Midterm Review Terms of Reference

Combatting Illegal Wildlife Trade, focusing on Ivory, Rhino Horn, Tiger and Pangolins in Thailand Project
(Project ID 00086286)

BASIC CONTRACT INFORMATION

Location: Thailand
Application Deadline: 11 June 2021
Type of Contract: Individual Contract
Post Level: National Midterm Evaluation (MTR) Consultant (Individual Consultant)
Languages Required: Thai, English
Starting Date: 1 July 2021
Duration of Initial Contract: 20 working days
Expected Duration of Assignment: 1 July – 10 August 2021

BACKGROUND

A. Project Title: Combatting Illegal Wildlife Trade, focusing on Ivory, Rhino Horn, Tiger and Pangolins in Thailand

B. 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.

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 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)

- 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

---

[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.

- 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).

Table. Progress Towards Results Matrix (Achievement of outcomes against End-of-project 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]	Achievement Rating[7]	Justification for Rating
Objective:	Indicator (if applicable):							
Outcome 1:	Indicator 1:							
	Indicator 2:							
Outcome 2:	Indicator 3:							
	Indicator 4:							
	Etc.							
Etc.								

Indicator Assessment Key

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

In addition to the progress towards outcomes analysis:

- Compare and analyse the GEF Tracking Tool/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?

---

[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

- 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.

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

---

[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.

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)?

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 *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

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:

- <u>MTR Inception Report</u>: 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: **6 July**
- <u>Presentation</u>: MTR team presents initial findings to project management and the Commissioning Unit at the end of the MTR mission. Completion date: **23 July**
- <u>Draft MTR Report</u>: MTR team submits the draft full report with annexes within 3 weeks of the MTR mission. Completion date: **29 July**
- <u>Final Report</u>*: 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: **6 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.

G. Institutional Arrangements

NOTE: Detail the role of the Commissioning Unit and Project Team in supporting the implementation of remote/ virtual meetings. An updated stakeholder list with contact details (phone and email) will need to be provided by the Commissioning Unit to the MTR team. Adjust the text if a mission will not take place.

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.

H. Duration of the Work

NOTE: Flexibility and delays should be included in the timeframe for the MTR, with additional time for implementing the MTR virtually recognising possible delays in accessing stakeholder groups due to COVID-19. Consideration may be given to a time contingency should the evaluation be delayed in any way due to COVID-19. Adjust the text in this column if a mission

will not take place. The stakeholder interviews, if done virtually, may require a longer than usual time period. Please adjust the number of days and completion date to accommodate this.

The total duration of the MTR will be approximately <u>20 working days over a period of 5 *weeks* starting from 1 July</u> and shall not exceed five months from when the consultant is hired. The tentative MTR timeframe is as follows:

TIMEFRAME	ACTIVITY
1 July	Contract begins Prep the MTR Team (handover of Project Documents)
1-6 July (5 working days)	Project Document Review Submit MTR Inception Report to UNDP for review
7 July	Finalization of the MTR Inception Report and re-submit to UNDP.
9 - 16 July (6 working days for consultant)	Inception meeting at UNDP Country Office Meeting with the Project Team MTR mission: stakeholder meetings, interviews and field visits (option)
17-18 July (2 working days)	Preparation of presentations for wrap-up meeting.
23 July (2 hours in one working day)	Mission wrap-up meeting & presentation of initial findings- earliest end of MTR mission
24 – 29 July 5 working days for consultant)	Preparing draft MTR report
(0 working days for consultant)	Circulation of draft report with draft management response template for comments and completion (To be done by the Commission Unit)
30 July -6 August (max: 4 working days)	Incorporating audit trail from feedbacks on draft report/Finalization of MTR report including Management Responses
10 August	Expected date of contract closure

The date start of contract is from 1 July – 10 August 2021.

I. Duty Station

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.

Travel:
Domestic travel will be required during the MTR mission;

- The BSAFE training course <u>must</u> be successfully completed <u>prior</u> 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/

<u>REQUIRED SKILLS AND EXPERIENCE</u>

J. Qualifications of the Successful Applicants

The Terminal Evaluation team will conduct the MTR - one team leader (with experience and exposure to projects and evaluations in other regions globally) and one national expert, from Thailand. The International Consultant will be designated as the team leader and will be responsible for the overall design and writing of the MTR report. The National Consultant will assess emerging trends with respect to regulatory frameworks, budget allocations, capacity building, work with the Project Team in developing the MTR itinerary, etc.

The National Consultant will work closely with the International Consultant in supporting any work that needs to be undertaken as laid out in this ToR, and other tasks, as required. The National Consultant will also act as a focal point for coordinating and working with relevant stakeholders in Thailand. In the case of international travel restriction and the mission is not possible, the MTR team will use alternative means of interviewing stakeholders and data collection (i.e. Skype interview, mobile questionnaires, etc.) including the field visit by the National Consultant under the International Consultant's guidance. 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:

<u>Education</u>

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

<u>Experience</u>

- 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

Responsibility
- Documentation review

- Leading the MTR Team in planning, conducting and reporting on the evaluation

- Deciding on division of labour within the Team and ensuring timeliness of reports

- Use of best practice evaluation methodologies in conducting the evaluation

- Leading the drafting and finalization of the Inception Report for the MTR

- Leading presentation of the draft evaluation findings and recommendations in-country

- Conducting the de-briefing for the UNDP Country Office in Thailand and Core Project Management Team

- Leading the drafting and finalization of the Midterm Review Report

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.

Remarks

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.

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.

Criteria for Selection

Criteria	Max. Point
Technical	
At least Master's degree in a discipline relevant to Natural Resource Management, Environmental Science, Development Studies, Economic or other closely related field (5 points)	70
Minimum of two (2) years of supporting project evaluation and/or implementation experience in the result-based management framework, adaptive management (25 points)	
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) (25 points)	
Proven experiences in field level data collection with adequate knowledge of data collection tools and experience with implementing evaluations remotely (10 points)	
Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender and community-based management (5 points)	

---

[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

Financial	30
Total	**100**

O. Annexes to the MTR ToR

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

Approved by _____ **Date**_____

Lovita Ramguttee, Deputy Resident Representative

UNDP Thailand Country Office

Annexes to Midterm Review Terms of Reference

- ToR ANNEX A: List of Documents to be reviewed by the MTR Team
- ToR ANNEX B: Guidelines on Contents for the Midterm Review Report[11]
- ToR ANNEX C: Midterm Review Evaluative Matrix Template
- ToR ANNEX D: UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluators/Midterm Review Consultants[12]
- ToR ANNEX E: MTR Ratings Table and Ratings Scales
- ToR ANNEX F: MTR Report Clearance Form
- ToR ANNEX G: Audit Trail Template
- ToR ANNEX H: Progress Towards Results Matrix
- ToR ANNEX I: GEF Co-Financing Template (provided as a separate file)

---

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

[12] http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/100

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

1. PIF
2. UNDP Initiation Plan
3. UNDP Project Document
4. UNDP Social and Environmental Screening Procedure (SESP)
5. Project Inception Report
6. All Project Implementation Reports (PIR's)
7. Quarterly progress reports and work plans of the various implementation task teams
8. Audit reports
9. Finalized GEF focal area Tracking Tools/Core Indicators at CEO endorsement and midterm
10. Oversight mission reports
11. All monitoring reports prepared by the project
12. Financial and Administration guidelines used by Project Team

The following documents will also be available:
13. Project operational guidelines, manuals and systems
14. UNDP country/countries programme document(s)
15. Minutes of the Combatting Illegal Wildlife Trade, focusing on Ivory, Rhino Horn, Tiger and Pangolins in Thailand Board Meetings (in Thai) and other meetings (i.e. Project Appraisal Committee meetings)
16. Project site location maps
17. Any additional documents, as relevant

ToR ANNEX B: Guidelines on Contents for the Midterm Review Report[13]

    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

---

[13] The Report length should not exceed *40* pages in total (not including annexes).

1. Executive Summary *(3-5 pages)*
   - Project Information Table
   - Project Description (brief)
   - 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
     - Social and Environmental Standards (Safeguards)
     - Reporting
     - Communications & Knowledge Management
   - **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.) or Core Indicators*
- *Annexed in a separate file: GEF Co-financing template (categorizing co-financing amounts by source as 'investment mobilized' or 'recurrent expenditure')*

ToR ANNEX C: Midterm Review Evaluative Matrix Template

(Draft questions to be filled out by the Commissioning Unit with support from the Project Team)

NOTE: Include COVID-19 specific questions, as needed.

Introduction
What is your position?
What is your relationship to the project and for how long have you been involved?
1. Project strategy
1.1 Project Design
1.1.1 How important is the problem addressed by the project for the four target regions?
1.1.1 Have the assumptions made during project design proven relevant? Have they evolved? (How?)
1.1.2 How effective is the selected strategy to achieve intended results? (Were lessons from previous projects integrated into project design?)
1.1.3 To what extent is the project responding to the national priorities and context? Has this changed since project design?
1.1.4 In your opinion, were all people affected or concerned by the project consulted during project design?
1.1.5 To what extent were gender issues taken into account during project design? *(Were any activities undertaken to assess gender-related needs for the project during project design?)*
1.2 Results Framework/ Logframe
1.2.1 Could you please explain in your own words the objective and intended outcomes of the project, its targets and their related timeframes?
1.2.1 How realistic are they?
1.2.2 Are there effects on development or on the environment that are not measured by current indicators?
1. Progress towards results
2.1 To what extent have the expected outputs, outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved so far? (Provide a list, as needed)
2.2 What are the main barriers to address to achieve expected results? What are the main opportunities to leverage?
2. Project implementation and adaptive management
3.1 Management arrangements
3.1.1 Are the roles and responsibilities of the Implementing Partner (DNP), UNDP and other partners clearly established?
3.1.1 In your opinion, is decision-making timely and transparent? How responsive are partners to changing needs of the project?
3.1.2 How would you describe the quality of management responses to project team members' inquiries and needs?

3.1.2 On a scale of 1 to 4, how would you rate the quality of supervision by UNDP? Why? (1=poor; 2=fair; 3=good; 4=excellent)
3.1.2 On a scale of 1 to 4, how would you rate the quality of supervision by UNOPS? Why? (same scale)
3.1.2 On a scale of 1 to 4, how would you rate the quality of risk management by UNDP? Why? (same scale)
3.1.2 On a scale of 1 to 4, how would you rate the quality of social and environmental management by UNDP? Why? (same scale)
3.2 Work Planning
3.2.1 Have there been any delays in implementation? If so, could you describe their cause and how many months of delay occurred?
3.2.3 How often do you use the project's logframe for management and/or M&E? How do you use it?
3.3 Finance and co-finance?
3.3.1 Is the project being implemented in a cost-effective manner? How? If not, why?
3.3.2 Have there been any variations between planned and actual expenditures? If yes, which ones and why?
3.3.3 What (and how much) co-financing is the project leveraging? How has this evolved since project design?
3.4 Project-level M&E systems
3.4.1 Is the M&E system operational and effective?
3.5 Stakeholder Engagement
3.5.1 How frequently do you interact/exchange with project staff / local partners?
3.5.1 On a scale of 1 to 4, how would you rate the quality of your interactions? (1=poor; 2=fair; 3=good; 4=excellent)
3.5.2 Is the project as it is implemented appropriate to your realities and capacities?
3.5.2 Are you aware of any mechanisms being in place for you to influence project decision-making?
3.5.3 In your opinion, is the project beneficial to your community? If so, what are its benefits?
3.6 Social and Environmental Standard (Safeguards)
3.6.1 Were all relevant risks identified at that outset or during project implementation? Are the identified environmental and social risks relevant and rated appropriately? If not, why?
3.6.2 Were adequate risk mitigation measures identified and implemented for all relevant risks? Is the social and environmental management plan implemented as planned? If not, why?
3.7 Reporting
3.7.1 How many lessons from adaptive management processes were shared with partners? Which partners?
3.7.1 Did you receive any documentation about lessons drawn from adaptive management processes undertaken by the project?
3.7.2 Could you provide examples where these lessons were used by your organization?
3.8 Communications & knowledge management
3.8.1 Could you please tell me what the project expected outcomes and its activities are?
3.8.2 What communication mechanisms or activities have been implemented by the project? Who has been targeted?
3.8.2 How have you received information about the project? Was this information useful?
3.8.3 Has knowledge been managed effectively? Have adequate knowledge management measures be identified and implemented?
4.Sustainability
4.1 Have the risks assessed during project design proven relevant? Have they evolved? (How?)

| 4.2 Which activities would require continued financial support after the end of the project for project outcomes to be maintained? |
| 4.2 Which outcomes should normally be maintained without additional resources? |
| 4.3 What social and/or political conditions could affect the sustainability of project outcomes? How? |
| 4.4 What frameworks/policies/governance structures/processes could potentially affect the sustainability of project benefits? How? |
| 4.4 What frameworks/policies/governance structures/processes are lacking to ensure the sustainability of project benefits? Why? |
| 4.5 Are there any biophysical that could affect the sustainability of project outcomes? How? |

This Midterm Review Evaluative Matrix must be fully completed/amended 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? To what extent has progress been made in the implementation of social and environmental management measures? Have there been changes to the overall project risk rating and/or the identified types of risks as outlined at the CEO Endorsement stage?			

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 Consultants[14]

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.
8. Must ensure that independence of judgement is maintained and that evaluation findings and recommendations are independently presented.
9. Must confirm that they have not been involved in designing, executing or advising on the project being evaluated.

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: _____

---

[14] http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/100

ToR ANNEX E: MTR Ratings & Achievement Summary Table + Ratings Scale

MTR Ratings & Achievement Summary Table for (Combatting Illegal Wildlife Trade, focusing on Ivory, Rhino Horn, Tiger and Pangolins in Thailand

)

Measure	MTR Rating	Achievement Description
Project Strategy	N/A	
Progress Towards Results	Objective Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale)	
	Outcome 1 Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale)	
	Outcome 2 Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale)	
	Outcome 3 Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale)	
	Etc.	
Project Implementation & Adaptive Management	(rate 6 pt. scale)	
Sustainability	(rate 4 pt. scale)	

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.
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 RTA and included in the final document)

Midterm Review Report Reviewed and Cleared By:

Commissioning Unit (M&E Focal Point)

Name: _____

Signature: _____   Date: _____

Regional Technical Advisor (Nature, Climate and Energy)

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 (Combatting Illegal Wildlife Trade, focusing on Ivory, Rhino Horn, Tiger and Pangolins in Thailand **) (UNDP Project ID-*PIMS # 5619)*

The following comments were provided in track changes to the draft Midterm Review report; they are referenced by institution ("Author" column) and not by the person's name, 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

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

Project Strategy	Indicator [15]	Baseline Level[16]	Level in 1st PIR (self-reported)	Midterm Target [17]	End-of-project Target	Midterm Level & Assessment[18]	Achievement Rating[19]	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

---

[15] Populate with data from the Logframe and scorecards

[16] Populate with data from the Project Document

[17] If available

[18] Colour code this column only

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

ToR ANNEX I: GEF Co-Financing Template (provided as a separate file)