

ANNEX 2: MID-TERM REVIEW (MTR)

TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR NATIONAL CONSULTANT (24 PAGES)

POSITION TYPE:

This TOR is for the recruitment of **“National Consultant”** on Mid-Term Evaluation of a GEF-funded Project. See qualifications in the **Team Composition Section (Section 8)** of this document.

1. INTRODUCTION

These terms of reference (TOR) sets out the expectations for the Mid-Term Review (MTR) for Sustainable Management of BD in Thailand’s Production Landscape (SMBT)”.

The essentials of the project to be evaluated are as follows:

PROJECT SUMMARY TABLE

Project Title:	BD FSP: Sustainable Management of BD in Thailand’s Production Landscape (SMBT)			
GEF Project ID:	PIMS # 3642		<i>at endorsement</i> <i>(Million US\$)</i>	<i>At MTR</i> <i>(Million US\$)</i>
UNDP Project ID:	00077720	GEF financing:	1,940,000	
Country:	Thailand	IA/EA own:	5,518,000	
Region:	Asia-Pacific	Government:	0	
Focal Area:	Biodiversity	Other:	0	
FA Objectives, (OP/SP):		Total co-financing:	5,518,000	
Executing Agency:	The Biodiversity-based Economy Development Office (BEDO) as a public organization under the Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment (MONRE)	Total Project Cost:	7,458,000	
Other Partners involved:	Ministry of Natural Resource and Environment (MONRE), Ministry of Agriculture and Cooperatives (MOAC), and Ministry of Commerce (MOC)	ProDoc Signature (date project began):		29 December 2011
		(Operational) Closing Date:	Proposed: 2015	Revised Closing Date:

2. PROJECT BACKGROUND INFORMATION AND OBJECTIVE SCOPE

Thailand is rich in biodiversity. It is the home of 12,000 vascular plant species, 302 species of mammals, and 982 species of birds. There are more than 2,100 marine and 720 freshwater fish species in the country, accounting for 10 percent of the estimated total fish species worldwide. IUCN Red List indicates that 200 significant portions of several WWF Eco-regions fall inside Thailand -

including Northern Indochina Subtropical Moist Forests, Kayah-Karen/Tenasserim Moist Forests, Peninsular Malaysian Lowland and Mountain Forests, and Cardamom Mountains Moist Forests. It has coastal and marine ecosystems of the Gulf of Thailand on one side and the Andaman Sea's marine and coastal ecosystem on the other side with substantially different species assemblages. The establishment of Protected Areas (PAs), Buffer Zones (BZs) and biodiversity corridors have been the primary approach for biodiversity conservation in Thailand with over 400 PAs currently gazette. However, only 18% of Thailand's total land area is under PAs. Therefore, much of the globally significant biodiversity in Thailand is found in "production landscapes" outside PAs – in agricultural areas and production forests and wetlands. Increasing population pressures and rapid economic development during recent decades are adding pressure to biodiversity both inside and outside PAs.

The Royal Thai Government authorities, with MONRE and MOAC as lead ministries, have made large efforts to arrest this degradation, also outside the PA's. An important initiative was the establishment of the Biodiversity-based Economy Development Office (BEDO) as a public organization. BEDO was given the mandate of promoting conservation of biodiversity in production landscapes, improving local community knowledge of best practice for sustainable production and enhancing biodiversity-based economic development. The long-term challenges for BEDO is to ensure that Biodiversity conservation is mainstreamed into production and marketing of agricultural, forestry and fishery business, in order to create community incentives to conserve and enhance biodiversity in Thailand's land- and seascapes while maintaining appropriate incomes to satisfy family needs for livelihood and wellbeing. There are three main barriers to achieve this: (i) At the national level, the institutional framework is not sufficiently capacitated to address the needs of an emerging biodiversity-based business sector, based on sustainable harvesting and production principles, (ii) At the community-level, sustainable production approaches and biodiversity conservation efforts are inadequate due to low incomes from present product categories, and (iii) Community revenues are limited due to low prices in the commodity market, as well as to high transaction costs in the supply chains.

The project will directly address these barriers through the three major components of the project:

1. Building national capacity for support of Biodiversity Business
2. Piloting Community-based Social Enterprises (CbSE) in valuable Eco-regions
3. Mainstreaming Biodiversity Business into the supply chains of high-value consumer markets

Please refer to the indicators in Annex 3 for more information.

3. OBJECTIVE OF THIS MID-TERM REVIEW

The objective of the MTR is to gain an independent analysis of the progress of the project so far. The MTR will identify potential project design problems, assess progress towards the achievement of the project objective, identify and document lessons learned (including lessons that might improve design and implementation of other UNDP-GEF projects), and make recommendations regarding specific actions that should be taken to improve the project. The MTR will assess early signs of project success or failure and identify the necessary changes to be made. The project performance will be measured based on the indicators of the project's logical framework (see Annex 3) and various Tracking Tools.

The MTR must provide evidence based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The review team is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with government counterparts, in particular the GEF operational focal point, UNDP Country Office, project team, UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based in the region and key stakeholders. The review team is expected to conduct field missions to Thailand, including the following project sites: **Prachinburi, Kanchanaburi, Ranong, Pang Nga.**

Interviews will be held with the following organizations and individuals at a minimum:

- Project Director
- Project Manager
- Representative of Responsible Parties, including Raks Thai Foundation and Thailand Environment Institute
- Field Officers
- Representatives from pilot communities
- Project Administrative Officer
- Project Financial Officer
- Members of Project Steering Committee
- UNDP Country Office in Bangkok in-charge of the 'Sustainable Management of Biodiversity in Thailand's Production Landscape' Project.

The team will review all relevant sources of information, such as the project document, project reports – including Annual APR/PIR, project budget revisions, progress reports, GEF focal area tracking tools, project files, national strategic and legal documents, and any other materials that the team considers useful for this evidence-based review. A list of documents that the project team and UNDP Country Office will provide to the team for review is included in Annex 2 of this Terms of Reference.

4. SCOPE OF THE MTR

The review team will assess the following three categories of project progress. For each category, the review team is required to rate overall progress using a six-point rating scale outlined in Annex 3:

4.1 Progress towards Results

Project design:

- Review the problem addressed by the project and the underlying assumptions. Review the effect of any incorrect assumptions made by the project. Identify new assumptions.
- Review the relevance of the project strategy and assess whether it provides the most effective route towards results.
- Review how the project addresses country priorities.
- Review the baseline data included in the project results framework and GEF Tracking tool and suggest revisions as necessary.

Progress:

- Assess the outputs and progress toward outcomes achieved so far and the contribution to attaining the overall objective of the project.

- Examine if progress so far has led to, or could in the future lead to, 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.
- Examine whether progress so far has led to, or could in the future lead to, potentially adverse environmental and/or social impacts/risks that could threaten the sustainability of the project outcomes. Are these risks being managed, mitigated, minimized or offset? Suggest mitigation measures as needed.
- Review the extent to which the implementation of the project has been inclusive of relevant stakeholders and to which it has been able to create collaboration between different partners. Identify opportunities for stronger substantive partnerships.

4.2 Adaptive management

Work Planning

- a) Are work planning processes result-based? If not, suggest ways to re-orientate work planning to focus on results.
- b) Examine the use of the project document logical/results framework as a management tool and review any changes made to it since project start. Ensure any revisions meet UNDP-GEF requirements and assess the impact of the revised approach on project management?

Finance and co-finance:

- a) Consider the financial management of the project, with specific reference to the cost-effectiveness of interventions.
- b) Complete the co-financing monitoring table (see Annex 4).
- c) Review the changes to fund allocations as a result of budget revisions and assess the appropriateness and relevance of such revisions.

Monitoring Systems.

- a) Review the monitoring tools currently being used: Do they provide the necessary information? Do they involve key partners? Do they use existing information? Are they efficient? Are they cost-effective? Are additional tools required?
- b) Ensure that the monitoring system, including performance indicators, meet GEF minimum requirements. Apply SMART indicators as necessary.
- c) Ensure broader development and gender aspects of the project are being monitored effectively. Develop SMART indicators, including disaggregated gender indicators as necessary;
- d) Review the mid-term GEF Tracking Tool (s) as appropriate and comment on progress made, quality of the submission, and overall value of the GEF Tracking Tool.
- e) Examine the financial management of the project monitoring and evaluation budget. Are sufficient resources being allocated to M&E? Are these resources being allocated effectively?

Risk Management

- a) Validate whether the risks identified in the project document, APR/PIRs and the ATLAS Risk Management Module are the most important and whether the risk ratings applied are appropriate. If not, explain why?

- b) Describe any additional risks identified and suggest risk ratings and possible risk management strategies to be adopted.

Reporting

- a) Assess how adaptive management changes have been reported by the project management, and shared with the Project Board.
- b) Assess how lessons derived from the adaptive management process have been documented, shared with key partners and internalized by partners.

4.3 Management arrangements

- a) 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.
- b) Review the quality of execution of the project Implementing Partners and recommend areas for improvement.
- c) Review the quality of support provided by UNDP and recommend areas for improvement.

5. MTR DELIVERABLES

Deliverable	Content	Timing	Responsibilities
Inception Report	Consultant provides clarifications on timing and method	No later than 2 weeks before the evaluation mission.	Consultant submits to UNDP CO
Presentation*	Initial Findings	End of evaluation mission	To project management, UNDP CO
Draft Final Mid-Term Review Report	Full report, (per template in annex 5) with annexes	Within 1 week of the evaluation mission	Sent to CO, reviewed by RTA, PCU, GEF OFPs
Final Mid-Term Review Report**	Revised report with audit trail detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final review report).	Within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft	Sent to CO for uploading to UNDP ERC.

* A power-point presentation of the findings of the review. Depending upon the complexity of the findings, UNDP CO in Thailand may consider organizing a half-day stakeholders meeting at which to make a presentation to the partners and stakeholders.

****When submitting the final evaluation report, the MTR team is required also to provide an 'audit trail', detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final evaluation report. The review report will be produced in the Thai and English language with executive summary (for both versions), highlighting important observations, analysis of information and key conclusions including its recommendations. Based on the scope of the MTR described above, the Review Report will include, among others:**

- Findings on the project implementation achievements, challenges, and difficulties to date;
- Assessments of the progress made towards the attainment of outcomes;
- Recommendations for modifications and the future course of action;
- Lessons learned from the project structure, coordination between different agencies, experience of the implementation, and output/outcome

The report will be initially shared with the Project's PMU to solicit comments or clarifications and will be presented to the UNDP Country Office (CO) in Thailand for further deliberations. Consequently, the final MTR Report (in three copies) will be made and submitted to the UNDP CO with a copy furnished to the Project's PMU.

6. IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENT

The principal responsibility for managing this review resides with the UNDP Country Office (UNDP CO) in Thailand. The BEDO project team will be responsible for liaising with the review team to set up stakeholder interviews, arrange field visits with missions to Prachinburi, Kanchanaburi, Ranong, Pang Nga.

In preparation for the review mission, the project manager, with assistance from UNDP country office, will arrange for the completion of the tracking tools (METT, Financial and Capacity scorecards for mid-term stage). The tracking tools will be completed/endorsed by the relevant implementing agency or qualified national research /scientific institution, and not by the international consultant or UNDP staff. The tracking tools will be submitted to the mid-term review team for comment. These comments will be addressed by the project team, and the final version of the Tracking tools will be attached as annexes to the Mid-term evaluation report.

7. TIMEFRAME

Twenty working days (20) days over the tentative period of **16 November -25 December 2014**. There will be an orientation meeting with UNDP CO, UNDP APRC and a briefing session with the project management team at the start.

The total duration of the review will be 20 days according to the following plan:

Activity	Timing	Tentative Period
Preparation	2 working days	<i>16-17 November 2014</i>
Evaluation Mission	5 working days	<i>18-24 November 2014</i>
Draft Evaluation Report	8 working days	<i>5-12 December 2014</i>
Final Report	4 working days	<i>22-25 December 2014</i>

8. TEAM COMPOSITION

The Mid-term Review team will be composed of ***one international lead consultant and a national consultant***. The consultants shall have prior experience in evaluating similar projects. Experience with GEF financed projects is an advantage. The consultants of the selected bidder should not have participated in the project preparation and/or implementation and should not have conflict of interest with project related activities.

The Team is expected to combine international standards of evaluation expertise, excellent knowledge of Climate Change Adaptation projects and national context of project and program implementation in Thailand.

At the minimum, the members of the MTR Team shall have the following professional background and responsibilities:

A. INTERNATIONAL LEAD CONSULTANT

PROFILE

- Post-Graduate in environmental studies, development studies, social sciences and/ or other related fields.
- Minimum of ten years accumulated and recognized experience in biodiversity conservation and sustainable utilisation areas, and sustainable livelihoods
- Minimum of five years of project evaluation and/or implementation experience in the result-based management framework, adaptive management and UNDP or GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy
- Familiarity in similar country or regional situations relevant to that of 'Sustainable Management of Biodiversity in Thailand's Production Landscape' Project
- Experience with multilateral and bilateral supported biodiversity conservation and sustainable utilisation projects
- Comprehensive knowledge of international biodiversity conservation and sustainable utilisation best practices
- Very good report writing skills in English

RESPONSIBILITIES

- Documentation of the review
- Leading the MTR Team in planning, conducting and reporting on the evaluation.
- Deciding on division of labor within the Team and ensuring timeliness of reports
- Use of best practice evaluation methodologies in conducting the evaluation
- Leading presentation of the draft evaluation findings and recommendations in-country
- Conducting the debriefing for the UNDP Country Office in Thailand and Core Project Management Team
- Leading the drafting and finalization of the MTR Evaluation Report

B. NATIONAL CONSULTANT

Profile

- Post-graduate in environmental studies, development studies, social sciences and/ or other related fields with at least ten years of project development and implementation.

- A minimum of five years of project management experience in biodiversity conservation and sustainable utilisation
- Multilateral and bilateral funded project development and implementation
- Familiarity with Thailand national development policies, programs and projects

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.

THE MEMBERS OF THE TEAM MUST BE INDEPENDENT FROM BOTH THE POLICY-MAKING PROCESS AND THE DELIVERY AND MANAGEMENT OF THE UNDP/GEF ASSISTANCE. THEREFORE, CANDIDATES WHO HAD ANY DIRECT INVOLVEMENT WITH THE DESIGN AND IMPLEMENTATION OF 'SUSTAINABLE MANAGEMENT OF BIODIVERSITY IN THAILAND'S PRODUCTION LANDSCAPE' PROJECT WILL NOT BE CONSIDERED

9. PAYMENT MODALITIES AND SPECIFICATIONS

%	Milestone
10%	Following submission and approval of Inception Report
40%	Following submission and approval of the 1ST draft midterm review report
50%	Following submission and approval (UNDP-CO and UNDP RTA) of the final midterm review report

ANNEX 3 OF MID-TERM REVIEW TOR: PROJECT LOGICAL FRAMEWORK

Project Strategy	Objectively verifiable indicators	Baseline	Target	Source of verification	Risks and assumptions
<p>Objective:</p> <p>To strengthen national and local capacity for mainstreaming biodiversity into the management of ecologically important production landscapes by transforming the supply and market chain of biodiversity based products.</p>	<p>1. The national governance system provides positive incentives and effective business facilitation and marketing support for biodiversity business development through BEDO and its partner network, demonstrated by:</p> <p>a. No. of enterprises for community-based biodiversity business assisted</p> <p>b. No and turnover from of commercial supply chain actors from project sites involved in marketing of sustainable biodiversity-based products in target markets</p>	<p>a. National framework for establishment of community enterprises based on local products in place via OTOP program</p> <p>b. BEDO has provided targeted support approx. 35 community enterprises, but with limited focus on mainstreaming</p> <p>c. Very few cases of systematic and comprehensive mainstreaming of biodiversity</p> <p>d. Limited focus on export markets for</p>	<p>At least 10 pilot products of community-based social enterprises (CbSE) supported in making high-value a)bamboo and other NTFP products, b) agricultural and horticultural products, c) marine products, d) tourism and recreation services successfully mainstreamed into the commercial markets</p> <p>- at least 5 of the pilot products successfully selling into national and export markets</p>	<p>Surveys of target sites</p>	<p>The private sector will see commercial advantages in supporting biodiversity business</p> <p>The producers will be able to produce high quality products in sufficient amount to attract interest from major actors in the market</p>

Project Strategy	Objectively verifiable indicators	Baseline	Target	Source of verification	Risks and assumptions
		biodiversity business			
	<p>2. Community-based social enterprises and commercial supply chains for biodiversity-based products increases family income, biodiversity conservation incentives and market share of certified sustainable production in target areas, demonstrated by</p> <p>a. Percentage of certified sustainable bamboo, marine- and other biodiversity-based products produced from project sites (percentage of total product output)</p> <p>b. Percentage of CbSE revenue allocated for biodiversity conservation and</p>	<p>a. No certification schemes are currently in use in target sites.</p> <p>b. Interviews at target sites indicate Bt 5,000-10,000 per household/month derived from existing biodiversity-based products.</p> <p>c. No systematic community funding specifically allocated for biodiversity conservation.</p>	<p>a) At end-project at least 30% of total product output from target sites is certified sustainable.</p> <p>b) At end-project, percentage of household incomes derived from certified products averages at least 25%.</p> <p>c) At end-project at least 10% of net annual CbSE revenue allocated to conservation and rehabilitation activities.</p>	<p>Surveys of target sites</p>	<p>Success of the CbSE model does not result in purely commercial competitors attempting to hijack the markets created. (Free-rider risk)</p> <p>CbSEs are able to generate net profits within the project period.</p>

Project Strategy	Objectively verifiable indicators	Baseline	Target	Source of verification	Risks and assumptions
	rehabilitation				
	3. Increase in percentage of target landscapes and seascapes under community-based sustainable management or co-management.	Less than 2.5% land- and sea-scapes managed by target communities is under sustainable management.	By end-project at least 5% of land and sea-scape managed by target communities is under sustainable management.	Community-based monitoring reports from their production landscapes	External economic forces do not alter significantly to induce communities to convert or sell their land.
Component 1: Building National Capacity for Support of Biodiversity Business					
Outcome 1.1 Institutional capacity and staff competences for national support to biodiversity business established.	<p>1. Enabling national policies, laws and regulations introduced by appropriate government departments with respect to:</p> <p>a) land use rights for biodiversity business</p> <p>b) Community based Social Enterprise establishment and operation</p>	<p>a. Overall policies, laws and regulations for biodiversity conservation and for mainstreaming of biodiversity business largely in place</p> <p>b. several unsolved conflicts about community land use rights not settled</p> <p>c. No regulation directly targeted to promote and</p>	A comprehensive policy and regulatory framework for CbSEs is developed, and submitted to the relevant Government authorities.	Documentation of submissions to relevant Government authorities.	Departments and – subsequently – the parliament will agree to pass the proposed policy and regulatory framework.

Project Strategy	Objectively verifiable indicators	Baseline	Target	Source of verification	Risks and assumptions
	c) incentives for community-based biodiversity conservation	facilitate CbSEs.			
	2. BEDO has the institutional capacities, organizational structure and resources required to act as national biodiversity business facility to facilitate development of CbSEs, as measured by the Capacity Scorecard.	BEDO has been mandated in law and established, however institutional capacities for business facilitation are at the average level, as indicated in the Capacity Scorecard assessment.	The institutional capacity scores for business facilitation are raised 50% relation to baseline at end of project	Survey reports From evaluations	BEDO board is strongly motivated to create a biodiversity business facility.
	3. BEDO staff have the technical capacities (skills, technical qualifications and experience) needed by a biodiversity business facility, as measured by the Capacity Scorecard	Baseline technical capacities assessed as low to medium, as indicated in the Capacity Scorecard.	The staff Capacity Scores are raised 50% relation to baseline at end of project	Survey reports From evaluations	BEDO staff is both motivated and professional equipped to perform the tasks of a biodiversity business facility
Outcome 1.2: Collaboration with and capacities in Partner Networks of the	1. Through the Partner Network, BEDO has the capacity to assess market needs and	Individual and ad-hoc analysis of various aspects of biodiversity business	By project mid-point, the Partner Network clearly demonstrates the capacity and	Mid-term evaluation assessment	Research institutions and other partners are willing to support BEDO and CbSE needs and to cooperate constructively in

Project Strategy	Objectively verifiable indicators	Baseline	Target	Source of verification	Risks and assumptions
Biodiversity Business Facility are strengthened	demands, and to develop targeted solutions to issues such as sustainable harvesting, waste minimization and reuse, low-impact packaging, etc.	have been undertaken by partners, however no systematic and comprehensive analytical capacity.	willingness to partner with BEDO in identifying, analyzing and resolving sustainable production and market development issues identified in the development of CbSEs.		multi-disciplinary studies.
	<p>2. Through the Partner Network, local communities and CbSEs have increased access to extension and business development services, as measured by:</p> <p>a. Number of community enterprises receiving support on sustainable harvesting and production</p> <p>b. Number of community enterprises receiving support for biodiversity business development and</p>	Limited collaboration mechanism among BEDO partners for providing extension services of biodiversity business development for CbSE	<p>Comprehensive and systematic collaboration mechanism with BEDO partners established to provide the extension services</p> <p>of biodiversity business development for CbSE</p>	Collaboration guidelines and minutes of meetings	Commitment of BEDO partners to strengthen collaboration on extension services

Project Strategy	Objectively verifiable indicators	Baseline	Target	Source of verification	Risks and assumptions
	management c. Number of communities receiving support on biodiversity conservation and rehabilitation				
Component 2: Piloting Community-based Social Enterprises in Valuable Eco-regions					
Outcome 2.1: Community-based sustainable production and <i>in-situ</i> biodiversity conservation and rehabilitation is strengthened.	1. Appropriate methods for community-based monitoring of biodiversity status for data collection.	Inadequate system of biodiversity status collection of data conducted by community.	Appropriate system developed for community monitoring of biodiversity status by the end of second year. At least, 4 communities actively applied by the end of year 3.	Mid-term Review	Community engages in the development and implement of monitoring system.
	2. Number of biodiversity conservation and rehabilitation projects	No community-initiated conservation projects	At end-project at least four conservation and/ or rehabilitation	Project monitoring reports.	CbSEs generate sufficient profits to finance conservation/ rehabilitation projects during project lifetime.

Project Strategy	Objectively verifiable indicators	Baseline	Target	Source of verification	Risks and assumptions
	planned and implemented by communities using revenues derived from CbSEs.	financed by CbSEs.	projects under way, financed by revenues from CbSEs.		
Outcome 2.2 : Pilot Models for Community-based Social Enterprises (CbSE) with Combined Objectives of Income generation, Sustainable Production and Biodiversity conservation are established.	1.a.CbSEs are using maximum sustainable yield as a benchmark to set production levels. 1.b.Change in marginal revenue per unit of resource use.	1. Existing community enterprises do not have capacity to assess maximum sustainable yield. 2. Marginal revenue per unit of resource use varies depending on product.	1. CbSE business plans incorporate maximum sustainable yield as a variable in setting production levels. 2. Marginal revenue per unit of resource use increases by at least 10% on average across all product lines.	Business plans and reports of CbSEs.	Maximum sustainable yield levels can be easily approximated for all major products.
	2. CbSE business plans and management strategies include explicit objectives to allocate net revenues for conservation and rehabilitation.	Existing community enterprises do not have specific objectives to allocate revenues for conservation or rehabilitation.	Every CbSE supported by the project has explicit objectives to allocate net revenues for conservation and rehabilitation.	CbSE business plans and marketing strategies.	CbSEs have transparent governance and accountability mechanisms.

Project Strategy	Objectively verifiable indicators	Baseline	Target	Source of verification	Risks and assumptions
Outcome 2.3: Human and technological capacities in producer communities are strengthened	1. CbSEs have the necessary skills and tools to produce products which meet the requirement for certification.	Community has basic skill in product development and productions.	CbSE in 4 communities are producing products which meet relevant certification standard	Data collected by BEDO (e.g. technical reports)	Community members have motivation and willingness to develop sufficient skill.
	2. CbSEs have a transparent and participatory governance mechanism.	Community enterprises have basic rule and regulation for governance.	Set governance mechanism which clearly includes participation, inclusiveness and gender parity.	CbSE rule and regulation.	Communities are aware of governance issue and willing to participate in the development of CbSE governance.
Component 3: Mainstreaming Biodiversity Business into the Supply Chains of High-value Consumer Markets					
Outcome 3.1: Demand-driven design and branding of high-value products	1. Mainstreaming of high-value products from biodiversity businesses is increased through development of appropriate products designs, focused on niche-markets of lifestyle consumers in Thailand and selected export markets, as demonstrated by number of CbSE products successfully	Present community-based products are designed for local markets with little coherence with high-value consumer demand	a. At least 50% of CbSE products are designed for high-value consumer markets b. 25% of the products from pilot communities are successfully introduced into high-value markets	Data collected by BEDO (e.g. technical reports)	The CbSE products' design are protected by Intellectual Property (Copy Right) to prevent plagiarism.

Project Strategy	Objectively verifiable indicators	Baseline	Target	Source of verification	Risks and assumptions
	designed, branded for introduction into target markets				
	2. Quality and value of CbSE products have been increased and meet BEDO certification standard for selected markets	No certified CbSE products in the pilot sites	80% of BEDO certified products recognised by and 20% endorsed by other relevant certifications e.g. FDA, Community Product Industrial standard (CPII)	Data collected by BEDO (e.g. technical reports)	Risks of pollution and contamination can be monitored and mitigated.
Outcome 3.2: Reduction of transaction costs through transformation in the supply chains	Transformation of supply chains have been demonstrated in relation to products from the target regions, as demonstrated by optimum of alternative supply chains provided.	No data on optimum alternative supply chains available for project sites The wholesale and retail actors keep the majority of value added	a. At least 50% of the pilot cases have introduced optimum alternative supply chains to increase gate revenue; b. Transaction costs are reduced in comparison to the existing transaction	Reports from project evaluations	Private Sector is positive to collaborate to provide optimum alternative supply chains

Project Strategy	Objectively verifiable indicators	Baseline	Target	Source of verification	Risks and assumptions
			costs		
Outcome 3.3: Increased investment and subsidy options for Community-based Social Enterprises	<p>1. Appropriate investment options for pilot CbSE's have been identified, as demonstrated by</p> <p>a) No. of dedicated investment windows in public and private sector</p> <p>b) No. of non-profit social and environmental investment funds</p>	Numerous public and private investment facilities available but not dedicated to small-scaled investment for CbSE's	80% of finance needs for pilot CbSE's are being met	Data collected by BEDO (e.g. technical reports)	<p>Sufficient community capacity for investment management</p> <p>Communities are willing to make investment for CbSE</p>
	<p>1.Amount of Subsidies raised for pilot CbSE's in relation to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> National Government subsidies; Local Government Organisations; Private Sector (CSR); Not-for-Profit 	There are several national and local subsidy schemes provided by government and not-for-profit organisations	10% of costs for biodiversity conservation activities are supported via Government and NGO subsidy programs	Data collected by BEDO (e.g. technical reports)	<p>Sources of fund from different agencies are available and accessible</p> <p>Private Sector is willing to engage CbSE and biodiversity conservation into their CSR agenda</p>

Project Strategy	Objectively verifiable indicators	Baseline	Target	Source of verification	Risks and assumptions
	<p>organisations/ Foundations</p> <p>2.No. Of projects from increased CSR collaborations on CbSE and biodiversity conservation in the target areas</p>	There is limited collaboration with CSR on CbSE and biodiversity conservation and rehabilitation in the target areas	At least 4 projects from CSR collaboration in the target areas		
Outcome 3.4: Strengthened awareness about commercial potentials in biodiversity business.	Types of IEC ¹ Materials on the potential of CbSE for biodiversity business for general public	There is limited awareness, campaigns, advocacy, on the potential of CbSE for biodiversity business	<p>IEC Materials developed in the form of print, audio-visual, internet</p> <p>At least 0.5% of the total communities across the country have contacted BEDO for support for possible replication</p>	IEC Materials	Project partners and stakeholders are willing to disseminate IEC Materials.

¹ IEC = Information, Education, and Communication

ANNEX 4 OF MID-TERM REVIEW TOR: LIST OF DOCUMENTS TO BE REVIEWED BY MTR TEAM

Prior to engagement and visiting the PMU, the MTR Team shall receive all the relevant documents including at least:

- ‘Sustainable Management of Biodiversity in Thailand’s Production Landscape’ Project Document and Project Brief
- Inception Report
- Annual Work and Financial Plans
- Annual Project Reports/Project Implementation Reviews (API/PIR) Minutes of Project Board and Project Team Meetings
- Back-to-Office Mission Reports

To provide more details, as may be needed, the following will be made available for access by the MTR Team:

- Executive summary of all quarterly reports
- Internal monitoring results
- Terms of Reference for past consultants’ assignments and summary of the results
- Past audit reports

ANNEX 5 OF MID-TERM REVIEW TOR: MID-TERM REVIEW RATING SCALE

This is a generic list, to be further detailed with more specific questions by CO and UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based on the particulars of the project.

Progress towards results: use the following rating scale

Highly Satisfactory (HS)	Project is expected to achieve or exceed all its major global environmental objectives, and yield substantial global environmental benefits, without major shortcomings. The project can be presented as “good practice”.
Satisfactory (S)	Project is expected to achieve most of its major global environmental objectives, and yield satisfactory global environmental benefits, with only minor shortcomings.
Moderately Satisfactory (MS)	Project is expected to achieve most of its major relevant objectives but with either significant shortcomings or modest overall relevance. Project is expected not to achieve some of its major global environmental objectives or yield some of the expected global environment benefits.
Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)	Project is expected to achieve its major global environmental objectives with major shortcomings or is expected to achieve only some of its major global environmental objectives.
Unsatisfactory (U)	Project is expected not to achieve most of its major global environment objectives or to yield any satisfactory global environmental benefits.
Highly Unsatisfactory (U)	The project has failed to achieve, and is not expected to achieve, any of its major global environment objectives with no worthwhile benefits.

Adaptive management AND Management Arrangements: use the following rating scale

Highly Satisfactory (HS)	The project has no shortcomings and can be presented as “good practice”.
Satisfactory (S)	The project has minor shortcomings.
Moderately Satisfactory (MS)	The project has moderate shortcomings.
Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)	The project has significant shortcomings.
Unsatisfactory (U)	The project has major shortcomings.
Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)	The project has severe shortcomings.

ANNEX 6 OF MID-TERM REVIEW TOR: CO-FINANCING TABLE

Sources of Co-financing ²	Name of Co-financer	Type of Co-financing ³	Amount Confirmed at CEO endorsement / approval	Actual Amount Materialized at Midterm	Actual Amount Materialized at Closing
		TOTAL			

Explain "Other Sources of Co-financing":

² Sources of Co-financing may include: Bilateral Aid Agency(ies), Foundation, GEF Agency, Local Government, National Government, Civil Society Organization, Other Multi-lateral Agency(ies), Private Sector, Other

³ Type of Co-financing may include: Grant, Soft Loan, Hard Loan, Guarantee, In-Kind, Other

ANNEX 7 OF MID-TERM REVIEW TOR: TABLE OF CONTENTS OF THE MID-TERM REVIEW REPORT

- i. Opening page:
 - Title of UNDP supported GEF financed project
 - UNDP and GEF project ID#s.
 - Evaluation time frame and date of evaluation report
 - Region and countries included in the project
 - GEF Operational Program/Strategic Program
 - Implementing Partner and other project partners
 - Evaluation team members
 - Acknowledgements
- ii. Executive Summary
 - Project Summary Table
 - Project Description (brief)
 - Evaluation Rating Table
 - Summary of conclusions, recommendations and lessons
- iii. Acronyms and Abbreviations
(See: UNDP Editorial Manual⁴)
- 1. Introduction
 - Purpose of the evaluation
 - Scope & Methodology
 - Structure of the evaluation report
- 2. Project description and development context
 - Project start and duration
 - Problems that the project sought to address
 - Immediate and development objectives of the project
 - Baseline Indicators established
 - Main stakeholders
 - Expected Results
- 3. Findings
(In addition to a descriptive assessment, all criteria marked with (*) must be rated⁵)
- 3.1 Project Design / Formulation
 - Analysis of LFA/Results Framework (Project logic /strategy; Indicators)
 - Assumptions and Risks
 - Lessons from other relevant projects (e.g., same focal area) incorporated into project design
 - Planned stakeholder participation
 - Replication approach
 - UNDP comparative advantage
 - Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector
 - Management arrangements
- 3.2 Project Implementation
 - Adaptive management (changes to the project design and project outputs during implementation)
 - Partnership arrangements (with relevant stakeholders involved in the country/region)
 - Feedback from M&E activities used for adaptive management
 - Project Finance:

⁴ UNDP Style Manual, Office of Communications, Partnerships Bureau, updated November 2008

⁵ Using a six-point rating scale: 6: Highly Satisfactory, 5: Satisfactory, 4: Marginally Satisfactory, 3: Marginally Unsatisfactory, 2: Unsatisfactory and 1: Highly Unsatisfactory, see section 3.5, page 37 for ratings explanations.

- Monitoring and evaluation: design at entry and implementation (*)
 - UNDP and Implementing Partner implementation / execution (*) coordination, and operational issues
- 3.3** Project Results
- Overall results (attainment of objectives) (*)
 - Relevance(*)
 - Effectiveness & Efficiency (*)
 - Country ownership
 - Mainstreaming
 - Sustainability (*)
 - Impact
- 4.** Conclusions, Recommendations & Lessons
- 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
 - Best and worst practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance and success
- 5.** Annexes
- ToR
 - Itinerary
 - List of persons interviewed
 - Summary of field visits
 - List of documents reviewed
 - Evaluation Question Matrix
 - Questionnaire used and summary of results
 - Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form