm (*fill in Results Tracker tab of the Project Performance Review*)
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:

1. Project operational guidelines, manuals and systems
2. UNDP country/countries programme document(s)
3. Minutes of the Annual Project Board Meetings and other meetings (i.e. Project Appraisal Committee (LPAC) meetings)
4. Project site location maps

**ToR ANNEX B: Guidelines on Contents for the Midterm Review Report**[[13]](#footnote-13)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **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
* 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)
* MTE 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)* |
|  |  **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 (review 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 (*METT, FSC, Capacity scorecard, etc.)*
 |

**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 MTE mission, etc.) | (i.e. document analysis, data analysis, interviews with project staff, interviews with stakeholders, etc.) |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| **Progress Towards Results: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved thus far?** |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| **Project Implementation and Adaptive Management: Has the project been implemented efficiently, cost-effectively, and been able to adapt to any changing conditions thus far? To what extent are project-level monitoring and evaluation systems, reporting, and project communications supporting the project’s implementation?** |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| **Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, socio-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?** |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

**ToR ANNEX D: UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluators/Midterm Review Consultants[[14]](#footnote-14)**

**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: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**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**

**Prepared by: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

*Emily Fajardo, Technical Specialist*

**Approved by: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

*Hisashi Izumi, Head of Programme*

1. Williams et al. (1993): Conservation Areas Strengthening Project 1994-2000 [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. WWF (2009): An Assessment of the Effectiveness of Papua New Guinea’s Protected Areas Using WWF’s RAPPAM Methodology. November 2009 [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. 13 Tortell and Duguman (2008): *Supporting Country Action on the CBD Programme of Work on Protected Areas, Report on Preparation of Request from Papua New Guinea*, UNDP, Port Moresby. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. Populate with data from the Logframe and scorecards [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. Populate with data from the Project Document [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. If available [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. Colour code this column only [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. Use the 6 point Progress Towards Results Rating Scale: HS, S, MS, MU, U, HU [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. Alternatively, MTE conclusions may be integrated into the body of the report. [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. 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> [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
11. <https://intranet.undp.org/unit/bom/pso/Support%20documents%20on%20IC%20Guidelines/Template%20for%20Confirmation%20of%20Interest%20and%20Submission%20of%20Financial%20Proposal.docx> [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
12. <http://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/corporate/Careers/P11_Personal_history_form.doc> [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
13. The Report length should not exceed *40* pages in total (not including annexes). [↑](#footnote-ref-13)
14. [www.undp.org/unegcodeofconduct](http://www.undp.org/unegcodeofconduct) [↑](#footnote-ref-14)