

## Terms of Reference

<b>Country:</b>	Kazakhstan
<b>Position:</b>	International Consultant to carry out Midterm Evaluation of the UNDP/GEF project
<b>Project name:</b>	Supporting sustainable land management in steppe and semi-arid zones through integrated territorial planning and agro-environmental incentives”
<b>Contract type:</b>	Individual contract
<b>Duty station:</b>	Home based with once time travel to Kazakhstan (project sites)
<b>Duration:</b>	June – October 2017 (25 working days)

### 1. INTRODUCTION

This is the Terms of Reference (ToR) for the UNDP-GEF Midterm Review (MTR) of the mid - sized project titled “**Supporting sustainable land management in steppe and semi-arid zones through integrated territorial planning and agro-environmental incentives**” (PIMS #00088403) implemented through the Ministry of Agriculture of Republic of Kazakhstan.

The project started on the Project Document signature date and is in its third 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](http://web.undp.org/evaluation/documents/guidance/GEF/mid-term/Guidance_Midterm%20Review%20_EN_2014.pdf))

### 2. PROJECT BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Building upon the experience of GEF funded projects’ efforts, the project is designed to create a more conducive policy and legal framework for establishment of agro-environmental incentives for sustainable and better integrated pasture and land use planning and management, and build national and local capacity for practical implementation of such planning in the field.

The Government of Kazakhstan is requesting GEF incremental assistance to address the situation described above by focusing on sustainable land management in critical, productive, steppe, arid and semi-arid landscapes found in Akmola, Kostanay, North and East Kazakhstan Oblasts (i.e., the northern steppe zone: forest steppe, meadow steppe and dry steppe ecosystems), and Almaty and Kyzyl Orda Oblasts (i.e., the southern arid zone: desert and steppe semi-desert ecosystems) of the country. Support is needed to change existing patterns of land use and improve land conditions by strengthening agricultural financial mechanisms and the current land-use planning system, which are the basic financial and administrative drivers of land use, thus addressing land degradation problems in the long term.

The project has built its implementation activities upon existing national subsidy programs in the agricultural sector, as well as on the national environmental development approach by facilitating integrated land use planning, with the emphasis being on decentralization and bottom-up planning, as opposed to the existing highly centralized, top-down system. This will include the wider application of a new financial mechanism in pasture and productive landscape management. Building upon the

experience of GEF funded projects' efforts, the project will create a more conducive policy and legal framework for establishment of agro-environmental incentives for sustainable and better integrated pasture and land use planning and management, and build national and local capacity for practical implementation of such planning in the field. Existing best practices and approaches will be replicated at a wider scale within selected representative oblasts.

The project document was signed in August 2015, and its implementation started in October 2015. Total project budget is \$9,499,459 million, 1,9 million of which is a contribution from the GEF. Implementing Agency from the part of the Government of the Republic of Kazakhstan is the Analytical center for economic research in agro-industrial complex of the Ministry of Agriculture of RK.

### **3. OBJECTIVES OF THE MTR**

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 set the project on the right track to achieve its intended results. The MTR will also review the project's strategy; pilots plots and 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 approach<sup>1</sup> 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.<sup>2</sup> Stakeholder involvement should include interviews with stakeholders who have project responsibilities, including but not limited to *UNDP Kazakhstan, project team*; executing agencies, senior officials and task team/ component leaders, key experts and consultants in the subject area, Project Board, project stakeholders, Protected Areas employees, academia, local government and CSOs, etc. Additionally, the MTR team is expected to conduct field missions to Kazakhstan, including the following project sites Astana city, Kyzylorda region, Kostanay and East Kazakhstan regions.

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**

---

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

<sup>2</sup> 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.

### 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, considered 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.
- If there are major areas of concern, recommend areas for improvement.

### Results Framework/Logframe:

- Undertake a critical analysis of the project's log frame 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 catalyze 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 log frame 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*; color 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 <sup>3</sup>	Baseline Level <sup>4</sup>	Level in 1 <sup>st</sup> PIR (self-reported)	Midterm Target <sup>5</sup>	End-ofproject Target	Midterm Level & Assessment <sup>6</sup>	Achievement Rating <sup>7</sup>	Justification for Rating
------------------	------------------------	-----------------------------	----------------------------------------------	-----------------------------	----------------------	-----------------------------------------	---------------------------------	--------------------------

<sup>3</sup> Populate with data from the Log frame and scorecards

<sup>4</sup> Populate with data from the Project Document

<sup>5</sup> If available

<sup>6</sup> Color code this column only

<sup>7</sup> Use the 6-point Progress Towards Results Rating Scale: HS, S, MS, MU, U, HU

<b>Objective:</b>	Indicator (if applicable):							
<b>Outcome 1:</b>	Indicator 1:							
	Indicator 2:							
<b>Outcome 2:</b>	Indicator 3:							
	Indicator 4:							
	Etc.							
<b>Etc.</b>								

#### **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 analyze 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.

#### 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/ log frame 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 because 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 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?
- Review all the project pilots and evaluate the proposals made under each pilot projects. Are those pilots being consistent with the project objectives and goals. Are those pilots are being sufficiently implemented.

#### 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 the concepts and strategies of the pilot plots being implemented in six targeted regions
- 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:

- 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.

#### 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, considering the findings.<sup>8</sup>

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.

**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  
(Improving sustainability of the protected areas system in desert ecosystems through promotion of biodiversity-compatible live-support sources in and around protected areas)

Measure	MTR Rating	Achievement Description
<b>Project Strategy</b>	N/A	
<b>Progress Towards Results</b>	Objective Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale)	
	Outcome 1 Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale)	
	Outcome 2 Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale)	
	Etc.	

<sup>8</sup> Alternatively, MTR conclusions may be integrated into the body of the report.

<b>Project Implementation &amp; Adaptive Management</b>	(rate 6 pt. scale)	
<b>Sustainability</b>	(rate 4 pt. scale)	

## 6. TIMEFRAME

The MTR consultancy will be for **25 days** over a period of approximately **15 weeks** starting June 17, 2017 and shall not exceed five months from when the consultant(s) are hired. The tentative MTR timeframe is as follows:

TIMEFRAME	ACTIVITY
12 May 2017	Application closes
Not later 02 June 2017	Select MTR Team
Not later 15 June 2017	Prep the MTR Team (handover of Project Documents)
Not later 23 June 2017, 2 days (1-2)	Document review and preparing MTR Inception Report
Not later 30 June 2017, 1 day (3)	Finalization and Validation of MTR Inception Report- latest start of MTR mission
Not later 05 July 2017, 5 days (4-8)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- MTR mission: stakeholder meetings, interviews, field visits (pls. see Mission agenda below);</li> <li>- mission wrap-up meeting &amp; presentation of initial findings- earliest end of MTR</li> </ul>
Not later 14 August 2017, 7 days (9-15)	Preparing draft report
Not later 04 September 2017, 7 days (16-22)	Incorporating audit trail from feedback on draft report/Finalization of MTR report
Not later 22 September 2017	Preparation & Issue of Management Response
Not later 10 October 2017, 3 days (23-25)	Expected date of full MTR completion

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

### **Travel:**

All envisaged travel costs including trip to Astana (3 days), Kyzylorda (1 day), Kostanay (1 day), Ayagoz East-Kazakhstan region (2 days) and per diem must be included in financial proposal (UNDP rate per diem for April, 2017 for Astana (\$177), Kyzylorda (\$113), Ayagoz East-Kazakhstan region (113). In general, UNDP should not accept travel costs exceeding those of an economy class ticket. Should the IC wish to travel on a higher class he/she should do so using their own resources.

In the case of unforeseeable travel, payment of travel costs including tickets, lodging and terminal expenses should be agreed upon, between the respective business unit and Individual Consultant, prior to travel and will be reimbursed.

### MTR mission agenda

Day	Time	Activity
First day, Astana	TBC	Arrival to Astana
Second day, Astana	09.00 -13.00	Presentation of project team
	13.00 -14.00	Lunch
	14.00 – 15.00	Meeting in UNDP Sustainable Development and Urbanization Unit and Deputy Resident Representative Mrs. Tuya Altangerel
	16.00 – 18.00	Meeting in the Ministry of Agriculture and Mr. Aidos Mukashbekov, acting director general, Center for economic research in the Agroindustry sector of the MOA RK.
Third day, Kyzylorda oblast	9:30 – 10:30	Flight to Kyzylorda
	11:00 – 12:00	Meeting with the administration of the Rice Research Institute
	13:00 – 18:00	Visit Demonstration plots
Fourth day Kostanay oblast	07:30 – 12:00	Flight from Kyzylorda to Kostanay
	10:00 – 13:00	Meeting with administration of the Research Institute of Agriculture
	13:00 – 18:00	Visit Demonstration plots
Fifth day, Ayaghoz East Kazakhstan region	07:15 – 12:00	Flight from Kostanay to Ustkamenagorsk
	14:30 – 15:00	Departure to Ayaghoz region
	15:00 – 20:00	Meeting with local parliament of Ayaghoz region
Sixth day, Ayaghoz East Kazakhstan region	07:15 – 12:00	Visit Demo plot in Ayaghoz
	14:30 – 17:30	Flight to Astana
Seventh day	Whole day	Deskwork and finalization of the mission in the project office

### 7. MIDTERM REVIEW DELIVERABLES

#	Deliverable	Description	Timing	Responsibilities
1	<b>MTR Inception Report</b>	MTR team clarifies objectives and methods of Midterm Review	Not later 30 June, 3 days	MTR team submits to the Commissioning Unit and project management
2	<b>Presentation</b>	Initial Findings	Not later 21 July, 1 day	MTR Team presents to project management and the Commissioning Unit
3	<b>Draft Final Report</b>	Full report (using guidelines on content outlined in Annex B) with annexes	Not later 14 August, within 2 weeks, 7 days	Sent to the Commissioning Unit, reviewed by RTA, Project Coordinating Unit, GEF OFP
4	<b>Final Report*</b>	Revised report with	Not later 10 October	Sent to the Commissioning



		audit trail detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final MTR report	2017, within 4 weeks, 10 days	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

MTR is UNDP Kazakhstan *(In the case of single-country projects, the Commissioning Unit is the UNDP. The principal responsibility for managing this MTR resides with the Commissioning Unit. The Commissioning Unit for this project's Country Office. In the case of regional projects and jointly-implemented projects, typically the principal responsibility for managing this MTR resides with the country or agency or regional coordination body – please confirm with the UNDPGEF team in the region – that is receiving the larger proportion of GEF financing. For global projects, the Commissioning Unit can be the UNDP-GEF Directorate or the lead UNDP Country Office).*

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

## 9. TEAM COMPOSITION

One independent consultant will conduct the MTR with the support of national translator. 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 selection of consultant 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 biodiversity conservation and land desertification protection;
- Experience working with the GEF or GEF-evaluations;
- Experience working in the CIS region is desirable (preferable Kazakhstan);
- Work experience in the water and sustainable land management or biodiversity area for at least 5 years;
- Demonstrated understanding of issues related to Environmental Economics, Agriculture, Sustainable Land Management, Organic Farming, Biodiversity conservation; experience in gender sensitive evaluation and analysis;
- Project evaluation/review experiences within United Nations system will be considered an asset;
- University degree in natural resources management, economics, environmental studies;
- Excellent communication skills;
- Demonstrable analytical skills;
- Full proficiency in English both written and verbal including ability to review, draft guidelines and edit required project documentation.

## 10. PAYMENT MODALITIES AND SPECIFICATIONS

The financial proposal shall specify a total lump sum amount, and payment terms around specific and measurable (qualitative and quantitative) deliverables (i.e. whether payments fall in installments or upon completion of the entire contract). Payments are based upon output, i.e. upon delivery of the services specified in the TOR. In order to assist the requesting unit in the comparison of financial proposals, the financial proposal will include a breakdown of this lump sum amount (including travel, per diems, and number of anticipated working days).

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

30 % upon submission of the draft MTR report

60 % upon finalization of the MTR report

## 11. APPLICATION PROCESS<sup>48</sup>

### Recommended Presentation of Proposal:

- Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability** using the [template](#)<sup>49</sup> provided by UNDP;
- CV or a Personal History Form** ([P11 form](#)<sup>50</sup>);
- 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.

<sup>48</sup> 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>

<sup>49</sup>

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

<sup>50</sup> [http://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/corporate/Careers/P11\\_Personal\\_history\\_form.doc](http://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/corporate/Careers/P11_Personal_history_form.doc)

### Criteria for Evaluation of Proposal:

Initially, individual consultants shall be short-listed on the following minimum qualification criteria:

- University degree in natural resources management, economics, environmental studies;*
- Work experience in the water and sustainable land management or biodiversity area for at least 5 years.*

The shortlisted candidates will be further evaluated based on Cumulative Scoring method – where the below indicated criteria (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.

<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Weight %</b>	<b>Max. points</b>
<b><u>Academic background and skills</u></b>		
A Master's degree in natural resources management, economics, environmental studies or other closely related field;	20%	100

Full proficiency of English language, excellent communication skills; demonstrable analytical skills;	15%	75
<b>Experience:</b>		
Work experience in relevant technical areas for at least 10 years; Demonstrated understanding of issues related to Environmental Economics, Agriculture, Sustainable Land Management, Organic Farming, Biodiversity conservation; experience in gender sensitive evaluation and analysis;	25%	125
Recent experience with result-based management evaluation methodologies;	15%	75
Experience working with the GEF or GEF-evaluations; Experience working in the CIS region is desirable; Project evaluation/review experiences within United Nations system will be considered an asset;	15%	75
Experience applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios; Competence in adaptive management, as applied to biodiversity conservation and land desertification protection.	10%	50
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>500</b>

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. All Project Implementation Reports (PIR's)
6. Quarterly progress reports and work plans of the various implementation task teams
7. Audit reports
8. Finalized GEF focal area Tracking Tools at CEO endorsement and midterm (*METT pilot protected areas*)
9. All monitoring reports prepared by the project
10. Financial and Administration guidelines used by Project Team

The following documents will also be available:

11. Project operational guidelines, manuals and systems
12. UNDP country/countries programme document(s)
13. Minutes of the Project Board Meetings and other meetings (i.e. Project Appraisal Committee meetings)
14. Project site location maps

## ToR ANNEX B: Guidelines on Contents for the Midterm Review Report<sup>9</sup>

### 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

#### 4.3 Project Implementation and Adaptive Management

- Management Arrangements
- Work planning
- Finance and co-finance
- Project-level monitoring and evaluation systems

---

<sup>9</sup> The Report length should not exceed 40 pages in total (not including annexes).

- 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 (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

## ToR ANNEX C: Midterm Review Evaluative Matrix Template

Evaluative Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
<b>Project Strategy: To what extent is the project strategy relevant to country priorities, country ownership, and the best route towards expected results?</b>			
(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.)
<b>Progress Towards Results: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved thus far?</b>			
<b>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?</b>			
<b>Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, socio-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?</b>			

**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 during 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)**

<sup>10</sup> [www.undp.org/unegcodeofconduct](http://www.undp.org/unegcodeofconduct)

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.

<b>Ratings for Project Implementation &amp; Adaptive Management: (one overall rating)</b>		
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.

<b>Ratings for Sustainability: (one overall rating)</b>		
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: \_\_\_\_\_