

TERMS OF REFERENCE

Individual Contractor

1. Assignment Information

Assignment Title:	International Mid-Term Review (MTR) Consultant
Cluster/Project:	Programme and Results Unit “Collaborative Management for Watershed and Ecosystem Service Protection and Rehabilitation in the Cardamom Mountains, Upper Prek Thnot River Basin (CoWES)”
Post Level:	Senior Specialist
Contract Type:	Individual Contractor (IC)
Duty Station:	Home-based and Cambodia
Expected Place of Travel:	Kampong Speu Province, Cambodia
Contract Duration:	25 working days from 14 December 2018 to 31 January 2019

2. Project Description

Project context:

Land degradation is a serious issue in Cambodia posing a direct threat to food and water security since it affects agriculture productivity and water retention capacity of watersheds. It is linked with deforestation and forest degradation and exacerbated by climate change perpetuating increased vulnerability to climate related risks in turn. The project title “Collaborative Management for Watershed and Ecosystem Service Protection and Rehabilitation in the Cardamom Mountains, Upper Prek Thnot River Basin (CoWES)” is designed to reduce pressures on upland watershed areas from competing land uses by demonstrating collaborative management and rehabilitation of agriculture lands and forest areas by promoting sustainable land management and stabilizing watershed catchment functions in a priority degraded area, Upper Prek Thnot watershed in Kampong Speu Province as identified by the National Action Plan to Combat Land Degradation 2018 - 2027. The project aims to achieve three main outputs: i) On-farm soil conservation and agroforestry practices improved; ii) Community forest areas restored and sustainably managed; and iii) Watershed management and monitoring capacity improved. The project forms part of the UNDP Cambodia’s Country Programme Action Plan(CPAP) 2016-2018 by contributing to strengthening environmental services and the system of forest management and protected areas, including sustainable land and watershed management.

Ministry of Agriculture Forestry and Fisheries (MAFF) is the Implementing Partner (IP) of the project, with support from a number of key relevant Ministries. To ensure effective engagement of stakeholders in order to establish institutional arrangements at provincial and district levels to lead watershed management programs and host M&E system in partnership with relevant stakeholders at various levels, various capacity development and trainings for communities as well as for national, provincial and district government officials will be provided by the project through consultation meetings and workshops to promote sustainable land and forest management practices in the targeted area.

CoWES aims to restore and maintain forest cover and watershed stability functions while providing for sustainable livelihoods and ecosystem services in the Upper Prek Thnot Watershed. In order to achieve this objective, the project will demonstrate, or pilot introduce sustainable land management (SLM) technologies with local household (small landholders), SLM and technical advices to agribusiness (large landholders and Economic Land Concession-ELCs) and experiment on wider landscape management for protection of ecosystem functional services. The project has 3 components and 7 outputs:

Component / Outcome 1: On-farm soil conservation and agroforestry practices improved

- Output 1.1: SLM priorities mainstreamed into local authority area plans in collaboration with MAFF and partners
- Output 1.2: Suitable SLM practices for small landholders demonstrated
- Output 1.3: Suitable land use practices demonstrated among medium to large scale agribusiness entities

Component / Outcome 2: Community forest areas restored and sustainably managed

- Output 2.1: Prioritized actions to accelerate CF implementation, reflected in local authority and MAFF programs of action
- Output 2.2: Suitable restoration strategies and livelihood enterprises demonstrated

Component / Outcome 3: Watershed management and monitoring capacity improved

- Output 3.1: Capacity of key stakeholders to develop and start a program of action for watershed management in place
- Output 3.2: Participatory monitoring and assessment to support agreed upon program of action is in place.

To execute project effectively, MAFF has engaged both non-governmental organization (NGO) and governmental organizations (GO—technical departments) to work and support activities at 3 target communes such as Krang Devay, Trapeang Chor and Tasal located in the upper part of Preaek Tnoat Watershed and made significant progress at these target areas.

To assess the project's effectiveness, efficiency, relevance, sustainability and ownership of project implementation, on behalf of the Government of Cambodia and the Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries (MAFF), UNDP is now recruiting an international consultant to conduct midterm review of CoWES Project.

3. Scope of Work

This is the Terms of Reference (ToR) for the Midterm Review (MTR) of the project titled "Collaborative Management for Watershed and Ecosystem Service Protection and Rehabilitation in the Cardamom Mountains, Upper Prek Thnot River Basin", known as the CoWES project. In line with the UNDP-GEF Guidance on MTR, this MTR process would be initiated before the submission of the second Project Implementation Report (PIR). The review needs to be conducted before both second meeting of project steering committee (February 2019) and second PIR report (May 2019).

The purpose of the MTR is to assess the project's performance since the beginning of its implementation and provide strategic partway for project intervention. The review will include both the evaluation of the project implementation progress, measured against planned outputs indicated in the results framework, in accordance with rational budget allocation and the assessment of features related to the process involved in achieving those outputs, as well as the initial and potential impacts of the project. The review will also address underlying causes and issues that have contributed to targets not adequately achieved.

The MTR is intended to identify weaknesses and strengths of the project design and provide recommendations for any necessary change alignments in the overall design and orientation of the project. This is done by evaluating the adequacy, efficiency, and effectiveness of project implementation, as well as assessing actual achievements of project outputs and outcomes to date. Consequently, the review mission is also expected to make detailed recommendations on the work plan for the remaining project period. It will

also provide recommendations on setting up the key priorities and modify implementation strategy to accommodate with remaining timeframe of project's life.

The consultant 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

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 and Project Inception Report.
- 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.
- If there are major areas of concern, recommend areas for improvement

Results Framework/Log-frame:

- 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

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	Baseline Level	Level in 1st PIR (self-reported)	Midterm Target	End-of project Target	Midterm Level & Assessment	Achievement Rating ⁵	Justification for Rating
------------------	-----------	----------------	----------------------------------	----------------	-----------------------	----------------------------	---------------------------------	--------------------------

Objective:								
Outcome 1:								
Outcome 2:								
Outcome 3:								
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 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

- Review overall effectiveness of project management as outlined in the Project Document and inception report. 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 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 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

iv. Sustainability

- Validate whether the risks identified in the Project Document, inception report, 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 consultant will include a section of the report setting out the MTR's evidence-based conclusions, in light of the findings.
- 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 consultant 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. No rating on Project Strategy and no overall project rating is required.

Table. MTR Ratings & Achievement Summary Table for (CoWES 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)	

4. **Expected Outputs and Deliverables**

The consultant will produce the following deliverables to UNDP, UNDP/GEF-CoWES and the Project Steering Committee:

- Develop inception report to include methodology and plan for midterm evaluation.
- A presentation of evaluation methodology and the findings to key stakeholders;
- Develop an executive summary to emphasizing key findings and key recommendations;
- A detailed evaluation report covering scope of the mid-term review with detailed attention to lessons learnt and recommendations; and
- List of annexes prepared by the consultants including TOR's, itinerary, list of persons interviewed, summary of field visits, list of documents reviewed, questionnaire and summary of results, co-financing and leveraged resources.

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

The Deliverables and timeline are summarized in the below table:

Deliverables/Outputs	Estimated Duration to Complete	Target Due Dates	Review and Approvals Required
Deliverable 1: MTR Inception Report: Consultant clarifies objectives and methods of Midterm Review	4 days No later than 2 weeks before the MTR mission	14 December 2018	Reviewed by National Project Advisor/Programme Analyst/Policy Analyst Approved by Project Manager & Assistant Country Director
Deliverable 2: Presentation: Initial Findings	8 days End of MTR mission: (Stakeholder meetings, interviews,	17 January 2019	

	field visits)		
Deliverable 3: Draft Report: Full report (To be provided).	8 days Within 2 weeks after MTR mission	25 January 2019	
Deliverable 4: Final Report: Revised report with audit trail detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final MTR report	5 days Within 1 week of receiving comments on draft	31 January 2019	
Total working day	25 days		

5. **Institutional Arrangement**

- The evaluation will be commissioned by the UNDP country office (CO) in Cambodia and managed by Head of Programme and Results Unit, UNDP. An internal Evaluation Consultant will be selected and tasked to carry out the evaluation with assistance of CoWES Project team, especially M&E Officer.
- The evaluation consultant will work under the overall direct supervision of the UNDP Head of Programme and Results Unit and guidance from National Project Director and Manager. The UNDP CO will ensure the timely provision travel arrangements within the country for the evaluator. The CoWES Project Team will be responsible for liaising with the consultant team to set up stakeholder interviews, arrange field visits, coordinate with the partners etc.
- The Basic Security in the Field II and Advanced Security in the Field courses must be successfully completed prior to commencement of travel;
- Individual Consultants are responsible for ensuring they have vaccinations/inoculations when travelling to certain countries, as designated by the UN Medical Director.
- Consultants are required to comply with the UN security directives set forth under: <https://dss.un.org/dssweb/>
- All related travel expenses will be covered and will be reimbursed as per UNDP rules and regulations upon submission of an F-10 claim form and supporting documents.

6. **Evaluation ethics**

The Evaluators must read to be familiar with the evaluation ethics and procedures^{1 2} of the UN System to safeguard the rights and confidentiality of information, for example: measures to ensure compliance with legal codes governing areas such as provisions to collect and report data, particularly permissions needed to interview or obtain information about children and young people; provisions to store and maintain security of collected information; and protocols to ensure anonymity and confidentiality.

7. **Duration of the Work**

¹ UNEG Ethical Guideline (<http://www.uneval.org/document/detail/102>)

² UNEG Norms and Standards for Evaluation (<http://www.uneval.org/document/detail/1914>)

The Consultant will work for 25 working days over a period from mid December 2018 till end January 2019 and shall not exceed 2 months from when the consultant is hired. The tentative MTR timeframe is as follows:

Deliverables/outputs	Estimated Duration to Complete	Target Due Dates
Document review and preparing MTR Inception Report (MTR Inception Report due no later than 2 weeks before the MTR mission)	4 days	14 December 2018
MTR mission: stakeholder meetings, interviews, field visits and presentation of initial findings- last day of the MTR mission	8 days	17 January 2019
Preparing draft report (due within 2 weeks of the MTR mission) 8	8 days	25 January 2019
Finalization of MTR report/Incorporating audit trail from feedback on draft report (due within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on the draft) (note: accommodate time delay in dates for circulation and review of the draft report)	5 days	31 January 2019

8. Duty Station

The duty stations for this assignment are home country and Cambodia with a trip to fields in Kampong Speu Province with a minimum number of stays in Phnom Penh and fields, Kampong Speu Province for 7 days. Travelling costs in Phnom Penh will be covered by the consultant.

9. Minimum Qualifications of the Individual Contractor

Education:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A master's degree in agriculture, forestry, environmental studies, development studies, and other related fields
Experience:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Minimum 7 years of result-based project management, monitoring and evaluation of environmental related projects Experience is an advantage Proven experience of evaluating similar projects, preferably involving UNDP/GEF or others UN Development Agencies or major donors Technical knowledge in the targeted focal area(s): Climate Change Adaptation/Disaster Management, agriculture, watershed, natural resource management and/or rural development. Experience working with government, particularly with projects under National Implementation is an asset. Experience and knowledge of the Cambodian development context. Prior experience with evaluation of projects commissioned by the UNDP with GEF financed projects in which this evaluation is to be carried out, would be an asset
Competencies:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Familiarity with government planning systems and institutional roles Ability to interact with senior government officials

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Team leadership experience Displays cultural, gender, religion, race, nationality and age sensitivity and adaptability
Language Requirements:	Fluency in English

10. Criteria for Evaluation of Level of Technical Compliance of Individual Contractor

The selection of consultants will be aimed at maximizing the overall qualities in the following technical evaluation areas:

Technical Evaluation Criteria	Obtainable Score
A master's degree in agriculture, forestry, environmental studies, development studies, and other related fields.	10
Proven experience of evaluating similar projects, preferably involving UNDP/GEF or others UN Development Agencies or major donors	30
Minimum 7 years of result-based project management, monitoring and evaluation of environmental related projects	30
Technical knowledge in the targeted focal area(s): Watershed, Adaptation Management, agriculture, sustainable land management, livelihoods, natural resource management and/or rural development. Experience in Cambodian development context is a plus	30
Total Obtainable Score	100

Financial evaluation.

With regards to technical evaluation criteria above, the financial evaluation will be also take into consideration.

Financial proposals must be "all inclusive" and expressed in a lump-sum for the total duration of the contract. The term "all inclusive" implies all cost (professional fees, travel costs, living allowances etc.); For duty travels, the UN's Daily Subsistence Allowance (DSA) rates are (fill for all travel destinations), which should provide indication of the cost of living in a duty station/destination.

Evaluation Method and Criteria

Individual consultants will be evaluated based on the following methodology:

Cumulative analysis

The award of the contract shall be made to the individual consultant whose offer has been evaluated and determined as a) responsive/compliant/acceptable; and b) having received the highest score out of set of weighted technical criteria (70%). and financial criteria (30%). Financial score shall be computed as a ratio of the proposal being evaluated and the lowest priced proposal received by UNDP for the assignment

Annexes to the MTR ToR

Possible annexes include: (reference ToR Annexes in Annex 3 of *Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects*)

- Project Document and latest results and resources framework

- Project Inception Report
- List of documents to be reviewed by the MTR Team
- Guidelines on Contents for the Midterm Review Report
- UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluators/Midterm Review Consultants
- MTR Required Ratings Table and Ratings Scales
- MTR Report Clearance Form
- Sample MTR Evaluative Matrix
- Progress Towards Results Matrix and MTR Ratings & Achievement Summary Tables (in Word)

11. Payment Milestones

This is a fixed out-put based contract price regardless of extension of the herein specific duration. The consultant will be paid on a lump sum basis under the following installments.

N	Outputs/Deliveries	Payment Schedule	Payment Amount
1	First payment will be made upon approval of the final MTR Inception Report	17 December 2018	20%
2	Second payment will be made upon satisfactory completion of the draft MTR report.	28 January 2019	30%
3	Final payment will be made upon approval of the Final MTR Report	31 January 2019	50%