INDIVIDUAL CONSULTANT PROCUREMENT NOTICE

Country: Thailand

Description of the assignment: National Consultant – Midterm Evaluation (MTR)

Duty Station: Home- based with travel to Nong Khai Province and Song Khla Province, Thailand

Project name: UNDP-Thailand Country Office- Combatting Illegal Wildlife Trade, focusing on Ivory, Rhino Horn, Tiger and Pangolins in Thailand Project

Period of assignment/services (if applicable): May 2021 – 24 August 2021 (up to 23 working days).

To apply for this position, please click the link below:

UNDP Jobs - 98915- National Consultant – Midterm Evaluation (MTR)

1. BACKGROUND

Project Description

UNDP Thailand Country Office is looking for a national consultant who will work together with a international consultant in conducting the Midterm Review (thereafter referred to as the "Evaluation Team").

This is the Terms of Reference for the UNDP-GEF Midterm Review (MTR) of the full-sized project titled "Combatting Illegal Wildlife Trade, focusing on Ivory, Rhino Horn, Tiger and Pangolins in Thailand" (PIMS# 5619) implemented through the Department of National Parks, Wildlife and Plant Conservation, which is to be undertaken in 2021. The project started on 19th November 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* (*https://co.undpgefpims.org/workspace?current_directory_id=45*).

The Project Objective is to reduce the trafficking of wildlife (focusing on elephant ivory, rhinoceros horn, tiger and pangolins) in Thailand through enhanced enforcement capacity and collaboration and targeted behavior change campaigns. To achieve this objective, the project will utilize four strategies or Project Components as follows: **Component 1:** Improved Cooperation, Coordination and Information Exchange. This will strengthen the collaboration mechanism and provide a platform for exchange of information among the responsible agencies for illegal wildlife trade (IWT) law enforcement. **Component 2:** Enhanced Enforcement and Prosecution Capacity. This will increase the coherence and capacity of law enforcement agencies to address and deter illegal trafficking of wildlife (focusing on elephant ivory, rhinoceros horn, tigers and pangolins) through strengthening the cross-sectoral enforcement and prosecution framework. **Component 3:** Reduced demand for illegal wildlife products and targeted awareness actions to support law enforcement. The project will work with partners to learn from existing efforts and achieve cumulative impact through a Steering Group and the Community of Practice on Demand Reduction. The activities will follow a well-defined systematic process for developing, implementing and evaluating SBCC initiatives. This component also aims to increase awareness of prevailing laws and upcoming WARPA reforms and publicize convictions to strengthen deterrence of wildlife trafficking. **Component 4:** Knowledge Management, Monitoring and Evaluation and Gender Mainstreaming. This component closely links with and underpins the other three, by supporting the sharing of knowledge, experiences and lessons learned through project implementation with project stakeholders, the wider public in Thailand, and globally through the GEF-financed, World Bank-led Global Wildlife Program, of which this project is a part.

The total budget is USD 4,018,440 with a planned co-financing as below:-

Parallel co-financing (all other co-financing that is not cash co-financing administered by UNDP)	
UNDP	USD 50,000
Government - DNP	USD 14,539,379

Government – NED/RTP	USD 10,000,000	
IUCN	USD 90,000	
TRAFFIC	USD 100,000	
TRACE	USD 30,000	
USAID Wildlife Asia	USD 3,000,000	
Total co-financing	**USD 27,809,379**	

Grand total Project Financing is USD 31,827,819

Since 2020, the prolonged strict COVID-19 crisis response has significantly impacted the project implementation. Activities at the project locations have been postponed and implementing partner was in difficulty to proceed a procurement, training, workshop, networking of activities.

C. MTR Purpose

The MTR will assess progress towards the achievement of the project objectives and outcomes as specified in the Project Document. It will identify 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.

The progress will be assessed in consideration of the following:

- Project strategy: project design and results framework/logframe;
- Progress towards results (outcomes);
- Project implementation and adaptive management: management arrangements, work planning, finance and co-finance, project-level monitoring and evaluation (M&E) systems, stakeholder engagement, social and environmental standards, reporting, and communication and knowledge management; and
- Sustainability: financial, socio-economic, environmental, institutional framework and governance risks to sustainability.

The MTR report will provide conclusions and recommendations deriving from the findings and rate project's results according to the template provided.

NOTE: Detail any COVID-19 project interventions that should be included in the scope of the evaluation.

The MTR will investigate how Covid-19 has affected the implementation of the project, both negatively and positively; how the project has adapted to the changed circumstances; and what interventions were undertaken in response to the circumstances.

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

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 Initiation Plan, UNDP Social and Environmental Screening Procedure (SESP), the Project Document, project reports including Annual Project Review/PIRs, project budget revisions, national strategic and legal documents, and any other materials that the team considers useful for this evidence-based review. The MTR team will review the baseline GEF focal area 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 approach[1] ensuring close engagement with the Project Team, government counterparts (the GEF Operational Focal Point), the UNDP Country Office(s), the Nature, Climate and Energy (NCE) Regional Technical Advisor, direct beneficiaries, and other key stakeholders.

Engagement of stakeholders is vital to a successful MTR.[2] Stakeholder involvement should include interviews with stakeholders who have project responsibilities, including but not limited to Department of National Parks, Wildlife and Plant Conservation (DNP), Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment (MoNRE); executing agencies, senior officials and task team/ component leaders, key experts and consultants in the subject area, Project Board, project stakeholders, academia, local government and CSOs, etc. Additionally, the MTR team is expected to conduct field missions to Nong Khai Province, Song Kla Province. (depending on travel restriction on COVID-19).

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

List of Stakeholders

Department of National Parks, Wildlife and Plant Conservation (DNP)

- Mr. Thanya Netithammakun, Director General

- Dr. Rungnapha Pattanaviboon, Deputy Director General,

- Director of Wildlife Conservation Office

- Director of CITES

- Director of Wildlife Check point bureau

- Dr. Kanita Ouitavorn, Director of Wildlife Forensic Center

- Mr. Manop Lauprasert (IWT Senior Advisor)

---

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

[2] 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.

- Dr. Ronasit Maneesia (IWT Project Co-manager
- Head of Wildlife Check point, Nongkai Province (DNP)
- Head of Wildlife Check point Songkha province (DNP)

Responsible Parties

- Stephen Watson,TRAFFIC | Senior Specialist, Behaviour Change
- Gayle Burgess, TRAFFIC | Behavioural Change Programme Leader
- Dararat Weerapong, TRAFFIC | Senior Project Manager
- Dr. Ross Ross McEwing, Director TRACE Wildlife Forensics Network
- Mr. Scott Perkin:,Head, Natural Resources Group; IUCN Asia Regional Office
- Ms. Siriporn Sriaram, Acting Head of Office, IUCN Thailand
- Mr. Pratheep Mekatitam, IWT Project Officer, IUCN Thailand Programme

IWT Partners

- Dr. Anak Pattanaviboon WCS, Dirctor Thailand Country Program
- Mr. Peter Collier, Chief of Party: USAID Wildlife Asia Programme
- Mr. Jedsada Taweekan, IWT Programme, WWF Thailand

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.

In case that the International MTR consultant cannot enter to Thailand due to the COVID-19 VISA protocol, the MTR team should develop a methodology that reflects the adaptive management. This includes remote interview methods and extended desk reviews, data analysis, surveys and evaluation questionnaires. This must be detailed in the MTR Inception Report and agreed with by the Commissioning Unit.

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 03/2020 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.

If all or part of the MTR is to be carried out virtually then consideration should be taken for stakeholder 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.

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.

NOTE: Include below COVID-19 specific questions, as needed, and/or recognise the impact of COVID-19 and limitations on the project in the guiding evaluation questions.

1. Project Strategy

Project Design:
- Review the problem addressed by the project and the underlying assumptions. Review the effect of any incorrect assumptions or changes to the context to achieving the project results as outlined in the Project Document.

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

able. Progress Towards Results Matrix (Achievement of outcomes against End-of-roject Targets)

Project Strategy	Indicator[3]	Baseline Level[4]	Level in 1st PIR (self-reported)	Midterm Target[5]	End-of-project Target	Midterm Level & Assessment[6]	Achievemen Rating[7]
Objective:	Indicator (if applicable):						
Outcome 1:	Indicator 1:						
	Indicator 2:						
Outcome 2:	Indicator 3:						
	Indicator 4:						
	Etc.						
Etc.							

Indicator Assessment Key

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

In addition to the progress towards outcomes analysis:
- Compare and analyse the GEF Tracking Tool/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.

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.

---

[3] Populate with data from the Logframe and scorecards
[4] Populate with data from the Project Document
[5] If available
[6] Colour code this column only
[7] Use the 6 point Progress Towards Results Rating Scale: HS, S, MS, MU, U, HU

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 risks[8] (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.

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)?

---

[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.

<u>Socio-economic risks to sustainability:</u>
- 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?

<u>Institutional Framework and Governance risks to sustainability:</u>
- 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.

<u>Environmental risks to sustainability:</u>
- 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. <u>The MTR consultant/team should make no more than 15 recommendations total.</u>

Ratings

The MTR team will include its ratings of the project's results and brief descriptions of the associated achievements in *MTR Ratings & Achievement Summary Table* in the Executive Summary of the MTR report. See the TOR Annexes for the Rating Table and ratings scales.

3. REQUIREMENTS FOR EXPERIENCE AND QUALIFICATIONS

Education:

- Master's degree in a discipline relevant to Natural Resource Management, Environmental Science, Development Studies, Economic or other closely related field.

Experience:

- Minimum of two (2) years of supporting project evaluation and/or implementation experience in the result-based management framework, adaptive management
- Previous experiences in project evaluation/project design/implementation in relevant thematic areas (i.e. wildlife conservation, species conservation, community-based management, livelihood, sustainable utilization, environmental conservation, land use planning, ecology)
- Proven experiences in field level data collection with adequate knowledge of data collection tools and experience with implementing evaluations remotely
- Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender and community-based management
- Experience applying SMART targets and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios
- Very good report writing skills in English
- Familiarity in similar country or regional situations relevant to that of Strengthening Capacity and Incentives for Wildlife Conservation in the Western Forest Complex is an advantage
- Some experience working with the GEF or GEF-evaluations is an advantage
- Excellent communication skills
- Demonstrable analytical skills
- Experience with implementing evaluations remotely will be considered an asset

Language:
- Fluency in written and spoken English.

Competencies:
- Strong interpersonal and communication skills;
- Strong analytical, reporting and writing abilities skills;
- Openness to change and ability to receive/integrate feedback;
- Ability to plan, organize, implement and report on work;
- Ability to work under pressure and tight deadlines;
- Proficiency in the use of office IT applications and internet in conducting research;
- Outstanding communication, project management and organizational skills;
- Excellent presentation and facilitation skills.
- Demonstrates integrity and ethical standards;
- Positive, constructive attitude to work;
- Displays cultural, gender, religion, race, nationality and age sensitivity and adaptability.

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

Contract Duration: May 2021 – 24 August 2021 (up to 23 working days).

Duty Station: Home- based with possible travel to Nong Khai Province and Song Khla Province, Thailand.

The National Consultant can provide option to work remotely if there are constraints in travelling due to Covid-19 restriction. If so, the national consultant can work from home. The national consultant will support the data collection, data summary, and coordination with the appointed International Consultant (Team Lead). The team's travel plan shall be adjusted based on travel restrictions of the government and UNDP, subject to the approval of the UNDP Thailand Resident Representative.

5. FINAL PRODUCTS

Due to unexpected the 3rd wave of Covid-19 outbreak in Thailand, the TE mission can be done a virtual meeting/interview with the stakeholders. It is subjected to be adjusted in consultation with the M&E focal point of the UNDP Thailand Country Office after the contract signing.
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. To be sent to the Commissioning Unit and project management. Completion date: 30 May 2021
• Presentation: MTR team presents initial findings to project management and the Commissioning Unit at the end of the MTR mission. Completion date: 18 June
• Draft MTR Report: MTR team submits the draft full report with annexes within 3 weeks of the MTR mission. Completion date: 25 June 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: 13 August 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.

6. PROVISION OF MONITORING AND PROGRESS CONTROLS

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

The Commissioning Unit will contract the consultants and ensure the timely provision of per diems and travel arrangements within the country for the MTR team. The Project Team will be responsible for liaising with the MTR team to provide all relevant documents, set up stakeholder interviews, and arrange field visits.

The UNDP Thailand Country Office and Project Team will provide logistic support in the implementation of remote/ virtual meetings if travel to project site is restricted. An updated stakeholder list with contact details (phone and email) will be provided by the UNDP Thailand Country Office to the MTR team. The MTR offer shall be all inclusive cost of travelling.

7. DOCUMENTS TO BE INCLUDED WHEN SUBMITTING THE PROPOSALS.

Interested individual consultants must submit the following documents/information to demonstrate their qualifications. Please group them into **one (1) single PDF document** as the application only allows to upload maximum one document:

- **Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability** using the template provided in Annex II (link to upload this form is at the end of Job Advertisement).
- **Personal CV or a Personal History Form (P11)** indicating all past experience from similar projects, as well as the contact details (email and telephone number) of the Candidate and at least three (3) professional references.
- **Financial proposal,** as per template provided in Annex II. Note: If an Offeror 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 Offeror must indicate at this point, and ensure that all such costs are duly incorporated in the financial proposal submitted to UNDP. (The same form as Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability)
- **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)

Incomplete proposals may not be considered. The shortlisted candidates may be contacted and the successful candidate will be notified.

8. FINANCIAL PROPOSAL

Price Proposal and Schedule of Payments:

The contract will be based on Lump sum

The total amount quoted shall be all-inclusive and include all costs components required to perform the deliverables identified in the TOR, including professional fee, travel costs, living allowance (if any work is to be done outside the IC´s duty station) and any other applicable cost to be incurred by the IC in completing the assignment. The contract price will be fixed output-based price regardless of extension of the herein specified duration. Payments will be done upon completion of the deliverables/outputs and as per below percentages:
- Deliverable 1 – a completed and satisfactory delivery of a final MTR Inception Report and approval by the Commissioning Unit: 20% of total contract amount
- Deliverable 2 – a completed and satisfactory delivery of a draft MTR report to the Commissioning Unit: 40% of total contract amount
- Deliverable 3 – a completed and satisfactory delivery of the Final MTR Report and approval by the Commissioning Unit and RTA and a completed delivery of TE Audit Trail : 40% of total contract amount

In general, UNDP shall not accept travel costs exceeding those of an economy class ticket. Should the IC wish to travel on a higher class he/she should do so using their own resources.

In the event of unforeseeable travel not anticipated in this TOR, payment of travel costs including tickets, lodging and terminal expenses should be agreed upon, between the respective business unit and the Individual Consultant, prior to travel and will be reimbursed.

Travel costs shall be reimbursed at actual but not exceeding the quotation from UNDP approved travel agent.

9. EVALUATION METHOD AND CRITERIA

Individual consultants will be evaluated based on the following methodology;

Cumulative analysis

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

- Only those applications which are responsive, compliant and accept in general condition will be evaluated;
- For those who passing technical and interview evaluation above, offers will be evaluated per the Combined Scoring method:
  a. Technical Evaluation (70%)
  b. Financial Evaluation (30%)

Technical Criteria for Evaluation (Maximum 70 points)

- Criteria 1: Relevance of education - Max 5 points;

  Criteria 2: Experience of supporting project evaluation and/or implementation experience in the result-based management framework, adaptive management - Max 25 points;

  Criteria 3: Experience in project evaluation/project design/implementation in relevant thematic areas (i.e. wildlife conservation, species conservation, community-based management, livelihood, sustainable utilization, environmental conservation, land use planning, ecology) - Max 25 points;

Criteria 4: Experience in in field level data collection with adequate knowledge of data collection tools and experience with implementing evaluations remotely - Max 10 points;

- Criteria 5: Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender and community-based management – Max 5 points;

Only candidates obtaining a minimum of 49 points (70% of total 100 points in technical evaluation) would be considered and Financial Evaluation respectively.