

UNDP-GEF: Development of Value Chains for Products derived from Genetic Resources Project
Midterm Review Terms of Reference

BASIC CONTRACT INFORMATION

Location: South Africa
Application Deadline: 05 July 2022
Type of Contract: Individual Contract
Post Level: National Consultant
Languages Required: English
Duration of Initial Contract: 8 weeks (40 Consultancy days)
Expected Duration of Assignment: 2 months

BACKGROUND

A. Project Title: Development of Value Chains for Products derived from Genetic Resources in Compliance with the Nagoya Protocol on Access and Benefit Sharing and the National Biodiversity Economy Strategy Project

B. Project Description

This is the Terms of Reference (ToR) for the UNDP-GEF Midterm Review (MTR) of the full-sized project titled *Support to the Development of Value Chains for Products derived from Genetic Resources Project* (PIMS# 5686) implemented through the *Department of Forestry, Fisheries and the Environment (DFFE), former Department of Environmental Affairs (DEA)*, which is to be undertaken in 2022. As a result of COVID-19 and delayed appointment of the Project Manager in DFFE, the required implementation agreements with the project partners (Centre for Scientific and Industrial Research, CSIR, Agricultural Research Council, ARC, and IUCN-TRAFFIC) were concluded in Q2 2021, which enable release of funds for actual implementation. Thus, the project is in its *second* year of implementation. In line with the UNDP-GEF Guidance on MTRs, this MTR process was initiated before 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 Projects* (<https://intranet.undp.org/unit/office/eo/SitePages/gef-evaluation-guidelines.aspx>) specifically: [\(COVID\) UNDP-GEF-MTR-TOR-Template-June2020 ENGLISH JobsSite \(3\)](#).

PROJECT BACKGROUND INFORMATION

South Africa is a megadiverse country, and this diversity is expressed in terms of both species richness and endemism. The conservation and sustainable use of South Africa's biological diversity is of strategic importance for the country. So is the maintenance of ecosystem services – now and in the future. This species richness and associated genetic diversity provides an important basis for economic growth and development which underpins the well-being of society.

Under leadership of the DFFE South Africa launched in 2015 its National Biodiversity Economy Strategy (NBES). The Strategy is concerned with supporting the development of businesses and economic activities that are either directly dependent on biodiversity for their core business or that contribute to conserving biodiversity through their activities. An important segment of the NBES is 'bioprospecting', and under it 'biotrade'.

The project will specifically support the implementation of the NBES by focusing on the use of indigenous plants' genetic resources and their current and potential applications, either in pharmaceuticals, personal care products, cosmetics, enzymes or similar non-food uses. It will address both conservation and Access and Benefit Sharing (ABS) issues linked to the development of different bioprospecting value chains, while also helping key players overcome related barriers and challenges.

The project will approach its core problem both through ABS pilots and ABS systemic measures that are relevant for the ABS-conservation nexus of the bioprospecting segment. More specifically, the project will focus on bioprocessing and product development, and on removing barriers through R&D and stakeholder collaboration. Overall, the project will foster innovation, equitable sharing of benefits from genetic resources, while contributing to both species and habitat conservation. Furthermore, the project will enhance South Africa's systemic capacity development for Nagoya Protocol compliance through gender-sensitive approaches.

The Project Objective is to strengthen the value chains for products derived from indigenous plants' genetic resources with a view to contributing to the equitable sharing of benefits and conservation of biodiversity.

The realization of the project Objective will eventually lead to the following changes (project's mid-term impact): (i) bioprospecting R&D focused on indigenous plants will make a more significant contribution to the national bioprospecting economy owing to at least 1 (one) new patent being registered and at least 4 (four) new market niches explored through sustainable and ABS-compliant value chains in the Northern Cape's Bioprospecting economy; (ii) the approach to ways of working, management conditions and techniques will change within 5 (five) strategic value chains, to the extent that they become examples of how conservation results (in particular through sustainable supplies of plant raw materials) and ABS-compliance can simultaneously be achieved through cooperation among bioeconomic players; and (iii) national capacity for the protection of traditional knowledge within the bioprospecting segment, as well as the general mainstreaming of both conservation and ABS compliance, will be gradually improved (as independently assessed). The project Objective will be achieved via three technical project Outcomes:

Outcome 1: 'Bioprospecting R&D that focuses on indigenous plants contributes to the national Bioprospecting economy' – this outcome aims at supporting the completion of critical steps in many R&D processes and overcoming context-specific barriers. One important output under the first Outcome will focus on the Northern Cape Province, where a support hub will be established. The component will also accelerate the registration – and transition to cultivation -- of the critically endangered *Siphonochilus aethiopicus* (African Ginger) as a medicinal product for asthma and allergies, while also considering what would be needed for conserving the diversity of the plant's gene pool in the wild. Under this Outcome an ABS monetary agreement will be negotiated between CSIR and the Traditional Healers Association for this medicinal product.

Outcome 2: 'The ways of working, management conditions and techniques change within 5 (five) strategic value chains, and demonstrate how conservation and ABS-compliance can be simultaneously achieved through cooperation among Bioprospecting economy players' – this outcome is focused on value-chain development. Both biotrade and landscape-level management are prominently featured among key activities under this outcome, where the goal is to ensure ABS compliance and the sustainability of supplies. Targeted species include *Pelargonium sidoides*, *Aloe ferox*, Honeybush (including at-least three species of *Cyclopia spp.* used in the

industry) and Rooibos (*Aspalathus linearis*). The government will specifically support extension services for the successful transition to cultivation for African ginger. Outcome will also facilitate the negotiation of a second ABS monetary agreement for a product derived from Rooibos.

Outcome 3: National capacity for the protection of traditional knowledge within the bioprospecting segment, as well as the general mainstreaming of both conservation and ABS compliance within them, is improved (as independently assessed) – this outcome is aimed at building the national stakeholders’ capacity for understanding ABS issues, compliance with national and international legislation and for better handling the inherently complex relationships between providers and users of genetic resources, as well as the implications of their economic activity for conservation. More specifically, the national registration system for documenting and protecting traditional knowledge will be strengthened. Additionally, a biotrade certification system will be developed, safeguarding the biodiversity within bioprospecting value chains.

In addition to the three technical outcomes, the dissemination of project lessons – along with the application of appropriate M&E framework – will contribute to institutional, community and corporate learning through the active participation of all stakeholder groups in project implementation (**Outcome 4** - Lessons learned and the application of a participatory and gender sensitive M&E framework effectively contribute to institutional, community and corporate learning on ABS).

COVID-19 implications in South Africa and impact on project components

The project had a smooth start of its implementation in May 2019 and was expected to make good progress by June 2020, but the COVID-19 pandemic significantly distorted the project’s 2020 work plan. This resulted in a shift of major work outputs to the following two years 2021 and 2022. Some tasks were also put on hold due to movement restrictions. Since the peak of COVID-19 cases in South Africa, very few field work trips were authorized in most of 2020 and 2021. Realizing that the impacts of COVID-19 will not go away soon, the project has learnt to work more efficiently through virtual means and in this regard has supported the stakeholders from the partners with procurement of internet data. Additionally, the project has to ensure that each international consultant hired during this period has a collaborating local consultant so that activities continue even with travel restrictions since most of the restrictions are around international travel. In light of the continuance of COVID-19 cases in the country, the project evaluations will follow a hybrid setting for conducting interviews.

Brief overview of the Institutional arrangements of the project, relevant partners and stakeholders

Department of Forestry, Fisheries and the Environment (DFFE): DFFE is the implementing partner for the overall project. The project will specifically support the implementation of the National Biodiversity Economy Strategy (NBES) by focusing on the current use of indigenous plants’ genetic resources and their potential, either in pharmaceuticals, personal care products, cosmetics and enzymes or similar non-food uses. It will address both conservation and Access Benefit Sharing (ABS) issues linked to their development.

Council for Scientific and Industrial Research (CSIR): The CSIR’s role is to function as the responsible party for Output 1.1: R&D barriers linked to clinical studies and registration of African Ginger (*Siphonochilus aethiopicus*) as a bioresource to treat inflammatory and allergic diseases are systematically overcome in an ABS-compliant manner.

Agricultural Research Council (ARC): The ARC's role is to implement Output 1.2: Bioprospecting R&D in the Northern Cape is supported, boosting the local Bioprospecting economy and establishing a strategically located 'Bioproducts Development Hub'.

TRAFFIC Conservation International: The role of TRAFFIC is to implement Output 2.1: The implementation of the Pelargonium Biodiversity Management Plan (BMP) is supported in close collaboration between the Pelargonium Working Group, community businesses and CSO stakeholders

The DFFE Project Management Unit (PMU): The PMU is responsible for implementing Outputs 2.2-2.3, respectively. Output 2.2: Development of an Aloe ferox harvesting, processing and trading hub in the Eastern Cape for promoting sustainable and equitable benefit sharing across the value chain is supported. Output 2.3: Community-based enterprises in honeybush farming are supported, ensuring conservation and equitable benefit sharing outcomes across the Cyclopia spp. landscape in the Cape Region.

The DFFE-Directorate: Bioprospecting and Biodiversity Economy: The role of DFFE-Directorate: Bioprospecting and Biodiversity Economy is to implement Output 2.4: The ABS implementation in Rooibos farming is strengthened, ensuring, fairness, equity and sustainability in relevant relationships among TK holders and industry.

The Department of Science and Innovation (DSI): The role of the DSI is to implement Output 3.1: The National Recordal System for traditional knowledge linked to bioprospecting is supported for ensuring ABS compliance in current and future agreements between indigenous and traditional knowledge holders and industry.

The PMU in Partnership with South African National Biodiversity Institute (SANBI): The role of the DFFE-PMU and SANBI is to co-implement Output 3.2: A biotrade certification system for South Africa is developed in view of safeguarding biodiversity conservation within bioprospecting value chains.

Other key project stakeholders include the following:

Pelargonium Working Group (PWG): The role of the PWG would be to provide support to the TRAFFIC and the PMU in implementing the activities proposed in Output 2.1: The implementation of the Pelargonium Biodiversity Management Plan (BMP) is supported in close collaboration between the Pelargonium Working Group, community businesses and CSO stakeholders.

Tyefu Traditional Trust: The PMU and the Tyefu Traditional Trust will be directly responsible for contributing to the implementation of Output 2.2: Development of an Aloe ferox harvesting, processing and trading hub in the Eastern Cape for promoting sustainable and equitable benefit sharing across the value chain is supported. The Tyefu Traditional Trust will, as the legal entity representing the livelihood interests of the community, be the beneficiary of activities proposed in Output 2.2.

Honeybush Community of Practice (HBCoP): The role of the HBCoP in the project is to provide support to the PMU in the implementation of Output 2.3: Community-based enterprises in honeybush farming are supported, ensuring conservation and equitable benefit sharing outcomes across the Cyclopia spp. landscape in the Cape Region.

Management

The Project Management Unit (PMU) is hosted in the DFFE. The PMU is comprised of a Project Manager (technical, strategic, managerial) and Technical M&E Officer. For the project implementation to follow as closely, the project reports through the various task teams of DFFE and a UNDP focal point. UNDP provides oversight and strategic guidance to the project.

The DFFE-PMU is responsible for making management decisions for the project when guidance is required by the Project Manager. Its roles include (i) to review the project progress, approve budgets and financial reports, and review and approve outputs as requested, (ii) to provide strategic guidance and policy directions to project implementation and to (iii) ensure the relevance of the project by making sure that the project is well aligned to national policies and priorities of the country.

C. MTR Purpose

The MTR will assess progress towards the achievement of the project objectives and outcomes as specified in the Project Document and assess early signs of project success or failure with the goal of identifying the necessary changes to be made 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. Further, the MTR will assess the impact of COVID-19 on the implementation of the project and make recommendations on necessary changes in order for the project to still continue to make reasonable level of implementation progress even with the COVID-19 pandemic situation.

DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

D. MTR Approach & Methodology

The MTR 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, lesson learned reports, 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 approach¹ ensuring close engagement with the Project Team, government counterparts (the GEF Operational Focal Point), the UNDP Country Office(s), the Nature and Energy (NCE) Regional Technical Advisor, direct beneficiary 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 Forestry, Fisheries and the Environment, Department of Science and Innovation, Agricultural Research Council, Council for Scientific and Industrial Research, South African National Biodiversity Institute (SANBI), TRAFFIC, Pelargonium Working Group (PWG), Tyefu Traditional Trust and Honeybush Community of Practice (HBCoP)*); 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. In terms of relevant International Cooperating Partners, Additionally, the MTR team is expected to conduct field missions in *South Africa* including the following project sites (*Northern Cape and Tyefu Community in the Eastern Cape*). If the field mission does not take place, stakeholders will assemble in selected places to interact virtually with the consultants in Pretoria.

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.

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, 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.

UNDP South Africa and DFFE will ensure that if all possible virtual meetings are arranged in case COVID-19 travel restrictions are still in place during the undertaking of the Mid-Term Evaluation. This will include interviews with key stakeholders at project sites to enable the MTR consultants to get an actual feel of the situation on the ground. This immediate implication of the COVID-19 situation is that the MTR consultants will need to do a lot of desk review. Additionally, the project management unit will need to submit all the necessary documents so that the consultants are able to form a clear picture about the progress made on the project from the documentation.

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 approach³ 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.)

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.

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. COVID-19 restrictions have kept moving up and down, but is currently on level 1 which has less restrictions for travel. If it is not possible to travel to or within the project area 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 PMU 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.

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.

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.

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, considered 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?
- Review the impact COVID-19 has had on project implementation. What more could have been achieved in terms of project implementation had it not been for the COVID-19 pandemic that restricted travel?
- If there are major areas of concern, recommended 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.

2. Progress Towards Results

- Review the log frame indicators against progress made towards the end-of-project targets; populate the Progress Towards Results Matrix, as described in the *Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects*; colour code progress in a “traffic light system” based on the level of progress achieved; assign a rating on progress for the project objective and each outcome; make recommendations from the areas marked as “not on target to be achieved” (red). Compare and analyse the GEF Tracking Tool/Core Indicators at the Baseline with the one completed right before the Midterm Review.
- Identify remaining barriers to achieving the project objective in the remainder of the project.
- By reviewing the aspects of the project that have already been successful, identify ways in which the project can further expand these benefits.

3. Project Implementation and Adaptive Management

Management Arrangements

- Review overall effectiveness of project management as outlined in the Project Document. Have changes been made and are they effective? Are responsibilities and reporting lines clear? Is decision-making transparent and undertaken in a timely manner? Recommend areas for improvement.
- Review the quality of execution of the Executing Agency/Implementing Partner(s) and recommend areas for improvement.
- Review the quality of support provided by the GEF Partner Agency (UNDP) and recommend areas for improvement.
- Do the Executing Agency/Implementing Partner and/or UNDP and other partners have the capacity to deliver benefits to or involve women? If yes, how?
- What is the gender balance of project staff? What steps have been taken to ensure gender balance in project staff?
- What is the gender balance of the Project Board? What steps have been taken to ensure gender balance in the Project Board?

Work Planning

- Review any delays in project start-up and implementation, identify the causes and examine if they have been resolved.
- Are work-planning processes results-based? If not, suggest ways to re-orientate work planning to focus on results?
- Examine the use of the project’s results framework/ logframe as a management tool and review any changes made to it since project start.

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 risks⁴ (in the SESP).

⁴ 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

- 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.

The 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)?

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.

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 the sustenance of project outcomes?

Conclusions & Recommendations

The MTR consultant/team will include a section in the MTR report for evidence-based **conclusions**, in light of the findings.

Additionally, the MTR consultant/team is expected to make **recommendations** to the Project Team. Recommendations should be succinct suggestions for critical intervention that are specific, measurable, achievable, and relevant. A recommendation table should be put in the report's executive summary. The MTR consultant/team should make no more than 15 recommendations total.

Ratings

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

F. Expected Outputs and Deliverables

The MTR team shall prepare and submit:

- MTR Inception Report: MTR team clarifies objectives and methods of the Midterm Review no later than 1 week before the MTR mission. To be sent to the PMU Unit and project management. Completion date: (22nd July 2022)
- Presentation: MTR team presents initial findings to project management and the Commissioning Unit at the end of the MTR mission. Completion date: (10th August 2022)
- Draft MTR Report: MTR team submits the draft full report with annexes within 3 weeks of the MTR mission. Completion date: (17th August 2022)
- 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: (26th August 2022)

*The final MTR report must be in English. If applicable, the Commissioning Unit may choose to arrange for a translation of the report into a language more widely shared by national stakeholders.

G. Institutional Arrangements

The principal responsibility for managing this MTR resides with the Commissioning Unit. The Commissioning Unit for this project's MTR is *UNDP South Africa Country Office (CO)*.

The Commissioning Unit will contract the consultants and ensure the timely provision of per diems and travel arrangements to the project sites 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 Project team and DFFE will be responsible for arranging all virtual meetings to ensure that the MTR consultant have as much access to the project area as possible within the limitations of COVID-19.

H. Duration of the Work

The total duration of the MTR will be approximately *40 days* over a time period of *8 weeks* starting *11 July 2021* and shall not exceed five months from when the consultant(s) are hired. The tentative MTR timeframe is as follows:

TIMEFRAME	ACTIVITY
<i>17th June 2022</i>	Advertisement posting
<i>1st July 2022</i>	Application closes (through existing roster)
<i>6th July 2022</i>	Evaluation of MTR proposals
<i>8th July 2022</i>	Selection and finalization of contracts
<i>8th July 2022</i>	Prep the MTR Team (handover of Project Documents)
<i>11th July 2022</i>	Inception meeting
<i>13th-15th July 2022</i>	Document review and preparing MTR Inception Report
<i>18th July 2022</i>	Inception Report Evaluation
<i>21st-22nd July 2022</i>	Finalization and Validation of MTR Inception Report - latest start of MTR mission
<i>25th July – 8th August 2022</i>	MTR mission: stakeholder meetings, interviews, field visits
<i>10th August 2022</i>	Mission wrap-up meeting & presentation of initial findings- earliest end of MTR mission (this includes presentation of preliminary findings to the PMU unit and commissioning Unit)
<i>11th- 17th August 2022</i>	Preparing draft report
<i>18th -24th August 2022</i>	Comments incorporation
<i>25th- 26th August 2022</i>	Finalization of MTR report.
<i>2nd September 2022</i>	Issue of Management Response

The date start of contract is (11 July 2022).

I. Duty Station

The local consultant will work closely with UNDP CO and DFFE-PMU (located in Pretoria). The local consultant will work with the international consultant on the project to deliver timely. The work of the local

consultant will be to complement the work of the international consultant including undertaking site visits wherever travel will be possible. The local consultant will support the International Consultant who will work as the MTR team lead, and will add value in all areas of the preparation of the MTR Report, including the provision of local context, and will work with the PMU to define the mission itinerary, stakeholder identification interviews.

The International and local consultant are to reach a consensus on the programme of work, roles and responsibilities.

Travel:

- Local travel will be required to project sites during the MTR mission;
- The BSAFE training course must be successfully completed prior to commencement of travel; Herewith is the link to access this training: <https://training.dss.un.org/courses/login/index.php> . These training modules at this secure internet site is accessible to Consultants, which allows for registration with private email.
- Individual Consultants are responsible for ensuring they have vaccinations/inoculations when travelling to certain countries, as designated by the UN Medical Director.
- Consultants are required to comply with the UN security directives set forth under <https://dss.un.org/dssweb/>
- All related travel expenses will be covered and will be reimbursed as per UNDP rules and regulations upon submission of an F-10 claim form and supporting documents.

REQUIRED SKILLS AND EXPERIENCE

J. Qualifications of the Successful Applicants

A team of two independent consultants will conduct the MTR - one team leader (with experience and exposure to projects and evaluations in other regions globally) and one national team expert. The consultants cannot have participated in the project preparation, formulation, and/or implementation (including the writing of the Project Document) and should not have a conflict of interest with project's related activities.

The selection of consultants will be aimed at maximizing the overall “team” qualities in the following areas:)

Education (20)

- A Minimum of Master's degree in eco-business management, environmental economics, natural resources management, ecology, biodiversity management, natural sciences, environmental management, environment, development studies, or other closely related field; or other closely related field (20 points)

Experience (70):

- Recent experience with result-based management evaluation methodologies; (10 points)
- Experience applying SMART targets and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios;(10 points)
- Competence in adaptive management, as applied to biodiversity and ecosystems, ecology, value chain analysis or related fields for at least 10 years; (10 points);
- Project evaluation/review experiences within United Nations system will be considered an asset (10 points);
- Experience in evaluating projects in South Africa; (10 points)
- Work experience in relevant technical areas for at least 6 years;(10 points)
- Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender and value chain management; experience in gender sensitive evaluation and analysis (5 points)

- Excellent communication and analytical skills (5 points).

Language (10 Points)

- Fluency in written and spoken English. (10 points)

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.

APPLICATION PROCESS

M. Recommended Presentation of Offer

- a) **Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability** using the [template](#)⁵ provided by UNDP;
- b) **CV** and a **Personal History Form** ([P11 form](#));

⁵

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

⁶ http://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/corporate/Careers/P11_Personal_history_form.doc

- c) **Brief description of approach to work/technical proposal** of why the individual considers him/herself as the most suitable for the assignment, and a proposed methodology on how they will approach and complete the assignment; (max 1 page)
- d) **Financial Proposal** that indicates the all-inclusive fixed total contract price and all other travel related costs (such as flight ticket, per diem, etc), supported by a breakdown of costs, as per template attached to the [Letter of Confirmation of Interest template](#). If an applicant is employed by an organization/company/institution, and he/she expects his/her employer to charge a management fee in the process of releasing him/her to UNDP under Reimbursable Loan Agreement (RLA), the applicant must indicate at this point, and ensure that all such costs are duly incorporated in the financial proposal submitted to UNDP.

All application materials should be submitted to the address The Resident Representative, United Nations Development Programme P.O. Box 6541 Pretoria, South Africa in a sealed envelope indicating the following reference “Consultant for the *Support to the Biodiversity Value chains development* project Midterm Review” or by email at the following address ONLY: OR by email to bid.pretoria@undp.org by **16:00 Pretoria time (GMT+2) by the 05th of July 2022**. Incomplete applications will be excluded from further consideration.

Criteria for Evaluation of Proposal: 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.

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.

O. Annexes to the MTR ToR

Include *Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects* and other existing literature or documents that will help candidates gain a better understanding of the project situation and the work required.

Annexes include: (reference ToR Annexes in Annex 3 of *Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects*)

- 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)