



INDIVIDUAL CONSULTANT PROCUREMENT NOTICE

Date: 31 August 2021

Reference: LBN-CO-IC-217-21

Country: Lebanon

Description of the assignment: International - UNDP-GEF Midterm Review Consultant.

Project name: Land Degradation Neutrality of mountain landscapes in Lebanon.

Duty Station: Home-based.

Period of assignment/services: 20 working days over a time period of 6 weeks, and shall not exceed two months.

Proposals should be submitted online through the UNDP job site at <https://jobs.undp.org/> no later than; **29 September 2021 at 11:59 PM Beirut Local Time. Proposals will not be received through email.**

Any request for clarification must be sent in writing to the e-mail Procurement.lb@undp.org. The UNDP Procurement Unit will respond in writing by standard electronic mail and will send written copies of the response, including an explanation of the query without identifying the source of inquiry, to all consultants.

1. BACKGROUND

This is the Terms of Reference (ToR) for the UNDP-GEF Midterm Review (MTR) of the *full-sized* project titled *Land Degradation Neutrality of mountain landscapes in Lebanon (LDN)* (PIMS #5837) implemented through the *Ministry of Environment*, which is to be undertaken in 2021. The project started on the *9th of March 2020* and is in its *second* year of implementation. In line with the UNDP-GEF Guidance on MTRs, this MTR process was initiated immediately after the submission of the second Project Implementation Report (PIR). 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*

2. PROJECT BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Project title:	Land Degradation Neutrality of mountain landscapes in Lebanon
Implementing Partner:	Ministry of Environment
PRODOC Signature	29 May 2019
Project duration	60 months
Total budget (in cash):	USD 4,741,005
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>GEF contribution</i> 	USD 4,621,005
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>UNDP contribution</i> 	USD 120,000

The 5-year project, titled “Land Degradation Neutrality of Mountain Landscapes in Lebanon” or “LDN” is financed by the Global Environment Facility (GEF) and is nationally implemented by the Ministry of Environment (MoE) of the Government of Lebanon (GoL) and by the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) under the Support to National Implementation Modality.

The project seeks land degradation neutrality (LDN) in mountain lands by rehabilitating degraded land and preventing further degradation. It will do this initially at the pilot scale to gain the necessary skills and know-how as well as confidence, before it can be up-scaled and replicated post-project comprehensively. The pilot areas will be the mountain ranges in the Cazas of Jbeil and Akkar. The project duration is five years.

Rehabilitation practices will be tested for technical effectiveness, cost-effectiveness and benefits in the agriculture, mountain pastures and forestry sectors, the quarrying sector, and the eco-tourism and outdoor recreation sectors. Prevention will be achieved through comprehensive land use planning and the monitoring for compliance with set conditions and their enforcement.

There will be clarification of roles and enhancement of capacities particularly at local government level. The institutional and regulatory context will be reviewed, updated and strengthened so as to prevent new degradation of forests, rangelands and agricultural lands. The project will aim for a robust, comprehensive and appropriate legal framework which will assess biodiversity and key ecosystem goods and services to inform permitting decisions.

Ultimately, the key to achieving LDN is in making the most effective land use planning decisions and in implementing and upscaling these together with appropriate restoration measures – which is reflected in the three Outcomes of the project which are:

Outcome 1: Degraded mountain land in selected mountain districts of northern Lebanon identified, rehabilitated and restored

Outcome 2: Mountain lands managed sustainably to prevent degradation

Outcome 3: Project monitoring and evaluation, communication, knowledge management and financial mechanisms for the dissemination and replication of the results of the project with the aim of achieving land degradation neutrality

The project is hosted by the Ministry of Environment in close coordination with the Ministry of Agriculture, Ministry of Public Works & Transport & DGUP, Council of Development and Reconstruction (CDR), Ministry of Tourism, Municipalities and Unions of Municipalities, NGOs, Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO), and other international organizations.

3.OBJECTIVES OF THE MTR

The MTR will assess progress towards the achievement of the project objectives and outcomes as specified in the Project Document, and assess early signs of project success or failure with the goal of identifying the necessary changes to be made in order to set the project on-track to achieve its intended results. The MTR will also review the project's strategy and its risks to sustainability.

4. MTR APPROACH & METHODOLOGY

The MTR must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The MTR evaluator will review all relevant sources of information including documents prepared during the preparation phase (i.e. PIF, UNDP Initiation Plan, UNDP Environmental & Social Safeguard Policy, the Project Document, project reports including Annual Project Review/PIRs, project budget revisions, lesson learned reports, national strategic and legal documents, and any other materials that the project considers useful for this evidence-based review). The MTR evaluator will review the baseline GEF focal area Tracking Tool submitted to the GEF at CEO endorsement, and the midterm GEF focal area Tracking Tool that must be completed before the MTR field mission begins.

The MTR evaluator is expected to follow a collaborative and participatory approach¹ ensuring close engagement with the Project Team, government counterparts (the GEF Operational Focal Point), the UNDP Country Office(s), UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Advisers, 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:

1. Ministry of Environment
2. Ministry of Agriculture
3. Ministry of Public Works and Transportation - Directorate General of Urban Planning
4. Council for Development & Reconstruction (CDR)
5. Unions of municipalities and municipalities

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.

Additionally, the MTR evaluator is expected to conduct field missions to Lebanon, including the following two project districts: Akkar and Jbeil.

The final MTR report should 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.

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

OBJECTIVES OF THE MTR

The MTR will assess progress towards the achievement of the project objectives and outcomes as specified in the Project Document, and assess early signs of project success or failure with the goal of identifying the necessary changes to be made in order to set the project on-track to achieve its intended results. The MTR will also review the project's strategy and its risks to sustainability.

MTR APPROACH & METHODOLOGY

The MTR must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The MTR evaluator will review all relevant sources of information including documents prepared during the preparation phase (i.e. PIF, UNDP Initiation Plan, UNDP Environmental & Social Safeguard Policy, the Project Document, project reports including Annual Project Review/PIRs, project budget revisions, lesson learned reports, national strategic and legal documents, and any other materials that the project considers useful for this evidence-based review). The MTR evaluator will review the baseline GEF focal area Tracking Tool submitted to the GEF at CEO endorsement, and the midterm GEF focal area Tracking Tool that must be completed before the MTR field mission begins.

The MTR evaluator is expected to follow a collaborative and participatory approach³ ensuring close engagement with the Project Team, government counterparts (the GEF Operational Focal Point), the UNDP Country Office(s), UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Advisers, and other key stakeholders.

Engagement of stakeholders is vital to a successful MTR.⁴ Stakeholder involvement should include interviews with stakeholders who have project responsibilities, including but not limited to:

6. Ministry of Environment
7. Ministry of Agriculture
8. Ministry of Public Works and Transportation - Directorate General of Urban Planning
9. Council for Development & Reconstruction (CDR)
10. Unions of municipalities and municipalities

Additionally, the MTR evaluator is expected to conduct field missions to Lebanon, including the following two project districts: Akkar and Jbeil.

³ For ideas on innovative and participatory Monitoring and Evaluation strategies and techniques, see [UNDP Discussion Paper: Innovations in Monitoring & Evaluating Results](#), 05 Nov 2013.

⁴ 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.

The final MTR report should 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.

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.

i. 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.
- If there are major areas of concern, recommend areas for improvement.

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.

ii. Progress Towards Results

Progress Towards Outcomes Analysis:

- Review the logframe indicators against progress made towards the end-of-project targets using the Progress Towards Results Matrix and following the *Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects*; colour code progress in a “traffic light system” based on the level of progress achieved; assign a rating on progress for each outcome; make recommendations from the areas marked as “Not on target to be achieved” (red).

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

Project Strategy	Indicator ⁵	Baseline Level ⁶	Level in 1 st PIR (self-reported)	Midterm Target ⁷	End-of-project Target	Midterm Level & Assessment ⁸	Achievement Rating ⁹	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 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.

⁵ Populate with data from the Logframe and scorecards

⁶ Populate with data from the Project Document

⁷ If available

⁸ Colour code this column only

⁹ Use the 6 point Progress Towards Results Rating Scale: HS, S, MS, MU, U, HU

iii. 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.

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, 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?

Project-level Monitoring and Evaluation Systems:

- Review the monitoring tools currently being used: Do they provide the necessary information? Do they involve key partners? Are they aligned or mainstreamed with national systems? Do they use existing information? Are they efficient? Are they cost-effective? Are additional tools required? How could they be made more participatory and inclusive?
- Examine the financial management of the project monitoring and evaluation budget. Are sufficient resources being allocated to monitoring and evaluation? Are these resources being allocated effectively?

Stakeholder Engagement:

- Project management: Has the project developed and leveraged the necessary and appropriate partnerships with direct and tangential stakeholders?
- Participation and country-driven processes: Do local and national government stakeholders support the objectives of the project? Do they continue to have an active role in project decision-making that supports efficient and effective project implementation?
- Participation and public awareness: To what extent has stakeholder involvement and public awareness contributed to the progress towards achievement of project objectives?

Reporting:

- Assess how adaptive management changes have been reported by the project management and shared with the Project Board.
- Assess how well the Project Team and partners undertake and fulfil GEF reporting requirements (i.e. how have they addressed poorly-rated PIRs, if applicable?)
- Assess how lessons derived from the adaptive management process have been documented, shared with key partners and internalized by partners.

Communications:

- Review internal project communication with stakeholders: Is communication regular and effective? Are there key stakeholders left out of communication? Are there feedback mechanisms when communication is received? Does this communication with stakeholders contribute to their awareness of project outcomes and activities and investment in the sustainability of project results?
- Review external project communication: Are proper means of communication established or being established to express the project progress and intended impact to the public (is there a web presence, for example? Or did the project implement appropriate outreach and public awareness campaigns?)
- For reporting purposes, write one half-page paragraph that summarizes the project's progress towards results in terms of contribution to sustainable development benefits, as well as global environmental benefits.

iv. Sustainability

- Validate whether the risks identified in the Project Document, Annual Project Review/PIRs and the ATLAS Risk Management Module are the most important and whether the risk ratings applied are appropriate and up to date. If not, explain why.
- In addition, assess the following risks to sustainability:

Financial risks to sustainability:

- What is the likelihood of financial and economic resources not being available once the GEF assistance ends (consider potential resources can be from multiple sources, such as the public and private sectors, income generating activities, and other funding that will be adequate financial resources for sustaining project's outcomes)?

Socio-economic risks to sustainability:

- Are there any social or political risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project outcomes? What is the risk that the level of stakeholder ownership (including ownership by governments and other key stakeholders) will be insufficient to allow for the project outcomes/benefits to be sustained? Do the various key stakeholders see that it is in their interest that the project benefits continue to flow? Is there sufficient public / stakeholder awareness in support of the long term objectives of the project? Are lessons learned being documented by the Project Team on a continual basis and shared/ transferred to appropriate parties who could learn from the project and potentially replicate and/or scale it in the future?

Institutional Framework and Governance risks to sustainability:

- Do the legal frameworks, policies, governance structures and processes pose risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project benefits? While assessing this parameter, also consider if the required systems/ mechanisms for accountability, transparency, and technical knowledge transfer are in place.

Environmental risks to sustainability:

- Are there any environmental risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project outcomes?

Conclusions & Recommendations

The MTR will include a section of the report setting out the MTR's evidence-based conclusions, in light of the findings.¹⁰ Recommendations should be succinct suggestions for critical intervention that are specific, measurable, achievable, and relevant. A recommendation table should be put in the report's executive summary. See the *Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects* for guidance on a recommendation table. No more than 15 recommendations should be provided.

Ratings

The MTR will include its ratings of the project's results and brief descriptions of the associated achievements in a *MTR Ratings & Achievement Summary Table* in the Executive Summary of the MTR report. See Annex E for ratings scales. No rating on Project Strategy and no overall project rating is required.

Table. MTR Ratings & Achievement Summary Table for LDN Project

Measure	MTR Rating	Achievement Description
Project Strategy	N/A	
Progress Towards Results	Objective Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale)	

¹⁰ Alternatively, MTR conclusions may be integrated into the body of the report.

	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)	

For additional information, please refer to ANNEX I – Terms of Reference

3. REQUIREMENTS FOR EXPERIENCE AND QUALIFICATIONS

Academic qualifications:

- Master’s Degree or higher in natural resource management or environmental science or environmental policy or land management or closely related field

Technical Experience:

- At least 10 years of work experience in relevant technical areas
- Experience in undertaking GEF evaluations
- Experience with results-based monitoring and evaluation methodologies
- Experience applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios
- Competence in adaptive management, as applied to Sustainable Land Management GEF Focal Area
- Experience working in Arab States region is a plus
- Project evaluation/review experiences within United Nations system will be considered an asset
- Experience in gender including on sensitive evaluation and analysis

Competencies:

- Excellent communication skills

- Demonstrable analytical skills.

4. DOCUMENTS TO BE INCLUDED WHEN SUBMITTING THE PROPOSALS.

Interested individual consultants must submit the following documents/information to demonstrate their qualifications:

(I). Technical **Proposal**:

- (i) **Letter to UNDP Confirming Interest and Availability for the Individual Contractor (IC) Assignment**
- (ii) **Explaining why** you are the most suitable for the work
- (iii) P11 (Personal History Form) including past experience in **similar projects** and at least **3 references**, mentioning the references' e-mails addresses.

5. FINANCIAL PROPOSAL

- **Lump sum contracts**

The financial proposal shall specify a total lump sum amount, and payment terms around specific and measurable (qualitative and quantitative) deliverables. Payments are based upon output, i.e. upon delivery of the services specified in the TOR as follows:

- 10% of payment upon approval of the final MTR Inception Report
- 70% upon submission of the draft MTR report
- 20% upon finalization of the MTR report.

In order to assist the requesting unit in the comparison of financial proposals, **the financial proposal shall include a breakdown of this lump sum amount (including travel, per diems, and number of anticipated working days)**. The financial proposal shall be presented using the enclosed format of Appendix a - Annex III.

Travel:

All envisaged travel costs must be included in the financial proposal. This includes all travel to join duty station/repatriation travel. In general, UNDP should 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 case of unforeseeable travel, payment of travel costs including tickets, lodging and terminal expenses should be agreed upon, between the respective business unit and Individual Consultant, prior to travel and will be reimbursed.

6. EVALUATION

Individual consultants will be evaluated based on the following methodology:

Cumulative analysis

When using this weighted scoring method, the award of the contract should be made to the individual consultant whose offer has been evaluated and determined as:

- a) responsive/compliant/acceptable, and
- b) Having received the highest score out of a pre-determined set of weighted technical and financial criteria specific to the solicitation.

** Technical Criteria weight; [70%]*

** Financial Criteria weight; [30%]*

Only candidates obtaining a minimum technical score of 70 points would be considered for the Financial Evaluation.

Criteria	Weight	Max. Point
Technical Competence	70%	100
Academic Qualifications (relevant) Master's degree: (14 points) PhD: (17 points) Relevant trainings/certificates: (3 Points)		20
Years of Relevant Experience below 10 years: Zero 10 Years: (21 points) Above 10 years (30 points)		30
Relevant Experience <ul style="list-style-type: none">Experience in undertaking GEF evaluations (15 points)Experience with results-based monitoring and evaluation methodologies (10 points)		50

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Experience applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios (10 points) • Competence in adaptive management, as applied to Sustainable Land Management GEF Focal Area (10 points) • Regional knowledge and experience; (5 points) 		
Financial (Lower Offer/Offer*100)	30%	100
Total Score	Technical Score * 0.7 + Financial Score * 0.3	

How to apply:

The consultancy is open for all international consultants who meet the selection criteria and propose a competitive fee. Interested consultants are requested to apply only through this UNDP jobs portal.

Submissions through any other media will not be considered.

The application must include all of the following documents:

1. P11,
2. Annex 3 (Offerors Letter) and
3. Financial proposal

All files shall be submitted in one single document and uploaded as word or PDF file to the UNDP job site.

It has been observed that bidders don't submit all requested documents and thus reducing their chance to be selected for a contract with UNDP. Before you submit your offer please revise that the application is complete and comprises all documents.

Incomplete applications will not be considered.

ANNEXES

ANNEX I - TERMS OF REFERENCE (TOR)

ANNEX II - INDIVIDUAL CONSULTANT CONTRACT AND GENERAL TERMS AND CONDITIONS

ANNEX III - OFFEROR'S LETTER TO UNDP CONFIRMING INTEREST AND AVAILABILITY FOR THE INDIVIDUAL CONTRACTOR (IC) ASSIGNMENT