

Midterm Review Terms of Reference

Standard Template 2: Formatted information to be entered in [UNDP Jobs website](#)¹

BASIC CONTRACT INFORMATION

Location: Indonesia

Application Deadline: 19:00 PM GMT +7 on 09 November 2020

Type of Contract: Individual Contract

Post Level: International Consultant (Senior Specialist)

Languages Required: English

Starting Date: 1 December 2020

Duration of Initial Contract: 49 working days (within 4 months)

Expected Duration of Assignment: December 2020 – March 2021

BACKGROUND

A. Project Title

Global Opportunities for Long-term Development Integrated Sound Management of Mercury in Indonesia's Artisanal and Small-scale Gold Mining (GOLD-ISMIA).

B. Project Description

This is the Terms of Reference for the UNDP-GEF Midterm Review (MTR) of the full-sized project titled Integrated Sound Management of Mercury in Indonesia's Artisanal and Small-scale Gold Mining (ISMIA) (PIMS#5872) implemented through the Executing Agency/Implementing Partner. The project started on 5 September 2018 and is in its third year of implementation. This ToR sets out the expectations for this MTR. The MTR process must follow the guidance outlined in the document *Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects* (http://web.undp.org/evaluation/documents/guidance/GEF/mid-term/Guidance_Midterm%20Review%20_EN_2014.pdf).

Worldwide Artisanal and Small-scale Gold Mining (ASGM) is the largest global source of anthropogenic mercury releases into the environment (35%).² Mercury can travel long distances, contributing to global mercury pollution and contaminating the world's ecosystems and fisheries. Exposure to mercury may cause serious health problems and is a particular threat to the development of the child in utero and early in life³. Phasing-out mercury from the ASGM sector is therefore of the utmost importance, however ASGM is a very important source of jobs and livelihoods. ASGM accounts for about 17-20% of the world's annual gold production⁴ with 15 million people directly participating in ASGM activities⁵ and another 100 million depending on ASGM for their livelihoods.

¹ <https://jobs.undp.org/>

² UNEP Global Mercury Assessment (2013)

³ WHO Fact Sheet No. 361 (2013)

⁴ Estelle Levin Limited (2014)

⁵ UNEP (2013) The Negotiating Process:

<http://www.unep.org/hazardoussubstances/Mercury/Negotiations/tabid/3320/Default.aspx>

The main objective of the GOLD-ISMIA Project is to reduce/eliminate mercury releases from the Indonesian ASGM sector through four (4) components, namely:

- Component 1: Strengthening institutions and the policy/regulatory framework for mercury-free ASGM;
- Component 2: Establishing financing lending arrangements to provide loans for mercury-free processing equipment;
- Component 3: Increasing the capacity of mining communities for mercury-free ASGM through the provision of technical assistance, technology transfer and support for formalization; and,
- Component 4: Raising awareness and disseminating best practices and lessons-learned on mercury phase-out in the ASGM sector.

The Project has been supporting 6 (six) ASGM communities in Indonesia to reduce mercury use by 5 metric tonnes/year starting in year 3 (three) of the project implementation. Over the project cycle period, the project is expected to strengthen the efforts of Indonesia to reduce 15 tonnes of Mercury. The 6 ASGM communities are as follows:

1. Kalirejo and Hargorejo Villages, Kulon Progo District, Daerah Istimewa Yogyakarta Province;
2. Buwun Mas Village, West Lombok District, Nusa Tenggara Barat Province;
3. Hulawa Village, North Gorontalo District, Gorontalo Province
4. Tatelu and Talawaan Villages, North Minahasa District, North Sulawesi Province;
5. Logas Hulu and Logas Hilir Villages, Kuantan Singingi District, Riau Province
6. Anggai Village, South Halmahera District, North Maluku Province

The project is planning to deliver these following financing plan in order to assure its performance as stipulated in the prodoc:

| FINANCING PLAN | |
|---|-----------------------|
| GEF Trust Fund | 6,720,000 USD |
| (1) Total Budget administered by UNDP | 6,720,000 USD |
| PARALLEL CO-FINANCING | |
| UNDP | 112,000 USD |
| Government: | |
| Ministry of Environment and Forestry | 11,434,774 USD |
| The Agency for Assessment and Application of Technology | 6,865,491 USD |
| Ministry of Energy and Mineral Resources | 160,235 USD |
| Coordinating Ministry for Maritime | 451,128 USD |
| Ministry of Health | 6,574,527 USD |
| Ministry of Communication and Information Technology | 2,725 USD |
| APRI (Indonesian Artisanal Mining Association) | 3,000,000 USD |
| (2) Total co-financing | 28,600,880 USD |
| (3) Grand-Total Project Financing (1) + (2) | 35,320,880 USD |

During its implementation in 2020, the global Covid-19 Outbreak has been seriously affecting the project implementation. As of 11 March 2020, the World Health Organization (WHO) declared COVID-19 a global pandemic as the new coronavirus rapidly spread to all regions of the world. Travel to the country has been restricted since 16 March 2020 and travel in the country is also restricted. If it is not possible to travel to or within the country for the MTR mission then the MTR team should develop a methodology that takes this into account the conduct of the MTR virtually and remotely, including the use of remote interview methods and extended desk reviews, data analysis, surveys and evaluation questionnaires. This should be detailed in the MTR Inception Report and agreed with the Commissioning Unit.

As of 14 September 2020, the Government of Indonesia has announced 221,523 confirmed cases of COVID-19 across all provinces of the country, with 8,841 deaths. The Government has also announced that 158,405 people have recovered from the illness. The Government also recorded 98,842 suspected cases.

The Indonesian Doctors Association recorded, as of September 13, a total of 194 deaths of health workers due to COVID-19, consisting of 115 general practitioners and specialists, 9 dentists and 70 nurses. The Central Bureau of Statistics registered a total of 81,011 doctors in Indonesia in 2019, with the largest numbers in DKI Jakarta (with 11,365 doctors), East Java (10,802 doctors), Central Java (9,747 doctors), and West Java (8,771 doctors).

Large-scale Social distancing policy (PSBB) and travel restriction that have been implemented in Indonesia affected the implementation of the project especially at project sites. Some planned activities of each project components were postponed as follow:

Component 1: Strengthening institutions and the policy/regulatory framework for mercury-free ASGM

1. National training targeting 100 staff of relevant ministries which is expected to be held in April 2020 was canceled.
2. Coaching clinic for 15 provinces and 9 districts to draft the sub-national action plan on mercury reduction and elimination
3. FGD on policy recommendations to be participated by relevant ministries

Component 2 Establishing financing lending arrangements to provide loans for mercury-free processing equipment:

1. Establishment of new/redesign the lending/loan scheme or mechanism for ASGM to enable procuring the new technology of mercury free gold processing equipment.
2. Delays on the project's facilitation to ASGM and ASGM Cooperatives in the field to increase their capacity to apply for loans for mercury-free processing equipment.

Component 3: Increasing the capacity of mining communities for mercury-free ASGM through the provision of technical assistance, technology transfer and support for formalization:

1. Data collection and socioeconomic interview with the local communities' miners, collect ore sampling, preparing and conduct training for the proposed techniques of processing and others.
2. Visit the BLU Tekmira laboratories to view on the proposed technique of Hg separation from amalgamation tailing.
3. Technical training on mercury-free processing technique and formalization for 20 miners in Sekotong.

Component 4: Raising awareness and disseminating best practices and lessons-learned on mercury phase-out in the ASGM sector.

1. Awareness raising field activities in Kulonprogo, Kuantan Singingi, Obi and North Gorontalo;
2. Festival of West Lombok

3. Introduction of storytelling technique to basic schools teachers in six project locations.

Component gender:

The impact of the COVID 19 outbreak is also affecting to the progress of the implementation of gender action plan under Gold- ISMIA project particularly on implementing workshops/awareness raising events to increase mining communities' awareness (including women miner groups) on the availability of various incentives and financial access that meet their needs as well as introducing new technology that will be equally accessed by women and men.

However, initiating alternative strategy, the project is taking advantage of the increasing use of online meetings with government entities and other stakeholders during the pandemic. The project has also expanded the communication with beneficiaries in project sites by hiring local facilitators and by using several online platforms such as WhatsApp Group (WAG) and social media including Instagram, twitter, YouTube. Project created one WAG for each project site that involves the village leader, mining leader, owner, miners and project's field facilitators.

C. MTR Purpose

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 in order to set the project on-track to achieve its intended results. The MTR will also review the project's strategy and its risks to sustainability.

MTRs are primarily a monitoring tool to identify challenges and outline corrective actions to ensure that a project is on track to achieve maximum results by its completion. The primary output/deliverable of a MTR process is the MTR report.

The MTR report will be submitted to GEF as a mandatory requirement for all GEF-financed full-sized projects (FSP). The MTR report must be completed and submitted to GEF secretariate with the 2nd Project Implementation Report (PIR) in 2021.

DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

D. MTR Approach & Methodology

The MTR report 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 Social and Environmental Screening Procedure (SESP)), the Project Document, project reports including PIRs, PAR, Annual Work Plans and relevant revisions, national strategy and priorities, and any other relevant materials considered useful for this evidence-based review. The MTR team will review the baseline GEF focal area Core Indicators/Tracking Tools submitted to the GEF at CEO endorsement, and the midterm GEF focal area Core Indicators/Tracking Tools that must be completed before the MTR field mission begins.

The MTR team is expected to follow a collaborative and participatory approach⁶ ensuring close engagement with the Project Team, government counterparts (including GEF Operational Focal Point), UNDP Country Office, UNDP BRH/Regional Technical Advisor, direct beneficiaries, and other key stakeholders.

Engagement of stakeholders is vital to a successful MTR.⁷ Stakeholder involvement should include interviews with stakeholders who have project responsibilities, including but not limited to Ministry of Environment and Forestry, Agency for Technology Assessment and Application (BPPT), Ministry of Energy and Mineral Resources, Sub-national agencies, Small-scale gold miners association, miner communities, senior officials and task team/ component leaders, key experts and consultants in the subject area, experts/academia, CSOs, etc. Additionally, the MTR team is expected to conduct field missions to Jakarta, Indonesia, including the following project sites in North Minahasa, Kuantan Singingi and Kulonprogo.

Due to Covid-19 Outbreak, all or parts of the MTR will potentially be carried out virtually. It will then consider the stakeholders' availability, ability or willingness to be interviewed remotely. In addition, their accessibility to the internet/computer may be an issue as many government and national counterparts may be working from home. These limitations must be reflected in the final MTR report.

If a data collection/field mission is not possible, then remote interviews may be undertaken through telephone or online (skype, zoom etc.). International consultants can work remotely with national evaluator support in the field if it is safe for them to operate and travel. No stakeholders, consultants or UNDP staff should be put in harm's way and safety is the key priority.

A short validation mission may be considered if it is confirmed to be safe for staff, consultants, stakeholders and if such a mission is possible within the MTR schedule. Equally, qualified and independent national consultants can be hired to undertake the MTR and interviews in country as long as it is safe to do so.

The specific design and methodology for the MTR should emerge from consultations between the MTR team and the above-mentioned parties regarding what is appropriate and feasible for meeting the MTR purpose and objectives and answering the evaluation questions, given limitations of budget, time and data. The MTR team must, however, use gender-responsive methodologies and tools and ensure that gender equality and women's empowerment, as well as other cross-cutting issues and SDGs are incorporated into the MTR report.

The final methodological approach including interview schedule, field visits and data to be used in the MTR should be clearly outlined in the Inception Report and be fully discussed and agreed between UNDP, stakeholders and the MTR team.

The final MTR report must 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.

E. 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. Project Strategy

⁶ For ideas on innovative and participatory Monitoring and Evaluation strategies and techniques, see [UNDP Discussion Paper: Innovations in Monitoring & Evaluating Results](#), 05 Nov 2013.

⁷ For more stakeholder engagement in the M&E process, see the [UNDP Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results](#), Chapter 3, pg. 93.

Project Design:

- Review the problem addressed by the project and the underlying assumptions. Review the effect of any incorrect assumptions or changes to the context to achieving the project results as outlined in the Project Document.
- Review the relevance of the project strategy and assess whether it provides the most effective route towards expected/intended results. Were lessons from other relevant projects properly incorporated into the project design?
- Review how the project addresses country priorities. Review country ownership. Was the project concept in line with the national sector development priorities and plans of the country (or of participating countries in the case of multi-country projects)?
- Review decision-making processes: were perspectives of those who would be affected by project decisions, those who could affect the outcomes, and those who could contribute information or other resources to the process, 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.
 - Were relevant gender issues (e.g. the impact of the project on gender equality in the programme country, involvement of women's groups, engaging women in project activities) raised in the Project Document?
- If there are major areas of concern, recommend areas for

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.

2. Progress Towards Results

- Review the logframe indicators against progress made towards the end-of-project targets; populate the Progress Towards Results Matrix, as described in 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 the project objective and each outcome; make recommendations from the areas marked as "not on target to be achieved" (red).
- Compare and analyse the GEF Tracking Tool/Core Indicators 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.

3. 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.
- Do the Executing Agency/Implementing Partner and/or UNDP and other partners have the capacity to deliver benefits to or involve women? If yes, how?
- What is the gender balance of project staff? What steps have been taken to ensure gender balance in project staff?
- What is the gender balance of the Project Board? What steps have been taken to ensure gender balance in the Project Board?

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.
- Examine the impacts of COVID-19 to the project implementation.
- Review any delays caused by COVID-19 situation.

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 by the Commissioning Unit and project team, 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?

| Sources of Co-financing | Name of Co-financer | Type of Co-financing | Co-financing amount confirmed at CEO Endorsement (US\$) | Actual Amount Contributed at stage of Midterm Review (US\$) | Actual % of Expected Amount |
|-------------------------|---------------------|----------------------|---|---|-----------------------------|
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | TOTAL | | | |

- Include the separate GEF Co-Financing template (filled out by the Commissioning Unit and project team) which categorizes co-financing amounts by source as ‘investment mobilized’ or ‘recurrent expenditures’. (This template will be annexed as a separate file).

Project-level monitoring and evaluation systems

- Review the monitoring tools currently being used: Do they provide the necessary information? Do they involve key partners? Are they aligned or mainstreamed with national systems? Do they use existing information? Are they efficient? Are they cost-effective? Are additional tools required? How could they be made more participatory and inclusive?
- Examine the financial management of the project monitoring and evaluation budget. Are sufficient resources being allocated to monitoring and evaluation? Are these resources being allocated effectively?
- Review the extent to which relevant gender issues were incorporated in monitoring systems. See Annex 9 of *Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects* for further guidelines.

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?
- How does the project engage women and girls? Is the project likely to have the same positive and/or negative effects on women and men, girls and boys? Identify, if possible, legal, cultural, or religious constraints on women’s participation in the project. What can the project do to enhance its gender benefits?

Social and Environmental Standards (Safeguards)

- Validate the risks identified in the project’s most current SESP, and those risks’ ratings; are any revisions needed?
- Summarize and assess the revisions made since CEO Endorsement/Approval (if any) to:
 - The project’s overall safeguards risk categorization.
 - The identified types of risks⁸ (in the SESP).
 - The individual risk ratings (in the SESP).
- Describe and assess progress made in the implementation of the project’s social and environmental management measures as outlined in the SESP submitted at CEO Endorsement/Approval (and prepared during implementation, if any), including any revisions to those measures. Such management measures might include Environmental and Social Management Plans (ESMPs) or other management plans, though can also include aspects of a project’s design; refer to Question 6 in the SESP template for a summary of the identified management measures.

A given project should be assessed against the version of UNDP’s safeguards policy that was in effect at the time of the project’s approval.

⁸ Risks are to be labeled with both the UNDP SES Principles and Standards, and the GEF’s “types of risks and potential impacts”: Climate Change and Disaster; Disadvantaged or Vulnerable Individuals or Groups; Disability Inclusion; Adverse Gender-Related impact, including Gender-based Violence and Sexual Exploitation; Biodiversity Conservation and the Sustainable Management of Living Natural Resources; Restrictions on Land Use and Involuntary Resettlement; Indigenous Peoples; Cultural Heritage; Resource Efficiency and Pollution Prevention; Labor and Working Conditions; Community Health, Safety and Security.

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 & Knowledge Management

- 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.
- List knowledge activities/products developed (based on knowledge management approach approved at CEO Endorsement/Approval).

4. Sustainability

- Validate whether the risks identified in the Project Document, Annual Project Review/PIRs and the ATLAS Risk Register 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 consultant/team will include a section in the MTR report for evidence-based **conclusions**, in light of the findings.

Additionally, the MTR consultant/team is expected to make **recommendations** to the Project Team. 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. The MTR consultant/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 the TOR Annexes for the Rating Table and ratings scales.

F. Expected Outputs and Deliverables

The MTR team shall prepare and submit:

- MTR Inception Report: MTR team clarifies objectives and methods of the Midterm Review no later than 2 weeks before the MTR mission or virtual MTR data collection. To be sent to the Commissioning Unit and project management. Completion date: (11 December 2020)
- Presentation: MTR team presents initial findings to project management and the Commissioning Unit at the end of the MTR mission. Completion date: (12 February 2021)
- Draft MTR Report: MTR team submits the draft full report with annexes within 3 weeks of the MTR mission. Completion date: (24 February 2021)
- Final Report*: MTR team submits the revised report with annexed and completed Audit Trail detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final MTR report. To be sent to the Commissioning Unit within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft. Completion date: (24 March 2021)

*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.

G. Institutional Arrangements

The principal responsibility for managing this MTR resides with the Commissioning Unit. The Commissioning Unit for this project's MTR is UNDP Indonesia Country Office. The Commissioning Unit will contract the consultants and ensure the timely provision of per diems and travel arrangements within the country (if needed) 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.

If a data collection/field mission is not possible, then remote interviews may be undertaken. The Commissioning Unit and Project Team will support the implementation of remote/ virtual meetings. An updated stakeholder list with contact details (phone and email) will be provided by the Commissioning Unit to the MTR team.

H. Duration of the Work

The total duration of the MTR will be approximately *(49 of days)* over a period of *(16 weeks /4 months)* starting *(1 December 2020)*, and shall not exceed five months from when the consultant(s) are hired. The tentative MTR timeframe is as follows:

Timeline di TOR:

- *09 November 2020*: Application closes
- *November 2020*: Selection of MTR Team
- *December 2020 1 day*: Prep the MTR Team (handover of project documents)
- *December 2020 4 days*: (Document review and preparing MTR Inception Report
- *December 2020 5 days*: Finalization and Validation of MTR Inception Report- latest start of MTR mission
- *February 2021 15 days*: MTR mission: stakeholder meetings, interviews, field visits
- *February 2021 1 day*: Mission wrap-up meeting & presentation of initial findings- earliest end of MTR mission
- *February 2021 7 days*: Preparing draft report
- *March 2021 7 days*: Incorporating audit trail on draft report/Finalization of MTR report
- *March 2021 5 days*: Preparation & Issue of Management Response
- *March 2021 1 day* (optional): Concluding Stakeholder Workshop (not mandatory for MTR team)
- *March 2021 3 days*: Expected date of full MTR completion

The date start of contract is 1 December 2020.

I. Duty Station

- a) The contractor's duty station will be **home-based** with possibility of travel to Jakarta in Indonesia, Kulonprogo, North Minahasa and Kuantan Singingi during the MTR mission, those are subject to the approval from RR or The Head of Unit.
- b) The consultant is working on the output-based, thus no necessity to report or present regularly.

Travel:

- If the travel is allowed, international travel will be required to Jakarta in Indonesia, Kulonprogo, North Minahasa and Kuantan Singingi during the MTR mission;
The selection of project sites is based on accessibility and ore differentiation. Kulonprogo and North Minahasa have primary ore and Kuantan Singingi has alluvial ore.
- The BSAFE training course must be successfully completed prior to commencement of travel; Herewith is the link to access this training: <https://training.dss.un.org/courses/login/index.php>. These training modules at this secure internet site is accessible to Consultants, which allows for registration with private email.
- 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 (travel expense will be facilitated by GOLD-ISMIA project).

| No | Indicative Location | Frequency | Number of Travel Days |
|----|--|-----------|-----------------------|
| 1 | Jakarta | 1 | 4 |
| 2 | Kulonprogo – Yogyakarta Province | 1 | 4 |
| 3 | North Minahasa – North Sulawesi Province | 1 | 4 |
| 4 | Kuantan Singingi – Riau Province | 1 | 4 |

- The International Consultant will work with a National Consultant and/or if the International Consultant is to operate remotely. Include a provision for experience in implementing evaluations remotely.

REQUIRED SKILLS AND EXPERIENCE

J. Qualifications of the Successful Applicants

A team of two independent consultants will conduct the MTR - one team leader / International Consultant (with experience and exposure to projects and evaluations in other regions globally) and one team expert / National Consultant, usually from Indonesia. The International Consultant will work with a National Consultant and/or if the International Consultant is to operate remotely. Include a provision for experience in implementing evaluations remotely.

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:

Education

- A Master's degree in Environmental Science, Environmental Engineering, Chemical Engineering, Natural Science, Natural Resource Management, Business Administration, Social-science or other relevant studies.

Experience

- Minimum 15 years of experience working in relevant technical areas including experience on project monitoring and evaluation;
- Experience applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios;
- Experience working with the GEF or GEF-evaluations;
- Experience with result-based management evaluation methodologies;
- Experience working in Asia-Pacific Countries;
- Experience with implementing evaluations remotely will be considered an asset.
- Project evaluation/review experiences within United Nations system will be considered an asset;
- Competence in adaptive management, especially on Artisanal Small-scale Gold Mining (ASGM) and hazardous chemicals such as mercury;

- Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender and *hazardous chemicals*; experience in gender sensitive evaluation and analysis;
- Demonstrable analytical skills;
- Excellent communication skills;

Language

- Fluency in written and spoken English.

K. Ethics

The MTR team will be held to the highest ethical standards and is required to sign a code of conduct upon acceptance of the assignment. This MTR will be conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG ‘Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation’. The MTR team must safeguard the rights and confidentiality of information providers, interviewees and stakeholders through measures to ensure compliance with legal and other relevant codes governing collection of data and reporting on data. The MTR team must also ensure security of collected information before and after the MTR and protocols to ensure anonymity and confidentiality of sources of information where that is expected. The information, knowledge and data gathered in the MTR process must also be solely used for the MTR and not for other uses without the express authorization of UNDP and partners.

L. Schedule of Payments

- 20% payment upon satisfactory delivery of the final MTR Inception Report and approval by the Commissioning Unit
- 40% payment upon satisfactory delivery of the draft MTR report to the Commissioning Unit
- 40% payment upon satisfactory delivery of the final MTR report and approval by the Commissioning Unit and RTA (via signatures on the TE Report Clearance Form) and delivery of completed TE Audit Trail

Criteria for issuing the final payment of 40%

- The final MTR report includes all requirements outlined in the MTR TOR and is in accordance with the MTR guidance.
- The final MTR report is clearly written, logically organized, and is specific for this project (i.e. text has not been cut & pasted from other MTR reports).
- The Audit Trail includes responses to and justification for each comment listed.

In line with the UNDP’s financial regulations, when determined by the Commissioning Unit and/or the consultant that a deliverable or service cannot be satisfactorily completed due to the impact of COVID-19 and limitations to the MTR, that deliverable or service will not be paid.

Due to the current COVID-19 situation and its implications, a partial payment may be considered if the consultant invested time towards the deliverable but was unable to complete to circumstances beyond his/her control.

APPLICATION PROCESS

M. Recommended Presentation of Offer

- a) **Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability** using the [template](#)⁹ provided by UNDP;
- b) **CV** and a **Personal History Form** ([P11 form](#)¹⁰);
- 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 the address **United Nations Development Programme, Menara Thamrin 8-9th Floor. Jl. MH Thamrin Kav.3 Jakarta 10250, Indonesia**; in a sealed envelope indicating the following reference **“International Consultant for GOLD-ISMIA Mid-term Review”** or by email at the following address ONLY: bids.id@undp.org by **19:00 PM GMT +7 on 09 November 2020**. Incomplete applications will be excluded from further consideration.

N. 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.

When using this weighted scoring method, the award of the contract should 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 a pre-determined set of weighted technical and financial criteria specific to the solicitation.
 - * Technical Criteria weight; 70%
 - * Financial Criteria weight; 30%

⁹

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

¹⁰ http://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/corporate/Careers/P11_Personal_history_form.doc

Only candidates obtaining a minimum of 70 point would be considered for the Financial Evaluation

| Criteria | Weight | Maximum Point |
|--|------------|---------------|
| Technical Criteria | 70% | 100 |
| Criteria A: qualification requirements as per ToR: | | 80 |
| A Master's degree in Environmental Science, Environmental Engineering, Chemical Engineering, Natural Science, Natural Resource Management, Business Administration, Social-science or other relevant studies | | 5 |
| Minimum 15 years of experience working in relevant technical areas including experience on project monitoring and evaluation; | | 10 |
| Experience applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios; | | 10 |
| Experience working with the GEF or GEF-evaluations; | | 10 |
| Experience with result-based management evaluation methodologies; | | 10 |
| Experience working in Asia-Pacific Countries; | | 5 |
| Experience with implementing evaluations remotely will be considered an asset; | | 5 |
| Project evaluation/review experiences within United Nations system will be considered an asset; | | 5 |
| Competence in adaptive management, especially on Artisanal Small-scale Gold Mining (ASGM) and hazardous chemicals such as mercury; | | 10 |
| Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender and <i>hazardous chemicals</i> ; experience in gender sensitive evaluation and analysis; | | 5 |
| Demonstrable analytical skills and excellent communication skills; | | 5 |
| Criteria B: Brief Description of Approach to Assignment: | | 20 |
| - Understand the task and applies a methodology appropriate for the task as well as strategy in a coherent manner. - Important aspects of the task addressed clearly and in sufficient detail. | | 20 |

| | | |
|--|------------|--|
| - Logical and realistic planning for efficient project implementation. | | |
| Financial Criteria | 30% | |

O. Annexes to the MTR ToR

ToR ANNEX A: List of Documents to be reviewed by the MTR Team

- GOLD-ISMIA Project Document
- Project Inception Report
- Project Implementation Reports (PIR's) and the attachments
- Project Portfolio Indicators
- Annual Work Plan
- Minutes of the GOLD-ISMIA Project Board Meeting
- Matrix of GEF-GOLD status
- Planet Gold Country Project Reporting
- Project Assessment Report (PAR)
- Project Annual Report
- Project Publications: factsheets, brief reports, assessment reports and
- Financial and Administration guidelines used by Project Team
- Project Financial Report / Combined Delivery Report (CDR)
- PIF

ToR ANNEX B: Guidelines on Contents for the Midterm Review Report¹¹

- i. Basic Report Information (*for opening page or title page*)
 - Title of UNDP supported GEF financed project
 - UNDP PIMS# and GEF project ID#
 - MTR time frame and date of MTR report
 - Region and countries included in the project
 - GEF Operational Focal Area/Strategic Program
 - Executing Agency/Implementing Partner and other project partners
 - MTR team members
 - Acknowledgements
- ii. Table of Contents
- iii. Acronyms and Abbreviations
1. Executive Summary (*3-5 pages*)
 - Project Information Table
 - Project Description (brief)

¹¹ The Report length should not exceed 40 pages in total (not including annexes).

- Project Progress Summary (between 200-500 words)
 - MTR Ratings & Achievement Summary Table
 - Concise summary of conclusions
 - Recommendation Summary Table
2. Introduction (*2-3 pages*)
 - Purpose of the MTR and objectives
 - Scope & Methodology: principles of design and execution of the MTR, MTR approach and data collection methods, limitations to the MTR
 - Structure of the MTR report
 3. Project Description and Background Context (*3-5 pages*)
 - Development context: environmental, socio-economic, institutional, and policy factors relevant to the project objective and scope
 - Problems that the project sought to address: threats and barriers targeted
 - Project Description and Strategy: objective, outcomes and expected results, description of field sites (if any)
 - Project Implementation Arrangements: short description of the Project Board, key implementing partner arrangements, etc.
 - Project timing and milestones
 - Main stakeholders: summary list
 4. Findings (*12-14 pages*)
 - 4.1 Project Strategy
 - Project Design
 - Results Framework/Logframe
 - 4.2 Progress Towards Results
 - Progress towards outcomes analysis
 - Remaining barriers to achieving the project objective
 - 4.3 Project Implementation and Adaptive Management
 - Management Arrangements
 - Work planning
 - Finance and co-finance
 - Project-level monitoring and evaluation systems
 - Stakeholder engagement
 - Reporting
 - Communications
 - 4.4 Sustainability
 - Financial risks to sustainability
 - Socio-economic to sustainability
 - Institutional framework and governance risks to sustainability
 - Environmental risks to sustainability
 5. Conclusions and Recommendations (*4-6 pages*)
 - 5.1 Conclusions
 - Comprehensive and balanced statements (that are evidence-based and connected to the MTR's findings) which highlight the strengths, weaknesses and results of the project
 - 5.2 Recommendations
 - Corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project
 - Actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the project
 - Proposals for future directions underlining main objectives

6. Annexes

- MTR ToR (excluding ToR annexes)
- MTR evaluative matrix (evaluation criteria with key questions, indicators, sources of data, and methodology)
- Example Questionnaire or Interview Guide used for data collection
- Ratings Scales
- MTR mission itinerary
- List of persons interviewed
- List of documents reviewed
- Co-financing table (if not previously included in the body of the report)
- Signed UNEG Code of Conduct form
- Signed MTR final report clearance form
- *Annexed in a separate file:* Audit trail from received comments on draft MTR report
- *Annexed in a separate file:* Relevant midterm tracking tools (*METT, FSC, Capacity scorecard, etc.*)

ToR ANNEX C: Midterm Review Evaluative Matrix Template

This Midterm Review Evaluative Matrix must be fully completed by the consultant and included in the MTR inception report and as an Annex to the MTR report.

| Evaluative Questions | Indicators | Sources | Methodology |
|---|---|---|--|
| Project Strategy: To what extent is the project strategy relevant to country priorities, country ownership, and the best route towards expected results? | | | |
| (include evaluative question(s)) | (i.e. relationships established, level of coherence between project design and implementation approach, specific activities conducted, quality of risk mitigation strategies, etc.) | (i.e. project documents, national policies or strategies, websites, project staff, project partners, data collected throughout the MTR mission, etc.) | (i.e. document analysis, data analysis, interviews with project staff, interviews with stakeholders, etc.) |
| | | | |
| Progress Towards Results: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved thus far? | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| Project Implementation and Adaptive Management: Has the project been implemented efficiently, cost-effectively, and been able to adapt to any changing conditions thus far? To what extent are project-level monitoring and evaluation systems, reporting, and project communications supporting the project's implementation? | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, socio-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results? | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |

ToR ANNEX D: UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluators/Midterm Review Consultants¹²

Evaluators/Consultants:

1. Must present information that is complete and fair in its assessment of strengths and weaknesses so that decisions or actions taken are well founded.
2. Must disclose the full set of evaluation findings along with information on their limitations and have this accessible to all affected by the evaluation with expressed legal rights to receive results.
3. Should protect the anonymity and confidentiality of individual informants. They should provide maximum notice, minimize demands on time, and respect people's right not to engage. Evaluators must respect people's right to provide information in confidence, and must ensure that sensitive information cannot be traced to its source. Evaluators are not expected to evaluate individuals, and must balance an evaluation of management functions with this general principle.
4. Sometimes uncover evidence of wrongdoing while conducting evaluations. Such cases must be reported discreetly to the appropriate investigative body. Evaluators should consult with other relevant oversight entities when there is any doubt about if and how issues should be reported.
5. Should be sensitive to beliefs, manners and customs and act with integrity and honesty in their relations with all stakeholders. In line with the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights, evaluators must be sensitive to and address issues of discrimination and gender equality. They should avoid offending the dignity and self-respect of those persons with whom they come in contact in the course of the evaluation. Knowing that evaluation might negatively affect the interests of some stakeholders, evaluators should conduct the evaluation and communicate its purpose and results in a way that clearly respects the stakeholders' dignity and self-worth.
6. Are responsible for their performance and their product(s). They are responsible for the clear, accurate and fair written and/or oral presentation of study limitations, findings and recommendations.
7. Should reflect sound accounting procedures and be prudent in using the resources of the evaluation.

MTR Consultant Agreement Form

Agreement to abide by the Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN System:

Name of Consultant: _____

Name of Consultancy Organization (where relevant): _____

I confirm that I have received and understood and will abide by the United Nations Code of Conduct for Evaluation.

Signed at _____ (*Place*) on _____ (*Date*)

Signature: _____

ToR ANNEX E: MTR Ratings

| Ratings for Progress Towards Results: (one rating for each outcome and for the objective) | | |
|---|--------------------------------|--|
| 6 | Highly Satisfactory (HS) | The objective/outcome is expected to achieve or exceed all its end-of-project targets, without major shortcomings. The progress towards the objective/outcome can be presented as "good practice". |
| 5 | Satisfactory (S) | The objective/outcome is expected to achieve most of its end-of-project targets, with only minor shortcomings. |
| 4 | Moderately Satisfactory (MS) | The objective/outcome is expected to achieve most of its end-of-project targets but with significant shortcomings. |
| 3 | Moderately Unsatisfactory (HU) | The objective/outcome is expected to achieve its end-of-project targets with major shortcomings. |

¹² <http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/100>

| | | |
|---|----------------------------|--|
| 2 | Unsatisfactory (U) | The objective/outcome is expected not to achieve most of its end-of-project targets. |
| 1 | Highly Unsatisfactory (HU) | The objective/outcome has failed to achieve its midterm targets, and is not expected to achieve any of its end-of-project targets. |

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

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

ToR ANNEX F: MTR Report Clearance Form

(to be completed by the Commissioning Unit and UNDP-GEF RTA and included in the final document)

| | |
|---|-------------|
| Midterm Review Report Reviewed and Cleared By: | |
| Commissioning Unit | |
| Name: _____ | |
| Signature: _____ | Date: _____ |
| UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Advisor | |
| Name: _____ | |
| Signature: _____ | Date: _____ |

ToR ANNEX G: Audit Trail Template

Note: The following is a template for the MTR Team to show how the received comments on the draft MTR report have (or have not) been incorporated into the final MTR report. This audit trail should be included as an annex in the final MTR report.

To the comments received on (date) from the Midterm Review of GOLD-ISMIA Project

The following comments were provided in track changes to the draft Midterm Review report; they are referenced by institution (“Author” column) and track change comment number (“#” column):

| Author | # | Para No./ comment location | Comment/Feedback on the draft MTR report | MTR team response and actions taken |
|--------|---|----------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |

ToR ANNEX H: Progress Towards Results Matrix and MTR Ratings & Achievement Summary Tables (in Word)

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

| Project Strategy | Indicator ¹³ | Baseline Level ¹⁴ | Level in 1 st PIR (self-reported) | Midterm Target ¹⁵ | End-of-project Target | Midterm Level & Assessment ¹⁶ | Achievement Rating ¹⁷ | 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 |
|-----------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|

¹³ Populate with data from the Logframe and scorecards

¹⁴ Populate with data from the Project Document

¹⁵ If available

¹⁶ Colour code this column only

¹⁷ Use the 6 point Progress Towards Results Rating Scale: HS, S, MS, MU, U, HU

