TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR MIDTERM REVIEW FOR THE STRENGTHENING THE MULTI-SECTORAL MANAGEMENT OF CRITICAL LANDSCAPES

A. Project Title:

Strengthening the Multi-Sectoral Management of Critical Landscapes (SMSMCL)

B. Project Description or Context and Background:

This is the Terms of Reference (ToR) for the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) – Global Environment Fund (GEF) Midterm Review (MTR) of the Full-sized project titled *Strengthening the Multi-Sectoral Management of Critical Landscapes* (SMSMCL) (PIMS4536), implemented through the Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment (MNRE) in Samoa, which is to be undertaken in 2016.

The project started on the 31st October 2013 and is in its third 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.

The project was designed to strengthen local capacities, incentives and actions for integrated landscape management in order to reduce land degradation and greenhouse emissions and promote nature conservation whilst enhancing sustainable livelihood. This project is the first upscaling initiative by the Government of Samoa to ensure land degradation issues across all level of society are well addressed through the integration of sustainable landscape management into planning framework and actions across multi-sectoral arrangements in order to achieve the Government of Samoa's long-term goal:

"Samoa's productive landscapes are protected and sustainably managed to mitigate land degradation and to increase soil carbon sequestration so as to contribute to poverty alleviation and mitigation and adaptation to climate change impacts, as well as to contribute to global environmental benefits by overcoming barriers to integrated sustainable land management."

The primary objective of this project is to strengthen local capacities, incentives and actions for integrated landscape management in order to reduce land degradation and greenhouse gas emissions and promote nature conservation whilst enhancing sustainable local livelihoods.

In order to achieve this objective the project will support local household and wider community actions to reduce pressures on natural resources from competing land uses in the wider landscape. The project has two outcomes and four outputs:

Outcome 1: Communities and farmers are able to undertake and benefit from integrated land and water

management on their traditionally owned land.

Output 1.1: Landowners engaged in farming in the targeted communities increase village land area under Sustainable Land Management practices.

Output 1.2: Community leaders in targeted villages endorse participatory action plans and engage in sustainable land management practices on village land.

Outcome 2: Strengthened national enabling environment to promote integrated landscape management through local households and communities.

Output 2.1: National agencies involved in land use activities are able to effectively coordinate field interventions using a multi-sectoral approach.

Output 2.2: Policy makers and key stakeholders have an increased knowledge of Sustainable Land Management through services and training.

The total GEF trust funds for this project is US$ 4,736,363 with in kind co-financing of US$ 23,000,000,

C. Scope of Work:

The objective of the consultancy is to undertake the MTR of SMSMCL.

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, its risks to sustainability.

The MTR will seek to review achievements made during the period 31st October 2013 to 31st May 2016.

The objectives of the evaluation are to assess the achievement of project results, and to draw lessons that can both improve the sustainability of benefits from this project, and aid in the overall enhancement of UNDP programming and provide recommendations on options in addressing issues/challenges and a way forward to ensure the achievement of project outputs and ultimately the outcomes of the project.

The Evaluation will also collate and analyze specific lessons and best practices pertaining to the strategies employed, and implementation arrangements, which may be of relevance to other projects in the country and elsewhere in the world. The evaluation will also evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of project design, implementation, monitoring and adaptive management and sustainability of project outcomes, including the project exit strategy.

The MTR will be conducted according to the guidance, rules and procedures established by UNDP and GEF as reflected in the UNDP Evaluation Guidance for GEF Financed Projects.

Evaluation Approach and Method:

The MTR must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The evaluator will review all relevant sources of information, such as the project document, project reports – including Annual APR/PIR, project budget revisions, midterm review, progress reports, project files, national strategic and legal documents, and any other materials that the evaluator considers useful for this evidence-based assessment. A list of documents that the project team will provide to the evaluator for review is included in Annex A of this Terms of Reference.

The MTR team will also 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 is expected to follow a collaborative and participatory approach ensuring close engagement with the Project Team, government counterparts (the GEF Operational Focal Point), the UNDP Country Office(s), UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Advisers, Steering Committee/Project Board members and other key stakeholders. Engagement of stakeholders is also vital to a successful MTR. Stakeholder involvement should include face to face interviews on their respective roles and responsibilities to the project, including but not limited to (list); 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 Samoa, including the following project sites
1. Key Biodiversity Areas – Uafato-Tiavea Conservation Area including two villages of Uafto and Tiavea;
2. Key Biodiversity Areas - Apia Catchment Basin including priority sites of the Apia Urban Area;
3. Sites in South East Upolu;
4. Sites in North West Savaii.

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.

The project evaluation is to be undertaken in accordance with UN evaluation norms and policies and should embody a strong results-based orientation. It should be made clear that the evaluation team is responsible for revising the approach as necessary and present its methodological proposal as part of the inception report. Evaluation methods should be selected for their rigor in producing empirically based evidence to address the evaluation criteria, to respond to the evaluation questions, and to meet the objectives of the evaluation.

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/Whether 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[1]	Baseline Level[2]	Level in 1st PIR (self-reported)	Midterm Target[3]	End-of-project Target	Midterm Level & Assessment[4]	Achievement Rating[5]	Justification for Rating

---

[1] Populate with data from the Logframe and scorecards
[2] Populate with data from the Project Document
[3] If available

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.

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.

---

[4] Colour code this column only
[5] Use the 6 point Progress Towards Results Rating Scale: HS, S, MS, MU, U, HU

- 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 team will include a section of the report setting out the MTR's evidence-based conclusions, in light of the findings.[6]

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.

The MTR team should make no more than 15 recommendations total.

Ratings

---

[6] Alternatively, MTR conclusions may be integrated into the body of the report.

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 Annex D for ratings scales. No rating on Project Strategy and no overall project rating is required.

Table. MTR Ratings & Achievement Summary Table for (*Project Title*)

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)	

D. Expected Outcomes and Deliverables:

#	Deliverable	Description	Timing	Responsibilities
1	MTR Inception Report	MTR team clarifies objectives and methods of Midterm Review	No later than 2 weeks before the MTR mission	MTR team submits to the Commissioning Unit and project management
2	Presentation	Initial Findings	End of MTR mission	MTR Team presents to project management and the Commissioning Unit
3	Draft Final Report	Full report (using guidelines on content outlined in Annex B) with annexes	Within 3 weeks of the MTR mission	Sent to the Commissioning Unit, reviewed by RTA, Project Coordinating Unit, GEF OFP
4	Final Report*	Revised report with audit trail detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final MTR report	Within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft	Sent to the Commissioning Unit

*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.

E. Institutional Arrangement:

The principal responsibility for managing this MTR resides with the UNDP MCO in Samoa. The UNDP MCO 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 evaluator to provide all relevant documents, set up stakeholder interviews, and arrange field visits.

F. Duration of the Work:

The MTR will be for 25 working days over a period of time of 4.5 months, starting *31 May 2016,* and shall not exceed five months from when the consultant(s) are hired. The tentative MTR timeframe is as follows:

TIMEFRAME	ACTIVITY
11 May 2016	Application closes
31 May 2016	Select MTR Team

31 May 2016	Prep the MTR Team (handover of Project Documents)
01 June 2016 – 4 days	Document review and preparing MTR Inception Report
June 2016 - 2 days	Finalization and Validation of MTR Inception Report- latest start of MTR mission
15– 30 June 2016 - 10 days	MTR mission: stakeholder meetings, interviews, field visits
22 July 2016 - 5 days	Preparing draft report
12 August - 2 days	Incorporating audit trail from feedback on draft report/Finalization of MTR report
31 August 2016	Expected date of full MTR completion

Options for site visits should be provided in the Inception Report.

G. Duty Station:

Home-based with travel to Samoa. It is expected that the consultant will spend 10 (working) days on mission in Samoa.

H. Competencies :

Corporate Competencies
- The independent consultant:
    - Demonstrates integrity by complying with the UN's values and ethical standards;
    - Promotes the vision, mission, and strategic goals of UNDP;
    - Displays cultural, gender, religion, race, nationality and age sensitivity and adaptability.

Functional
- The independent consultant should possess proven and strong analytical and communication skills, including the ability to produce high quality reports.

Project & Resource Management
- The independent consultant should have strong organizational skills;
- The independent consultant should be able to work independently and collectively to produce individual high quality inputs and collectively high quality and TOR-compliant outputs;
- The independent consultant should possess sound judgment, strategic thinking and the ability to manage competing priorities.

Team Work
- Demonstrated ability of the consultant to work in a multi-cultural environment.

I. Qualifications and Experience of the Successful Contractor:

The consultant shall have prior experience in evaluating similar projects. Experience with GEF financed projects is an advantage. The evaluator selected should not have participated in the project preparation and/or implementation and should not have conflict of interest with project related activities.

The consultant must present the following qualifications:

- Post-graduate degree in environmental science or Natural Resource Management, sustainable land management, or other closely related field (25 points)
- Minimum 8 years of relevant professional experience in Natural Resource Management / Sustainable Land Management (30 points)
- Minimum of 5 years experience with evaluations, results-based monitoring, and/or evaluation methodologies (30 points)
- Experience working with the GEF/GEF-LDCF programs and in the targeted focal areas: Natural Resource Management / Sustainable Land Management (5 points)
- Experience working in the Pacific region (5 points)
- Fluency in English (oral and written) is a requirement (5 points)

Offers will be evaluated according to the Combined Scoring method – where the technical criteria will be weighted at 70% and the financial offer will be weighted at 30%.

Evaluation consultants will be held to the highest ethical standards and are required to sign a Code of Conduct (Annex E) upon acceptance of the assignment. UNDP evaluations are conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluations'.

J. Scope of Bid Price & Schedule of Payments:

DELIVERABLES	DUE DATEAND WEIGHTING (%)	AMOUNT IN USD TO BE PAID AFTER CERTIFICATION BY UNDP AND VERIFICATION BY MNRE-PMU OF SATISFACTORY PERFORMANCE OF DELIVERABLES
Upon approval and certification by UNDP / MNRE of the Final MTR Inception Report	10%	$xxx
Upon approval and certification by UNDP / MNRE of the 1st draft MTR Report	30%	$xxx
Upon approval and certification by UNDP / MNRE / UNDP RTA of the final MTR Report	60%	$xxx
Total		

- **Recommended Presentation of Proposal**:

Given below is the recommended format for submitting your proposal. The following headings with the required details are important. Please use the template available (Letter of Offer to complete financial proposal)

CVs with a proposed methodology addressing the elements mentioned under deliverables must be submitted by **11 May, 2016,** electronically via email: procurement.ws@undp.org or apply online attaching all the required documents on https://jobs.undp.org/ . Incomplete applications will not be considered and only candidates for whom there is further interest will be contacted. Proposals must include:

- **Letter of interest and availability** summarizing all details required (template attached)
- **P11** of the individual or **profile** of the company addressing the academic qualifications and experience required and demonstrating understanding of the requirements – **(template attached)**
- **3 professional references (most recent)**
- **Brief Methodology** on how you will approach and conduct the work (no more than 1 page)
- **Financial Proposal** – Professional daily fee (inclusive of per diem and travel costs) or alternatively lump sum amount

Queries about the consultancy can be directed to procurement.ws@undp.org with copy to anne.trevor@undp.org.

UNDP applies a fair and transparent selection process that will take into account the competencies/skills of the applicants as well as their financial proposals. Qualified women and members of social minorities are encouraged to apply.

ANNEX A: LIST OF DOCUMENTS TO BE REVIEWED BY THE EVALUATORS

1. PIF – Project Identification Form;
2. SMSMCL – Project Document;
3. SMSMCL - Project Brief;
4. UNDP Environmental and Social Screening results;
5. Project inception report;
6. All AWPs (annual work plans);
7. All annual financial project reports (CDRs);
8. All Project Implementation Reports (PIR's)
9. Consultancy products (report, technical studies, etc.);
10. Quarterly Progress Reports (QPRs) and quarterly Financial Reports (FRs)
11. Finalized GEF focal area Tracking Tools at CEO endorsement and midterm (fill in specific TTs for this project's focal area)
12. Minutes of SMSMCL meetings/Project board meeting minutes
13. Audit reports;
14. All communication products;
15. All monitoring reports prepared by the project
16. Community consultations minutes, if available;
17. UNDP Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF); and
18. Financial and Administration guidelines used by Project Team
19. Any other project relevant documents.
20. Strategy for the Development of Samoa 2012-2016
21. Agriculture Sector Plan
22. National Environment Management Strategy/Plan?? (the Environment Sector Plan)
23. National Program of Action to combat land degradation and to mitigate the effects of drought 2015-2020.

ANNEX B: GUIDELINES ON CONTENTS FOR THE MIDTERM REVIEW REPORT[7]

    i.   Basic Report Information *(for opening page or title page)*
- Title of UNDP supported GEF financed project
- UNDP PIMS# and GEF project ID#
- MTR time frame and date of MTR report
- Region and countries included in the project
- GEF Operational Focal Area/Strategic Program
- Executing Agency/Implementing Partner and other project partners
- MTR team members
- Acknowledgements

    ii.   Table of Contents

    iii.   Acronyms and Abbreviations

1.   Executive Summary *(3-5 pages)*
- Project Information Table
- Project Description (brief)
- 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

---

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

4.2   Progress Towards Results
- Progress towards outcomes analysis
- Remaining barriers to achieving the project objective

4.3   Project Implementation and Adaptive Management
- Management Arrangements
- Work planning
- Finance and co-finance
- Project-level monitoring and evaluation systems
- Stakeholder engagement
- Reporting
- Communications

4.4   Sustainability
- Financial risks to sustainability
- Socio-economic to sustainability
- Institutional framework and governance risks to sustainability
- Environmental risks to sustainability

5. Conclusions and Recommendations *(4-6 pages)*

5.1   Conclusions
- Comprehensive and balanced statements (that are evidence-based and connected to the MTR's findings) which highlight the strengths, weaknesses and results of the project

5.2   Recommendations
- Corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project
- Actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the project
- Proposals for future directions underlining main objectives

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

ANNEX C: MIDTERM REVIEW EVALUATION MATRIX TEMPLATE

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

Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, socio-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?			

	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

ANNEX E: EVALUATION CONSULTANT CODE OF CONDUCT AND AGREEMENT FORM

Evaluators:
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 imitations, findings and recommendations.
7. Should reflect sound accounting procedures and be prudent in using the resources of the evaluation.

Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form[8]

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.

Signature: _____

Signed at *place* on *date*

---

[8]www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct

ANNEX F: EVALUATION REPORT CLEARANCE FORM

(to be completed by MCO and UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based in the region and included in the final document)

Evaluation Report Reviewed and Cleared by

UNDP Multi-Country Office

Name: _____

Signature: _____ Date: _____

UNDP GEF RTA

Name: _____

Signature: _____ Date: _____

ANNEX G: MTR REPORT AUDIT TRAIL

The following is a template for the evaluator 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 (*dates*) from the Midterm Review of Strengthening the Multi-Sectoral Management of Critical Landscapes (PIMS 4536)

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

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