

INDIVIDUAL CONSULTANT PROCUREMENT NOTICE



Date: 5 July 2018

Country: Bangkok, Thailand

Description of the assignment: UNDP-GEF Midterm Review Term of Reference (National MTR Consultant)

Duty Station: home-based with one mission to Bangkok and the project sites in Thailand.

Project name: Sustainable Management Models for Local Government Organisations to Enhance Biodiversity Protection and Utilization in Selected Eco-regions of Thailand

Period of assignment/services (if applicable): 30 July 2018 to 19 November 2018 with maximum of 24 working days.

Proposal should be submitted no later than **22 July 2018**

Please click on the link below to apply: https://jobs.undp.org/cj_view_job.cfm?cur_job_id=79861

1. BACKGROUND

Introduction

This is the Terms of Reference (ToR) for the UNDP-GEF Midterm Review (MTR) of the medium-sized project titled **Sustainable Management Models for Local Government Organisations to Enhance Biodiversity Protection and Utilization in Selected Eco-regions of Thailand** (PIMS#5271), implemented through Biodiversity-Based Economy Development Office (BEDO), which is to be undertaken in 2018. The project started on 19 February 2016 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* [Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects](#).

Project Background Information

The objective of the project is to mainstream biodiversity conservation priorities into the performance management, development planning and budgeting systems of local government in Thailand.

Thailand is one of the most biodiverse countries in the world containing over 15,000 species of plant and 4,722 species of vertebrates. Many of these species are however threatened with over 555 species of vertebrates listed as endangered domestically and 231 classified as endangered by the IUCN. These species and the diversity they represent are being threatened by on-going urban, agricultural and infrastructure development that is resulting in extensive habitat destruction or degradation as well as increasing demand for natural resources which is resulting in their unsustainable use.

Thailand has taken steps to protect its biodiversity and has an extensive protected areas network covering over 20% of the country's terrestrial and marine area. However much of the country's biodiversity exists within areas that are not protected and will, if its survival is to be assured along with national develop, need to be able to coexist with on-going human development.

This project will support the realization of this by providing a framework for the inclusion of biodiversity into the development planning, management and performance assessment mechanisms of local government organisations (LGOs). This will be achieved through working on the development of a national level framework to guide LGOs as well as developing the tools (including a Biodiversity Health Index) and capacity to implement it.

The project will also demonstrate how this approach can be achieved within the two pilot locations of Don Hoi Lord (Ramsar No 1099) in Samut Songkram Province and Bang Krachao an "urban oasis" within Samut Prakarn Province. In doing so the project will enhance conservation management of 69,618 ha of land and marine area, as well as supporting the conservation of the habitats of a number of threatened species including the Great Knot (*Calidris tenuirostris*) (IUCN – VU), Bar-tailed Godwit (*Limosa lapponica*) (IUCN – NT), Eurasian Curlew (*Numenius arquata*) (IUCN – NT) and Asian Dowitcher (*Limnodromus semipalmatus*) (IUCN – NT), as well as a locally endemic earthworm (*Glyphidrilus* sp).

2. OBJECTIVE, SCOPE OF WORK, RESPONSIBILITIES AND DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSED ANALYTICAL WORK

Objective 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 be made to set the project on-track to achieve its intended results. The MTR will also review the project's strategy, its risks to sustainability.

MTR Approach and 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 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.¹ Stakeholder involvement should include interviews with stakeholders who have project responsibilities, including but not limited to (list); 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 mission to Thailand, including the project sites in two pilot locations of Don Hoi Lord (Ramsar No 1099) in Samut Songkram Province and Bang Krachao an “urban oasis” within Samut Prakarn Province. Interviews will be held with the following organizations and individuals at a minimum:

- Project Director (BEDO)
- Project Manager and Project Coordinator
- Field Coordinators
- Representatives from pilot areas
- Project Administrative/Financial Officer
- Members of Project Board
- King Prajadhipok's Institute
- Department of Local Administration (DLA)
- Project experts from Thailand Environment Institute (TEI) and Mahidol University
- Other project consultants as appropriate
- UNDP Thailand Country Office in Bangkok

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.

Detailed Scope of the MTR

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

¹ 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.

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

ii. Progress Towards Results

Progress Towards Outcomes Analysis:

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

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

Project Strategy	Indicator ²	Baseline Level ³	Level in 1 st PIR (self-reported)	Midterm Target ⁴	End-of-project Target	Midterm Level & Assessment ⁵	Achievement Rating ⁶	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 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/ 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.

² Populate with data from the Logframe and scorecards

- 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

³ Populate with data from the Project Document

⁴ If available

⁵ Colour code this column only

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

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, Annual Project Review/PIRs and the ATLAS Risk Management Module are the most important and whether the risk ratings applied are appropriate and up to date. If not, explain why.
- In addition, assess the following risks to sustainability:

Financial risks to sustainability:

- What is the likelihood of financial and economic resources not being available once the GEF assistance ends (consider potential resources can be from multiple sources, such as the public and private sectors, income generating activities, and other funding that will be adequate financial resources for sustaining project's outcomes)?

Socio-economic risks to sustainability:

- Are there any social or political risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project outcomes? What is the risk that the level of stakeholder ownership (including ownership by governments and other key stakeholders) will be insufficient to allow for the project outcomes/benefits to be sustained? Do the various key stakeholders see that it is in their interest that the project benefits continue to flow? Is there sufficient public / stakeholder awareness in support of the long term objectives of the project? Are lessons learned being documented by the Project Team on a continual basis and shared/ transferred to appropriate parties who could learn from the project and potentially replicate and/or scale it in the future?

Institutional Framework and Governance risks to sustainability:

- Do the legal frameworks, policies, governance structures and processes pose risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project benefits? While assessing this parameter, also consider if the required systems/ mechanisms for accountability, transparency, and technical knowledge transfer are in place.

Environmental risks to sustainability:

- Are there any environmental risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project outcomes?

Conclusions & Recommendations

The MTR team will include a section of the report setting out the MTR's evidence-based conclusions, in light of the findings.⁷

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.

⁷ Alternatively, MTR conclusions may be integrated into the body of the report.

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 (*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)	

3. REQUIREMENTS FOR EXPERIENCE AND QUALIFICATIONS

A team of two independent consultants will conduct the MTR – one team leader (with experience and exposure to projects and evaluations in other regions globally) and one team local expert, from Thailand. The consultants cannot have participated in the project preparation, formulation, and/or implementation (including the writing of the Project Document) and should not have a conflict of interest with project’s related activities.

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

NATIONAL CONSULTANT

Profile

- At least a Master’s degree in social development, public policy, environmental studies, development studies, social sciences and/ or other related fields (20%)
- Minimum of five (5) years of supporting project evaluation and/or implementation experience in the result-based management framework, adaptive management (20%).
- Proven communication, facilitation, and writing skills.
- Evaluation skills, including conducting interviews, focus group discussions, desk research, qualitative and quantitative analysis.
- Excellent command of English both writing and speaking (20%)
- Familiarity with Thailand national and local development policies, programs and projects (20%)
- Some project management experience in local government biodiversity conservation, biodiversity conservation and management and sustainable utilisation would be an advantage (10%).
- Some knowledge of UNDP or GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy would be an advantage (10%)

Responsibilities

- Documentation review and data gathering
- Contributing to the development of the review plan and methodology
- Conducting those elements of the evaluation determined jointly with the international consultant and UNDP
- Contributing to presentation of the review findings and recommendations at the wrap-up meeting
- Contributing to the drafting and finalization of the review report

4. DURATION OF ASSIGNMENT, DUTY STATION AND EXPECTED PLACES OF TRAVEL

Timeframe

The total duration of the contract will be approximately 24 working days from **30 July 2018 to 19 November 2018**.

Duty Station: home-based with one mission to Bangkok and the project sites in Thailand.
The tentative MTR timeframe is as follows:

TIMEFRAME	ACTIVITY
30 July 2018	Contract begins Prep the MTR Team (handover of Project Documents)
30 July-3 August 2018 (5 working days)	Project Document Review Submit MTR Inception Report to UNDP for review
4 August 2018	Finalization of the MTR Inception Report and re-submit to UNDP.
16 September 2018	Arrival in Bangkok of International Evaluation Team Lead
17-25 September 2018 (7 working days)	Inception meeting at UNDP Country Office Meeting with BEDO Project Director and team and other stakeholders in Bangkok. MTR mission: stakeholder meetings, interviews and field visits.
26-27 September 2018 (2 working days)	Preparation of presentations for wrap-up meeting.
28 September 2018 (1 working days)	Mission wrap-up meeting & presentation of initial findings- earliest end of MTR mission

2-8 October 2018 (5 working days)	Preparing draft report
9 October 2018 (0 working days for consultant)	Circulation of draft report with draft management response template for comments and completion
30 October-2 November 2018 (max: 4 working days)	Incorporating audit trail from feedbacks on draft report/Finalization of MTR report including Management Responses
19 November 2018	Expected date of contract closure

5. FINAL PRODUCTS

MTR Deliverables				
#	Deliverable	Description	Timing	Responsibilities
1	MTR Inception Report	MTR team clarifies objectives and methods of Midterm Review	4 August 2018	MTR team submits to the Commissioning Unit and project management
2	Presentation	Initial Findings	28 September 2018	MTR Team presents to project management and the Commissioning Unit
3	Draft Final MTR Report	Full report (using guidelines on content outlined in Annex B) with annexes	9 October 2018	Sent to the Commissioning Unit, reviewed by RTA, Project Coordinating Unit, GEF OFP
4	Final MTR Report*	Revised report with audit trail detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final MTR report	6 November 2018 (or within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft)	Sent to the Commissioning Unit

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

6. PROVISION OF MONITORING AND PROGRESS CONTROLS

MTR Arrangements

The principal responsibility for managing this MTR resides with the Commissioning Unit (UNDP Thailand Country Office). The Commissioning Unit for this project's MTR is UNDP Thailand Country Office.

The commissioning unit will contract the consultants and ensure the timely provision of the 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.

7. DOCUMENTS TO BE INCLUDED WHEN SUBMITTING THE PROPOSALS.

Recommended Presentation of Proposal:

- a) **Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability and Financial Proposal** using the [template](#) provided by UNDP
- b) **CV** and a **Personal History Form (P11 form)** indicating all past experiences from similar projects, as well as the contact details (email and telephone number) of the Candidate and at least three (3) professional references.
- c) **Brief description of approach to work/technical proposal** of why the individual considers him/herself as the most suitable for the assignment, and a proposed methodology on how they will approach and complete the assignment; (max 1 page)
- d) **Financial Proposal** that indicates the all-inclusive fixed total contract price and all other travel related costs (such as flight ticket, per diem, etc), supported by a breakdown of costs, as per template attached to the Letter of Confirmation of Interest template. If an applicant is employed by an organization/company/institution, and he/she expects his/her employer to charge a management fee in the process of releasing him/her to UNDP under Reimbursable Loan Agreement (RLA), the applicant must indicate at this point, and ensure that all such costs are duly incorporated in the financial proposal submitted to UNDP.

All application materials should be submitted to UNDP by 22 July 2018. The short-listed candidates may be contacted and the successful candidate will be notified.

8. FINANCIAL PROPOSAL

Price Proposal and Schedule of Payment :

Consultant must send a financial proposal based on Lump Sum Amount. The total amount quoted shall be all-inclusive and include all costs components required to perform the deliverables identified in the TOR, including professional fee, travel costs, living allowance (if any work is to be done outside the IC's duty station) and any other applicable cost to be incurred by the IC in completing the assignment. The contract price will be fixed output-based price regardless of extension of the herein specified duration. Payments will be done upon completion of the deliverables/outputs and as per below percentages:

%	Milestone
10%	Following submission and approval of Inception Report
40%	Following submission and approval of the draft MTR report
50%	Following submission and approval (UNDP-CO and UNDP RTA) of the final MTR report

In general, UNDP shall 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 event of unforeseeable travel not anticipated in this TOR, payment of travel costs including tickets, lodging and terminal expenses should be agreed upon, between the respective business unit and the Individual Consultant, prior to travel and will be reimbursed. Travel costs shall be reimbursed at actual but not exceeding the quotation from UNDP approved travel agent. The provided living allowance will not be exceeding UNDP DSA rates. Repatriation travel cost from home to duty station in Bangkok and return shall not be covered by UNDP.

9. EVALUATION

Criteria for Selection of the Best Offer

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

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

ANNEXES

Annex I - TOR_ UNDP-GEF Midterm Review Term of Reference (National MTR Consultant)

TOR Annex A: List of Documents to be reviewed by MTR TEAM

TOR Annex B: Guidelines on Contents for the Midterm Review Report

TOR Annex C: MTR Evaluation Matrix Template

TOR Annex D: UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluators/Midterm Review Consultants

TOR Annex E: MTR Ratings

TOR ANNEX F: MTR Report Clearance Form

TOR Annex G: MTR Report Audit Trail Template

Annex II- General Condition of Contract

Annex III - Offeror's Letter to UNDP Confirming Interest and Availability and Financial Proposal

All documents can be downloaded at : http://procurement-notices.undp.org/view_notice.cfm?notice_id=47796