



## TERMS OF REFERENCE

### Team Member for the Mid-Term Review of the UNDP- GEF Project “Strengthening Sustainability of Protected Area Management in Myanmar”

Assignment Title	Team Member for the Mid-term Review (MTR) of UNDP Supported, GEF Funded Project in Myanmar
Project	Strengthening Sustainability of Protected Area Management in Myanmar
Type of Contract	Individual Contract ( <b>National Consultant</b> )
Contract Period	1 October– 15 November 2017
Estimated working days	25 days
Supervisor	Team Leader, Environmental Governance and Disaster Resilience
Duty Station	Home-based with travel to Nay Pyi Taw, Yangon, Kachin State, Sagaing Region
Country	Myanmar

#### A. BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT

The midterm review of the **Strengthening Sustainability of Protected Area Management in Myanmar** Project (PIMS #5162) is implemented through the *Wildlife Conservation Society (WCS)*, and is scheduled to be undertaken in *October 2017*. The project, funded by the Global Environment Facility (GEF) started on *1 July 2015* and is in its *second* 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* found via this link: [http://web.undp.org/evaluation/documents/guidance/GEF/mid-term/Guidance\\_Midterm%20Review%20EN\\_2014.pdf](http://web.undp.org/evaluation/documents/guidance/GEF/mid-term/Guidance_Midterm%20Review%20EN_2014.pdf).

The Strengthening Sustainability of Protected Area Management in Myanmar Project was designed with the overall goal of contributing to the conservation and sustainable use of globally significant biodiversity in Myanmar with the objective to strengthen the terrestrial system of national protected areas for biodiversity conservation through enhanced representation, management effectiveness, monitoring, enforcement and financing. To achieve the project objective, and based on a barrier analysis which identified: (i) the problem being addressed by the project; (ii) its root causes; and (iii) the barriers that need to be overcome to address the problem and its root causes, the project’s intervention has been organized into two components.

Component 1 addresses the first barrier: the weak systematic and institutional capacity to plan and manage the expanded national protected area (PA) system. This is being addressed through a range of inputs aiming to: strengthen the national and regional policy and planning frameworks in relation to PAs; build central capacity for PA system management; expand the PA system coverage to 10% of the national land area; develop a systematic approach for sustainable financing of the expanded PA system; and integrate PA values into regional and local development for sub national government units associated with the demonstration PAs.

Component 2 addresses the second barrier: insufficient management capacity and motivation at the PA level to manage local threats and achieve conservation outcomes. This component focuses on strengthening management effectiveness, financial sustainability, community engagement, monitoring and planning to address external threats at the four selected demonstration PAs. The two components will result in the following project outcomes which are in line with the UNDP's country program output of 'enhanced capacities to sustainably manage natural resources at local, regional and national levels'. The project document can be found via this link:<https://www.thegef.org/project/strengthening-sustainability-protected-area-management>.

The project has two overall outcomes:

- **Outcome 1:** Enhanced Systemic, Institutional and Financial Frameworks for Protected Area Expansion and Management:
- **Outcome 2:** Strengthened Management and Threat Reduction in the Target Protected Areas and Buffer Zone:

The project is being implemented in four demonstration PA sites in Kachin State and Sagaing Region: Hukaung Valley Wildlife Sanctuary, Hkakaborazi National Park, Hponkanrazi Wildlife Sanctuary, and Htamanthi Wildlife Sanctuary. National level project coordination takes place in Nay Pyi Taw. The Myanmar Ministry of Natural Resources and Environmental Conservation (MONREC), formerly the Ministry of Environmental Conservation and Forestry, is the lead government agency and is responsible for the coordination of the project activities on behalf of the Government of Myanmar.

In line with the project cooperation agreement signed between UNDP and the Wildlife Conservation Society (WCS), the project is being implemented by the WCS under the civil society organization (CSO) modality. As implementing partner of the project, WCS is responsible for the project implementation, and the timely and verifiable attainment of project objectives and outcomes. The project is scheduled to run for 60 months and is expected to end on 30 June 2020. It is fully funded by the GEF in the amount of USD 6,027,397 and with planned government co-financing estimated at USD 4,646,300.

## **B. OBJECTIVES OF THE MID-TERM REVIEW**

---

This MTR will assess progress towards the achievement of the project objectives and outcomes as specified in the project document, and assess early signs of project success or failure with the goal of identifying the necessary changes to be made to set the project on-track to achieve its intended results. The MTR will also review the project's strategy and any risks to its sustainability.

## **C. MID-TERM REVIEW 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 mid-term 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 key senior management and environment program staff of the UNDP Myanmar Country Office; the Wildlife Conservation Society project team; government officials from MONREC, specifically the Environmental Conservation Department; executing agencies, senior officials and task team/ component leaders, key experts and consultants in the subject area, Project Board, project stakeholders, academia, local government and CSOs, etc. Additionally, the MTR Team is expected to conduct field missions to Kachin State, Sagaing Region, Nay Pyi Taw, and Yangon), including the following project sites: Htamanthi Wildlife Sanctuary, Hponkanrazi Wildlife Sanctuary and Hkakaborazi National Park.

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.

#### D. SCOPE OF WORK

---

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.

##### a) Project Strategy

###### Project Design:

- Review the problem addressed by the project and the underlying assumptions. Review the effect of any incorrect assumptions or changes to the context to achieving the project results as outlined in the Project Document.
- Review the relevance of the project strategy and assess whether it provides the most effective route towards expected/intended results. Were lessons from other relevant projects properly incorporated into the project design?
- Review how the project addresses country priorities. Review country ownership. Was the project concept in line with the national sector development priorities and plans of the country (or of participating countries in the case of multi-country projects)?
- Review decision-making processes: were perspectives of those who would be affected by project decisions, those who could affect the outcomes, and those who could contribute information or other resources to the process, taken into account during project design processes?
- Review the extent to which relevant gender issues were raised in the project design. See Annex 9 of *Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects* for further guidelines.
- If there are major areas of concern, recommend areas for improvement.

###### Results Framework/Logframe:

- Undertake a critical analysis of the project's logframe indicators and targets, assess how "SMART" the midterm and end-of-project targets are (Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Relevant, Time-bound), and suggest specific amendments/revisions to the targets and indicators as necessary.

---

<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.

- Are the project's objectives and outcomes or components clear, practical, and feasible within its time frame?
- Examine if progress so far has led to, or could in the future catalyse beneficial development effects (i.e. income generation, gender equality and women's empowerment, improved governance etc...) that should be included in the project results framework and monitored on an annual basis.
- Ensure broader development and gender aspects of the project are being monitored effectively. Develop and recommend SMART 'development' indicators, including sex-disaggregated indicators and indicators that capture development benefits.

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-of-project Target	Midterm Level & Assessment <sup>6</sup>	Achievement Rating <sup>7</sup>	Justification for Rating
Objective:	Indicator (if applicable):							
Outcome 1:	Indicator 1:							
	Indicator 2:							
Outcome 2:	Indicator 3:							
	Indicator 4:							
	Etc.							
Etc.								

#### b) Progress Towards Results

##### Progress Towards Outcomes Analysis:

- Review the logframe indicators against progress made towards the end-of-project targets using the Progress Towards Results Matrix and following the *Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects*; colour code progress in a "traffic light system" based on the level of progress achieved; assign a rating on progress for each outcome; make recommendations from the areas marked as "Not on target to be achieved" (red).

**Table. Progress Towards Results Matrix (Achievement of Outcomes against End-of-Project Targets)**

##### Indicator Assessment Key

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

In addition to the progress towards outcomes analysis:

- Compare and analyse the GEF Tracking Tool at the Baseline with the one completed right before the Midterm Review.
- Identify remaining barriers to achieving the project objective in the remainder of the project.
- By reviewing the aspects of the project that have already been successful, identify ways in which the project can further expand these benefits.

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

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

<sup>5</sup> If available

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

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

### c) 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 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.

#### **d) 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?

### Summary of Conclusions & Recommendations

The MTR Team will include a section in the report which outlines 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 in total.***

### Summary of 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 the achievement summary and ratings scales. No rating on Project Strategy and no overall project rating is required.

## E. MID-TERM REVIEW DELIVERABLES

The MTR, led by the International Consultant, will be responsible for completion of deliverables outlined in the table below:

#	Deliverable	Description	Estimated Timing	Responsibilities
1	<b>MTR Inception Report</b>	MTR Team clarifies objectives and methods of Midterm Review	No later than 2 weeks before the MTR mission	MTR Team submits to the UNDP and the WCS Project Management Team
2	<b>Presentation</b>	Initial Findings presented to selected audience	End of MTR mission	MTR Team presents to the UNDP and the Project Management Team
3	<b>Draft Final Report</b>	Full report submitted (using guidelines on content outlined in Annex B) with annexes	Within 3 weeks of the MTR mission	Sent to the UNDP, reviewed by the RTA, Project Coordinating Unit, GEF OFP
4	<b>Final Report*</b>	Revised report with audit trail detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final MTR report	Within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft	Sent to the UNDP

\* The final MTR report must be in English; submitted as both Word and PDF documents. If applicable, UNDP Myanmar may choose to arrange for a translation of the report into a language more widely shared by national stakeholders.

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

## F. COMPOSITION OF THE MID-TERM REVIEW TEAM

---

- A team of two independent consultants will conduct the MTR.
- The team will be led by one international team leader (with experience and exposure to projects and evaluations in other regions globally) and further comprised of one Myanmar national who will serve as the team expert.
- The consultants must be persons who have not 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 the project's related activities.

### Team Roles:

- The Lead Consultant is ultimately responsible for the timely completion and submission of all deliverables.
- The Team Member will make significant contributions to the deliverables and provide insights to the Myanmar operating context
  - The Team Member will be responsible for:
    - Providing inputs and insights (based on the context biodiversity conservation / protected area management) to the independent evaluation of the project
    - Participate in and contribute to meetings with governments counterparts, UN/UNDP staff, donors and other partners with the Team Leader
    - Providing support and assistance to finalize the mission agenda, meetings and required visits
    - Provide inputs to the deliverables: inception report, draft evaluation report, evaluation brief and final evaluation report
    - Providing Myanmar language interpretation during for meeting; and translation of documents (as required), to ensure clear communication between the international consultant and all concerned stakeholders
- *This Terms of Reference is for the Team Member (National Consultant)*

## G. EXPERTISE AND QUALIFICATIONS REQUIRED

---

The Team Member (National Consultant) should have the following expertise and qualifications:

### **Education**

- At Bachelor's degree or higher in biodiversity conservation, environmental finance, economics, environmental or natural resource economics, environmental planning/management, public finance, or other closely related field.

### **Experience**

- At least 7 years' experience in sustainable development management, natural resource management, ecology, or conservation-related areas
- Knowledge and demonstrable experience in the field of environmental sciences and natural resource management in Myanmar is strongly preferred
- Proven skills and experience in conducting evaluations and project/program assessments is highly desirable
- Experience working with environmental conservation projects is strongly preferred



- Track record of previous research, evaluations and assessments
- Experience working with and delivering support to governments;

**Competencies**

- Excellent spoken and written English language communication skills is mandatory
- Fluency in spoken and written Myanmar language
- Ability to carry out field research and evaluations
- Ability to make presentations and convey key messages to a range of stakeholders including government officials and donor representatives
- Strong analytical skills

## H. TIMEFRAME FOR THE ASSIGNMENT

---

- The total duration of the MTR will be approximately *8 weeks* starting *1 October 2017*, and shall not exceed two months from when the consultant(s) are contracted.
  - The Team Member (National Consultant) will be contracted for 6 weeks during this period
- The contract will come into effect in October 2017 and will last for 6 weeks from the start date of contract
- The consultant will work for a period of 25 work days during the period 1 October to 15 November 2017.

## I. MANAGEMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS

---

1. The principal responsibility for managing this MTR resides with the Commissioning Unit i.e. the UNDP Myanmar Country Office. UNDP Myanmar will contract the consultants and ensure the timely provision of per diems and travel arrangements within Myanmar for the MTR Team.
2. The WCS Project Team will be responsible for liaising with the MTR Team to provide all relevant documents, arrange stakeholder meetings and interviews, and arrange field visits.

The following management and implementation arrangements will be in place:

- The consultants will report to the UNDP Team Leader, Environmental Governance and Disaster Resilience
- The Program Management Specialist will act as the UNDP Program Team focal point for this assignment
- The MTR will be carried out in close collaboration with the Regional Technical Advisor
- In accordance with expected outputs and deliverables, the consultants will submit required reports and updates to the UNDP Myanmar Program Team for reviewing outputs, comments, and certifying approval/acceptance of works afterwards.
- In case of any delays in achieving the expected outputs, the MTR Team should notify the UNDP Program Team in advance so that necessary steps are taken in a timely manner
- UNDP and WCS will facilitate government (and other counterpart) cooperation for this assignment, including visas and travel authorization as required
- The consultants will be given access to relevant information necessary for execution of the tasks under this assignment
- Consultants are responsible for providing their own laptop computers and mobile phones for use during this assignment; the consultants must have access to reliable internet connection for the duration of the assignment

**TRAVEL:**

- Any necessary missions must be approved in advance and in writing by the supervisor
- All travels within Myanmar will be arranged by the UNDP Myanmar Country Office and the Wildlife Conservation Society

- The in-country mission will last for approximately 4 weeks with travel to project sites in remote areas in Northern Myanmar (Kachin State and Sagaing Region).
  - Applicants are advised that travel to project sites will include air travel (3 hours), travel by boat (4 hours), and extended treks (up to 9 hours)
    - Consultants are advised to pack appropriate clothing and footwear
  - Project site visits will last approximately 12 days
- For all required travel, UNDP will provide economy class air fares and living allowance rates prevailing at the time of sourcing, for the duty station and all other cities indicated in the TOR as part of duty travel destinations.
- Consultants will be entitled to apply for reimbursement of costs associated with necessary work-related travel in accordance with UNDP's travel policy for consultants and upon submission of claim forms and supporting documents
- The Basic Security in the Field II and Advanced Security in the Field courses must be successfully completed prior to commencement of travel.
  - The basic training course can be accessed here: <https://training.dss.un.org/course/detail/19928>.
  - The advance course can be accessed here: <https://training.dss.un.org/course/detail/19921>.
- Consultants must comply with the UN security directives set forth under <https://dss.un.org/dssweb/>.
- Consultants are responsible for ensuring they have vaccinations/inoculations when travelling to Myanmar, as designated by the UN Medical Doctor

## J. DUTY STATION

This assignment will be home-based with mission travel to locations in Myanmar as deemed necessary for completion of the MTR namely: Nay Pyi Taw, Yangon, Kachin State, and Sagaing Region.

## K. PAYMENT MODALITIES AND SPECIFICATIONS

The consultants will be paid upon completion of deliverables and approval by the UNDP Myanmar Program Team as detailed below:

	Deliverables/ Outputs	Estimated Due Date	Contract Percentage
1	Upon submission and approval of the final MTR Inception Report	9 October 2017	20%
2	Upon presentation of initial findings	30 October 2017	30%
3	Upon submission of the draft MTR report	15 November 2017	30%
	<b>Total</b>		<b>100%</b>

- Payments will be made only upon confirmation by UNDP of the consultants having delivered all contract obligations in a satisfactory manner.
- Payments will be made to consultants upon submission of a detailed time sheet (where applicable) and certification of payment form

## L. APPLICATION PROCESS

---

Interested persons are requested to submit the following documents as part of their application:

- 1) **Brief description/ Cover letter** of why the individual considers him/herself as the most suitable for the assignment
- 2) **Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability** using the template provided by UNDP.
- 3) **CV and Personal History (P11) Form** indicating all relevant experience as well as the contact details (email and telephone number) of the candidate and at least three (3) professional references. Please use the P11 form provided by UNDP.
- 4) **Sample of previous written work** i.e. a project report, assessment report (written by you)
- 5) **Financial Proposal** that indicates the daily fees and costs of air travel between city and country of residence and Myanmar as per the template provided by UNDP. Please quote return ticket air fares.
  - 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.

Applicants are advised to take note of the following conditions:

- For any air travel required, UNDP will pay economy class air fares as per the UNDP policy for consultants' travel
- The contract price is fixed regardless of changes in the cost components

Interested persons are requested to **26 September 2017** by sending their application to [bids.mm@undp.org](mailto:bids.mm@undp.org) with the subject line "Team Member: Mid-term Review of the UNDP-GEF Funded Project in Myanmar".

## M. CRITERIA FOR SELECTION OF THE BEST OFFER

---

The following criteria shall serve as basis for evaluating offers:

- **Combined Scoring Method:** Where the qualifications and methodology will be weighted a maximum of 70% and combined with the price offer which will be weighted a maximum of 30%
- **Technical Evaluation of Proposals:** All applications comprising the information/documentation provided will be evaluated to ascertain the suitability of the applicants to carry out the assignment. Candidates who obtain the minimum of 49 points of the full mark (70 points) will be considered technically compliant and their financial evaluations will be evaluated thereafter.
  - Applications will be scored as per the following breakdown (Total 70 points):
    - o **Educational background: 10 points**
      - A Master's degree or higher in biodiversity conservation, environmental finance, economics, environmental or natural resource economics, environmental planning/management, public finance, or other closely related field.
    - o **Relevant Experience: 50 points**
      - At least 10 years' experience in environment and/or conservation finance or
      - At least 7 years' experience in sustainable development management, natural resource management, ecology, or conservation-related areas
      - Knowledge and demonstrable experience in the field of environmental sciences and natural resource management in Myanmar is strongly preferred

- Proven skills and experience in conducting evaluations and project/program assessments is highly desirable
- Experience working with environmental conservation projects is strongly preferred
- Track record of previous research, evaluations and assessments
- Experience working with and delivering support to governments;
- **English language skills: 10 points**
  - Fluency in written and spoken English
- **Financial Evaluation of Proposals:**
  - The financial proposals of all the applicants who pass the technical evaluation will be scored.
  - The maximum 30 points will be allotted to the lowest financial bid, and all other bids shall receive points in inverse proportion to the lowest fee e.g. [30 Points] x [USD lowest] / [USD other] = points for other proposer's fees
- The contract shall be awarded to the applicant who receives the highest cumulative score.
- Where possible, consultants will be selected from UNDP pre-approved rosters of experts.

## **N. APPROVAL**

---

This TOR is approved by:

Lat Lat Aye  
Team Leader, Environmental Governance and Disaster Resilience

Signature:



Date:

12 Sept. 2017

## **ToR ANNEX A: List of Documents to be Reviewed by the MTR Team**

---

1. PIF
2. UNDP Initiation Plan
3. UNDP Project Document
4. UNDP Environmental and Social Screening results
5. Project Inception Report
6. All Project Implementation Reports (PIR's)
7. Quarterly progress reports and work plans of the various implementation task teams
8. Audit reports
9. Finalized GEF focal area Tracking Tools at CEO endorsement and midterm
  - i. *Capacity Development Scorecard*
  - ii. *Financial Sustainability Scorecard*
  - iii. *Management Effective Tracking Tool (METT)*
10. Oversight mission reports
11. All monitoring reports prepared by the project
12. Financial and Administration guidelines used by Project Team

The following documents will also be available:

13. Project operational guidelines, manuals and systems
14. UNDP country programme document
15. Minutes of the Project Board Meetings and other meetings (i.e. Project Appraisal Committee meetings)
16. 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
    - Stakeholder engagement
    - Reporting
    - Communications

---

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

- 4.4 Sustainability
  - Financial risks to sustainability
  - Socio-economic to sustainability
  - Institutional framework and governance risks to sustainability
  - Environmental risks to sustainability
- 5. Conclusions and Recommendations (4-6 pages)
  - 5.1 Conclusions
    - Comprehensive and balanced statements (that are evidence-based and connected to the MTR's findings) which highlight the strengths, weaknesses and results of the project
  - 5.2 Recommendations
    - Corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project
    - Actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the project
    - Proposals for future directions underlining main objectives
- 6. Annexes
  - MTR ToR (excluding ToR annexes)
  - MTR evaluative matrix (evaluation criteria with key questions, indicators, sources of data, and methodology)
  - Example Questionnaire or Interview Guide used for data collection
  - Ratings Scales
  - MTR mission itinerary
  - List of persons interviewed
  - List of documents reviewed
  - Co-financing table (if not previously included in the body of the report)
  - Signed UNEG Code of Conduct form
  - Signed MTR final report clearance form
  - *Annexed in a separate file:* Audit trail from received comments on draft MTR report
  - *Annexed in a separate file:* Relevant midterm tracking tools (*METT, FSC, Capacity scorecard, etc.*)

## 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 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: \_\_\_\_\_

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

## ToR ANNEX E: MTR Ratings

Table. MTR Ratings & Achievement Summary Table for Project

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

Ratings for Progress Towards Results: (one rating for each outcome and for the objective)		
6	Highly Satisfactory (HS)	The objective/outcome is expected to achieve or exceed all its end-of-project targets, without major shortcomings. The progress towards the objective/outcome can be presented as "good practice".
5	Satisfactory (S)	The objective/outcome is expected to achieve most of its end-of-project targets, with only minor shortcomings.
4	Moderately Satisfactory (MS)	The objective/outcome is expected to achieve most of its end-of-project targets but with significant shortcomings.
3	Moderately Unsatisfactory (HU)	The objective/outcome is expected to achieve its end-of-project targets with major shortcomings.
2	Unsatisfactory (U)	The objective/outcome is expected not to achieve most of its end-of-project targets.
1	Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)	The objective/outcome has failed to achieve its midterm targets, and is not expected to achieve any of its end-of-project targets.

Ratings for Project Implementation & Adaptive Management: (one overall rating)		
6	Highly Satisfactory (HS)	Implementation of all seven components – management arrangements, work planning, finance and co-finance, project-level monitoring and evaluation systems, stakeholder engagement, reporting, and communications – is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management. The project can be presented as “good practice”.
5	Satisfactory (S)	Implementation of most of the seven components is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management except for only few that are subject to remedial action.
4	Moderately Satisfactory (MS)	Implementation of some of the seven components is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management, with some components requiring remedial action.
3	Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)	Implementation of some of the seven components is not leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive, with most components requiring remedial action.
2	Unsatisfactory (U)	Implementation of most of the seven components is not leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management.
1	Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)	Implementation of none of the seven components is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management.

Ratings for Sustainability: (one overall rating)		
4	Likely (L)	Negligible risks to sustainability, with key outcomes on track to be achieved by the project's closure and expected to continue into the foreseeable future
3	Moderately Likely (ML)	Moderate risks, but expectations that at least some outcomes will be sustained due to the progress towards results on outcomes at the Midterm Review
2	Moderately Unlikely (MU)	Significant risk that key outcomes will not carry on after project closure, although some outputs and activities should carry on
1	Unlikely (U)	Severe risks that project outcomes as well as key outputs will not be sustained

## ToR ANNEX F: MTR Report Clearance Form

---

*(to be completed 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: \_\_\_\_\_