



Terms of Reference

Mid Term Review of the UNDP GEF project

ESCO Moldova-Transforming the market for urban energy efficiency in Moldova by introducing Energy Service Companies

Job title:	International Consultant on Energy Efficiency for Mid Term Review
Type of Contract:	Individual Contract (IC)
Assignment type:	International Consultant
Section/Unit:	Environment and Energy Cluster
Duty Station:	Home based with one mission of 5 working days to Moldova
Languages required:	English
Starting Date:	01 November 2016
Duration of Assignment:	21 working days (16 home based, 5 working days on mission).
Payment arrangements:	Lump sum contract (payments linked to satisfactory performance and delivery of outputs)
Evaluation method:	Desk review with validation interview

I. Introduction

This is the Terms of Reference (ToR) for the UNDP-GEF Midterm Review (MTR) of the *full-sized project titled ESCO Moldova- Transforming the market for urban energy efficiency in Moldova by introducing Energy Service Companies, PIMS 5135, implemented in partnership with the Ministry of Environment which is to be undertaken during July-September 2016. The project started on November 2014, had the inception workshop in June 2015 and it is in its second year of implementation. This ToR sets out the expectations for this MTR.*

The MTR process must follow the guidance outlined in the document *Guidance for Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects* (attached).

See link:

http://web.undp.org/evaluation/documents/guidance/GEF/mid-term/Guidance_Midterm%20Review%20_EN_2014.pdf

II. Project Background Information

The UNDP GEF “ESCO Moldova project - Transforming the market for Urban Energy Efficiency in Moldova by introducing Energy Service Companies”, funded by the Global Environment Facility (GEF), and co-financed and implemented by the United Nations Development Program has an implementation timeframe of 4 years with a total budget of 1.45 million USD of which \$1.3 million USD comes from the GEF and \$150,000 USD from UNDP.

The project objective is to create a functioning, sustainable and effective ESCO market in Moldova by converting existing energy service provider companies into ESCO companies, as the basis for scaling up mitigation efforts in the whole municipal building sector in Moldova, leading to CO2 emission reductions by implementing energy performance contracts. The project will work on the largely untapped energy efficiency market in the municipal sector, especially in facilities owned and operated by municipalities, in the Chisinau area for the first stage and then to other parts of Moldova.

The main barriers that the project is trying to address are related to:

- Energy efficiency project financing;
- The eagerness of existing Energy Service Providers to embark on the ESCO business model;
- Institutional barriers at the local level;
- Energy efficiency awareness in the municipal sector.

The ESCO Moldova Project intends to eliminate/address these impediments through the following project outputs:

- Green Urban Development Plan adopted by city of Chisinau;
- ESCO Business model in Moldova is operational;
- Financial mechanism and financial support available to ESCOs;
- EPC projects replicated in other municipalities and information disseminated.

The main targets to be achieved by the end of the project are:

- A functional ESCO market with a functional LGF in place;

- ESCO companies created and consolidated; creation of new investments in EE measures that will lead to long term energy consumption savings and 20 EE projects implemented;
- Better conditions in public and residential buildings and overall Chisinau will advance in its sustainable green development.

Project activities were designed to respond all the outlined challenges and consequently offer feasible solutions to the requirements of the energy efficiency financing market needs. Also they envisaged the opportunity of creating synergies with local stakeholders as well as offer incentives for the ESCO market to start developing. A specific attention will be offered to development of capacities of local energy service providers (potential ESCOs), local authority as well as the banking sector. The overall project activities will also develop amendments to the legal framework for energy services and green procurement, will facilitate the improvement of the Urban Development Plan by adding energy efficiency elements, and ultimately will incentivise the implementation of the first 20 projects using the guaranties of a fund established to secure the participation of all stakeholders in the financing scheme.

The inception phase of this project began in January 2015 and the project is due to finish at the end of 2018 after a duration of 4 years. The project is implemented by UNDP Moldova. It is being implemented in close collaboration with the Ministry of Environment, Energy Efficiency Agency, Energy Efficiency Fund and the Municipality of Chisinau. Specific emphasis will be placed on capacity building of all involved stakeholders to adopt the new financing modality and understand their roles and responsibilities, improvement of urban planning and energy efficiency measures to be implemented in Chisinau as well as financial incentives required to give a push to energy services market development. The best practices and lessons learned of the pilot projects implemented in Chisinau will offer an additional argument for replicating them all over the country.

III. 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, its risks to sustainability.

The main output of the MTR will be specific recommendations for adaptive management to improve the project over the second half of its lifetime.

It is recommended that the Mid Term Review not provide more than 15 recommendations in total, to improve the project.

IV. MTR APPROACH & METHODOLOGY

The MTR must provide evidence based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The MTR international consultant 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 team considers useful for this evidence-based review). The MTR international consultant 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 international energy efficiency MTR consultant 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 Ministry of Environment, Energy Efficiency Agency, Energy Efficiency Fund and Municipality of Chisinau, UNDP Moldova staff, UNDP Istanbul Regional Technical Advisor on Climate Change Mitigation, 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 consultant is expected to conduct a field mission to Chisinau which will consist of a minimum of 5 working days (not including weekend or travel days). While in Moldova, the international consultant will meet with all key stakeholders and assess the results of the project and the extent that it is on track to meet its overall objective and outcomes. Skype interviews will also be carried out with all other key stakeholders involved in the design and implementation of the project.

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.

V. Detailed Scope of the MTR

The International consultant 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 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.

1. Project Strategy

Project design:

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

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

Indicator Assessment Key

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

In addition to the progress towards outcomes analysis:

- Compare and analyse the GEF Tracking Tool 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 Populate with data from the Logframe and scorecards

⁴ Populate with data from the Project Document

⁵ If available

⁶ Colour code this column only

⁷ Use the 6 point Progress Towards Results Rating Scale: HS, S, MS, MU, U, HU

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.

Overall Effectiveness

- To what extent is the project on track to have 20 building rehabilitations financed in Moldova, using the ESCO modality, before the end of the project?
- Is the project on track to deliver cumulative (20 years) energy savings of 295 GWh as a result of the 20 demo projects selected?
- To what extent is the loan guarantee fund on track to deliver \$2.7 million dollars of loan guarantees to be signed with the Energy Efficiency Fund?
- To what extent is the project on track to leave behind a market in Moldova for ESCOs in which there are at least 5 companies, which previously worked as engineering companies, now working as ESCOs.

Component 1

- Is the project on track to have a green urban development plan for Chisinau, including a resource mobilization plan, developed and approved, with support from this project, by the end of the project?
- Is the project on track to have a public green procurement plan developed and applied by the City of Chisinau by the end of the project?

Component 2

- What progress has the project made related to training on the ESCO business model which includes 3 target beneficiaries' groups and 3 training sessions, at least 20 ESPs are trained on the ESCO business model, public Building managers and Maintenance Managers, at least 20 staffs are trained on ESCO business model, and Financial Institutions (5), including the EEF are trained on the ESCO business model
- To what extent is the project on track to have 20 projects selected and contracted and under implementation using the EPC modality before the project ends?
- To what extent is the project on track to have a framework agreement signed with the Energy Efficiency Agency, the City of Chisinau, and the PMU

Component 3

- To what extent has the loan guarantee mechanism been adequately designed and set-up? Have the adaptive management changes to the loan guarantee mechanism

from how it was described and defined in the project document helped to strengthen the project or otherwise? Please explain.

- To what extent is the loan guarantee mechanism likely to be sustainable beyond the lifetime of the project?
- To what extent, if any, has the banking sector in Moldova worked with the loan guarantee mechanism? What could be done in this regard?
- What changes, if any, could be used to strengthen the loan guarantee mechanism?

Component 4

- To what extent is the project on track to achieve replication and dissemination to another town/city in Moldova and to what extent have initial discussions been held with another town/city regarding working with the ESCO Moldova project
- To what extent is the project on track to support the development of a green urban development plan in another city?

Work Planning:

- Review any delays in project start-up and implementation, identify the causes and examine if they have been resolved.
- Has the work planning been carried out in a manner which is consistent with the project document and with the project workplan or are there significant deviations
- 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. Have the budget revisions strengthened or weakened the project overall?
- 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 Manager 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 including PIR reporting and quarterly financial reporting: 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 including assessing how well the project has worked with UNDP Moldova and the UNDP Istanbul Regional Hub in identifying and implementing adaptive management measures
- Assess how well the Project international consultant 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 has 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.

4. 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)?
- What is the likelihood of the financial support mechanism being established by the project being sustainable (meaning that it will continue to operate and function beyond the lifetime of the project)

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 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.
- To what extent has the project managed to improve or contribute to legal frameworks related to the development of the ESCO market in Moldova

Environmental risks to sustainability:

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

Conclusions & Recommendations

The MTR International consultant will include a section of the report setting out the MTR's evidence-based conclusions, in light of the findings with the main goal of making recommendations on how to significantly improve the project (i.e – how to implement adaptive management) over the second half of its lifetime.⁸

⁸ Alternatively, MTR conclusions may be integrated into the body of the report.

UNDP and GEF rules for adaptive management allow for change of activities and outputs to better achieve the project objective and main outcomes. However, they do not allow for the project objective or outcomes to be changed.

There should be no more than 15 recommendations. 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.

Ratings

The MTR International consultant 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. In addition, an overall rating for the project should be given.

Table. MTR Ratings & Achievement Summary Table for ESCO Moldova project

Measure	MTR Rating	Achievement Description
Overall Rating		<i>(Please note that for the mid-term review an overall rating is optional)</i>
Project Design and Strategy		
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)	

VI. TIMEFRAME

The total duration of the mid-term review will be **21 days** from the start date of the assignment which works out to approximately 1.5 months from November to the mid of December 2016.

ACTIVITY	TIMEFRAME	Number of Days
Preparation for the mission by the International consultant (handover of all project documents)	<i>beginning of November</i>	1
Document review and preparation and submission of MTR Inception Report	<i>Beginning of November</i>	4
5 working days MTR mission to Moldova: stakeholder meetings, interviews, field visits	<i>Mid-November</i>	5
Preparing draft MTR report and submitting to Project Manager, UNDP Moldova, and UNDP Istanbul Regional Hub and holding conference call to discuss the draft report	<i>By end of November</i>	6
Incorporating audit trail from feedback on draft report/Finalization of MTR report	<i>By end of November</i>	1
Preparation & Finalization of UNDP Management Response by UNDP Moldova in consultations with the MTR Consultant.	<i>By end of November</i>	1
Finalization of MTR incorporating all comments and responding to all issues raised by all stakeholders	<i>By beginning of December</i>	3
	Total	21

Options for site visits and a detailed list of interviewees and questions to be asked should be provided in the Inception Report.

VII. Expected Deliverables

#	Deliverable	Description	Timing	Responsibilities
1	MTR Inception Report	MTR International consultant clarifies objectives and methods of Midterm Review	No later than Beginning of November	MTR International consultant submits to the UNDP CO and project management
2	Presentation	Initial Findings	Last day of 7 working days	MTR International consultant presents

			MTR mission (powerpoint presentation) to be carried out in Mid-November	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 and expected to be at the end of November	Sent to the UNDP CO 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, and expected to be at beginning of December 2016	Sent to the UNDP CO and UNDP Regional Technical Advisor

*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.

VIII. MTR Arrangements

Institutional arrangements

The principal responsibility for managing this MTR resides with the UNDP Moldova Country Office which is the Commissioning Unit.

The Project team will be responsible for liaising with the MTR International consultant to provide all relevant documents, set up stakeholder interviews and agenda, and arrange field visits if necessary. The MTR consultant should review all documents and request meetings and interviews to take place prior to the mission.

Duty station

Home-based with 5 working days mission to Moldova which should be carried out in November 2016.

Travel:

- **International travel** (5 working days - mission) will be required to Moldova which is called the Mid-Term Review mission; This 5 working days mission does not include travel days or weekend days which means that the consultant will need to stay one weekend in Moldova. Weekend days are not considered working days. All envisaged travel costs must be included in the financial proposal.

IX. Qualifications and experience requirements

The MTR International Consultant should be an international expert with experience and exposure to energy efficiency projects and will have some prior experience in carrying out mid-term or final evaluations. It is preferable that the international consultant has some prior familiarity with the ESCO business model. The international consultant 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 International Consultant on energy-efficiency - MTR Consultant should have the following qualifications and experience:

Academic qualifications:

- Master's degree in Energy, Environment, Business Administration, Economics, Engineering, or other closely related field. PhD is an asset;

Experience:

- At least 5 (five) years work experience in providing advice to energy-efficiency projects funded by international donors including UNDP or other donors;
- At least 7 (seven) years work experience and proven track record with policy advice and/or project development/implementation in energy efficiency in transition economies;
- Experience in working with the UNDP or another GEF agency or GEF project evaluations, including experience with SMART based indicators (Project evaluation/review experiences within United Nations system will be considered an asset);
- Experience in evaluating performance based energy efficiency projects. Proven knowledge of energy performance contracting, ESCO mechanism;
- Experience in working with international technical assistance projects in the Europe and CIS region with international organizations;
- Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender; experience in gender sensitive evaluation and analysis;
- Proven experience in preparation of written reports in an accurate and concise manner in English;

Language requirements:

- Writing and verbal skills in English, knowledge of Romanian or Russian would be an asset.

X. Payment modalities

The international consultant shall be paid in three instalments as follows:

- 10% of total contract amount payable upon approval of the final MTR Inception Report
- 50% of total contract amount payable upon submission and acceptance of the draft MTR report
- 40% of total contract amount payable upon finalization of the MTR report and its acceptance by UNDP Moldova and UNDP Istanbul Regional Hub

XI. Application process

All applications should include the following:

1. Personal information (Personal History Form/P11) including past experience in similar projects.
2. Financial proposal (in USD, specifying the total lump sum amount as well as the requested amount of the fee per day).
3. The most recent reports delivered in a similar position.

Incomplete applications will not be considered.

Annex I – Financial Proposal of the International Consultant

	Nr. of units*	Units	Rate / USD	Total / USD
Work in home office**				
Preparation for Mission to Moldova	5	man/days		0
Follow-up to Mission to Moldova	11	man/days		0
				0
Work on mission**				
5 working day mission to Moldova	5	man/days		0
DSA				0
Return Air-Ticket				0
Sub-total fee				0
Other costs				
				0
				0
				0
Sub-total other costs				0
TOTAL	21			0

* Estimates are indicated in the TOR, the applicant is requested to review and revise, if applicable.

** Add rows as needed

I agree to perform this assignment for a lump sum of _____ USD

Name: _____

Signature: _____

Date: _____ / _____ / 2016

This offer remains valid for a period of 3 months from the date of signature.

ANNEXES to MTR TOR

ToR ANNEX A: List of Documents to be reviewed by the International consultant

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

The following documents will also be available:

13. Project operational guidelines, manuals and systems
14. UNDP country/countries programme document(s)
15. Minutes of the (*Project Title*) Board Meetings and other meetings (i.e. Project Appraisal Committee meetings)
16. Project site location maps

ToR ANNEX B: Guidelines on Contents for the Midterm Review Report⁹

- 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
 - International consultant 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)

⁹ The Report length should not exceed 40 pages in total (not including annexes).

- MTR Ratings & Achievement Summary Table
- Concise summary of conclusions
- Recommendation Summary Table
- 2. Introduction (2-3 pages)
 - Purpose of the MTR and objectives
 - Scope & Methodology: principles of design and execution of the MTR, MTR approach and data collection methods, limitations to the MTR
 - Structure of the MTR report
- 3. Project Description and Background Context (3-5 pages)
 - Development context: environmental, socio-economic, institutional, and policy factors relevant to the project objective and scope
 - Problems that the project sought to address: threats and barriers targeted
 - Project Description and Strategy: objective, outcomes and expected results, description of field sites (if any)
 - Project Implementation Arrangements: short description of the Project Board, key implementing partner arrangements, etc.
 - Project timing and milestones
 - Main stakeholders: summary list
- 4. Findings (12-14 pages)
 - 4.1 Project Strategy
 - Project Design
 - Results Framework/Logframe
 - 4.2 Progress Towards Results
 - Progress towards outcomes analysis
 - Remaining barriers to achieving the project objective
 - 4.3 Project Implementation and Adaptive Management
 - Management Arrangements
 - Work planning
 - Finance and co-finance
 - Project-level monitoring and evaluation systems
 - Stakeholder engagement
 - 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.*)

ToR ANNEX C: Midterm Review Evaluative 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?			

Evaluators/Consultants:

1. Must present information that is complete and fair in its assessment of strengths and weaknesses so that decisions or actions taken are well founded.
2. Must disclose the full set of evaluation findings along with information on their limitations and have this accessible to all affected by the evaluation with expressed legal rights to receive results.
3. Should protect the anonymity and confidentiality of individual informants. They should provide maximum notice, minimize demands on time, and respect people's right not to engage. Evaluators must respect people's right to provide information in confidence, and must ensure that sensitive information cannot be traced to its source. Evaluators are not expected to evaluate individuals, and must balance an evaluation of management functions with this general principle.
4. Sometimes uncover evidence of wrongdoing while conducting evaluations. Such cases must be reported discreetly to the appropriate investigative body. Evaluators should consult with other relevant oversight entities when there is any doubt about if and how issues should be reported.
5. Should be sensitive to beliefs, manners and customs and act with integrity and honesty in their relations with all stakeholders. In line with the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights, evaluators must be sensitive to and address issues of discrimination and gender equality. They should avoid offending the dignity and self-respect of those persons with whom they come in contact in the course of the evaluation. Knowing that evaluation might negatively affect the interests of some stakeholders, evaluators should conduct the evaluation and communicate its purpose and results in a way that clearly respects the stakeholders' dignity and self-worth.
6. Are responsible for their performance and their product(s). They are responsible for the clear, accurate and fair written and/or oral presentation of study limitations, findings and recommendations.
7. Should reflect sound accounting procedures and be prudent in using the resources of the evaluation.

MTR Consultant Agreement Form

Agreement to abide by the Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN System:

Name of Consultant: _____

Name of Consultancy Organization (where relevant): _____

I confirm that I have received and understood and will abide by the United Nations Code of Conduct for Evaluation.

Signed at _____ (Place) on _____ (Date)

Signature: _____

¹⁰ www.undp.org/unegcodeofconduct

ToR ANNEX E: MTR Ratings

Ratings for Progress Towards Results: (one rating for each outcome and for the objective)		
6	Highly Satisfactory (HS)	The objective/outcome is expected to achieve or exceed all its end-of-project targets, without major shortcomings. The progress towards the objective/outcome can be presented as “good practice”.
5	Satisfactory (S)	The objective/outcome is expected to achieve most of its end-of-project targets, with only minor shortcomings.
4	Moderately Satisfactory (MS)	The objective/outcome is expected to achieve most of its end-of-project targets but with significant shortcomings.
3	Moderately Unsatisfactory (HU)	The objective/outcome is expected to achieve its end-of-project targets with major shortcomings.
2	Unsatisfactory (U)	The objective/outcome is expected not to achieve most of its end-of-project targets.
1	Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)	The objective/outcome has failed to achieve its midterm targets, and is not expected to achieve any of its end-of-project targets.

Ratings for Project Implementation & Adaptive Management: (one overall rating)		
6	Highly Satisfactory (HS)	Implementation of all seven components – management arrangements, work planning, finance and co-finance, project-level monitoring and evaluation systems, stakeholder engagement, reporting, and communications – is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management. The project can be presented as “good practice”.
5	Satisfactory (S)	Implementation of most of the seven components is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management except for only few that are subject to remedial action.
4	Moderately Satisfactory (MS)	Implementation of some of the seven components is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management, with some components requiring remedial action.
3	Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)	Implementation of some of the seven components is not leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive, with most components requiring remedial action.
2	Unsatisfactory (U)	Implementation of most of the seven components is not leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management.
1	Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)	Implementation of none of the seven components is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management.

Ratings for Sustainability: (one overall rating)		
4	Likely (L)	Negligible risks to sustainability, with key outcomes on track to be achieved by the project’s closure and expected to continue into the foreseeable future
3	Moderately Likely (ML)	Moderate risks, but expectations that at least some outcomes will be sustained due to the progress towards results on outcomes at the Midterm Review

2	Moderately Unlikely (MU)	Significant risk that key outcomes will not carry on after project closure, although some outputs and activities should carry on
1	Unlikely (U)	Severe risks that project outcomes as well as key outputs will not be sustained

ToR ANNEX F: MTR Report Clearance Form

(to be completed by the Commissioning Unit and UNDP-GEF RTA and included in the final document)

Midterm Review Report Reviewed and Cleared By:

Commissioning Unit

Name: _____

Signature: _____ Date: _____

UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Advisor

Name: _____

Signature: _____ Date: _____