United Nations Development Programme

TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR MID-TERM REVIEW OF THE ECONOMY-WIDE INTEGRATION OF CLIMATE CHANGE ADAPTATION AND DISASTER RISK MANAGEMENT TO CLIMATE VULNERABILITY OF COMMUNITIES IN SAMOA (EWACC) PROJECT

A. Introduction:

This is the Terms of Reference (ToR) for the UNDP-GEF Midterm Review (MTR) of the full-sized project titled *Economy-Wide Integration of Climate Change Adaptation and Disaster Risk Management to Climate Vulnerability of communities in Samoa (EWACC) Project* (PIMS 5264) implemented through the Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment, which is to be undertaken in 2017. The project started on 7 November 2014 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.

B. Project Description or Context and Background:

The project was designed to adopt an economy-wide approach to climate change in Samoa, that will allow for increased integration of climate change adaptation and disaster risk into national development planning and programming across all sectors as well as strengthening resilience of communities including their physical assets and livelihoods. The project has five outcomes and these are as follows;

- OUTCOME 1.1. Policy Strategies/Institutional Strengthening: Climate change adaptation and DRM mainstreamed in relevant policies, sectoral strategies, sub-national strategies[1] and budgeting processes through enhanced coordination of government institutions
- OUTCOME 1.2. Public finance management at the national and village level: Capacity to access, manage, implement and monitor use of climate change funds is enhanced at the national and village level.
- OUTCOME 2.1. Protection of communities' physical assets and livelihoods: Increased resilience, and decreased exposure and susceptibility of communities to climate change and natural disasters by protection of household and community assets and promoting resilient livelihoods
- OUTCOME 2.2. CCA/DRM plans and implementation: Increased adaptive capacity of communities for implementation of effective risk management and protection of household and community assets.

---

[1] Sub-national strategies include district/village strategies and a strategy for Apia

Empowered lives.
Resilient nations.

- OUTCOME 3.1. Knowledge about CCA and DRM is captured and shared at the regional and global level.

The total grant funding for this project is US$12,322,936 from the Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF) with in kind co-financing of US$ 90,000,000. The project document was signed on the 7th November 2014. The executing agency for this project is the Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment and responsible parties are the Ministry of Finance, Ministry of Women Communities and Social Development and the Land Transport Authority.

C. Scope of Work:

The objective of this consultancy is to undertake the mid-term review of the EWACC project.

1. 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.

2. 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 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 team will review the baseline GEF focal area Tracking Tool submitted to the GEF at CEO endorsement, and the midterm GEF focal area Tracking Tool that must be completed before the MTR field mission begins.

The MTR team is expected to follow a collaborative and participatory approach[2] 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.[3] Stakeholder involvement should include interviews with stakeholders who have project responsibilities, including but not limited to *Ministry of Finance (Climate Resilience Investment Coordination Unit and Aid Coordination & Debt Management Division)*, *Ministry of Natural Resource and Environment (GEF Division, Water*

---

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

[3] 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.

Resources Division, Disaster Management Office, Ministry of Works and Infrastructure (Building Management Division and Land Transport Division), Ministry of Women, Community and Social Development (Economic Empowerment Division and Youth Employment Programme) Land Transport Authority, Samoa Water Authority, METI, Vaisigano community, Kramer Aucesco; 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 *Vaisigano, METI project site (Nofoalii, Faleasiu, Sapunaoa and Maninoa), NEOC (CDCRM sites to be confirmed)and YEP (sites to be confirmed)*.

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.

3.   DETAILED SCOPE OF THE MTR

The MTR team will assess the following four categories of project progress. See the *Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects* for extended descriptions.

i. Project Strategy

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

Results Framework/Logframe:
- Undertake a critical analysis of the project's logframe indicators and targets, assess how "SMART" the midterm and end-of-project targets are (Specific, Measurable, Attainable,

Relevant, Time-bound), and suggest specific amendments/revisions to the targets and indicators as necessary.
- Are the project's objectives and outcomes or components clear, practical, and feasible within its time frame?
- Examine if progress so far has led to, or could in the future catalyse beneficial development effects (i.e. income generation, gender equality and women's empowerment, improved governance etc...) that should be included in the project results framework and monitored on an annual basis.
- Ensure broader development and gender aspects of the project are being monitored effectively. Develop and recommend SMART 'development' indicators, including sex-disaggregated indicators and indicators that capture development benefits.

ii. Progress Towards Results

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

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

Project Strategy	Indicator[4]	Baseline Level[5]	Level in 1st PIR (self-reported)	Midterm Target[6]	End-of-project Target	Midterm Level & Assessment[7]	Achievement Rating[8]
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

---

[4] Populate with data from the Logframe and scorecards
[5] Populate with data from the Project Document
[6] If available
[7] Colour code this column only
[8] Use the 6 point Progress Towards Results Rating Scale: HS, S, MS, MU, U, HU

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.
- 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?

Empowered lives.
Resilient nations.

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.

Empowered lives.
Resilient nations.

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.[9]

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.

---

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

Empowered lives.
Resilient nations.

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

Table. MTR Ratings & Achievement Summary Table for EWACC

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)	

4. Expected Outcomes and Deliverables:

#	Deliverable	Description	Timing	Responsibilities

Empowered lives.
Resilient nations.

1	**MTR Inception Report**	MTR team clarifies objectives and methods of Midterm Review	No later than 2 weeks before the MTR mission: 23rd June 2017	MTR team submits to the Commissioning Unit and project management
2	**Presentation**	Initial Findings	End of MTR mission: 21st July 2017	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: 18th August 2017	Sent to the Commissioning Unit

5.   Institutional Arrangement:

The principal responsibility for managing this MTR resides with the Commissioning Unit. The Commissioning Unit for this project's MTR is the UNDP Samoa Multi-country office for Cook Islands, Niue, Samoa and Tokelau based in Samoa

The commissioning unit will contract the consultants and ensure the timely provision of per diems and travel arrangements within the country for the MTR team. The Project Team will be responsible for liaising with the MTR team to provide all relevant documents, set up stakeholder interviews, and arrange field visits.

6.   Duration of the Work:

The total duration of the MTR will be approximately *25 working days* over a time period of *18 weeks* starting *31st May 2017*, and shall not exceed five months from when the consultant(s) are hired. The tentative MTR timeframe is as follows:

Empowered lives.
Resilient nations.

COMPLETION DATE	NUMBER OF WORKING DAYS	ACTIVITY
19th May 2017		Application closes
31st May 2017		Select MTR Team
31st May 2017		Prep the MTR Team (handover of Project Documents)
9th June 2017	4 working days	Document review and preparing MTR Inception Report
23rd June 2017		Finalization and Validation of MTR Inception Report- latest start of MTR mission
10th – 21st July 2017	5 working days	MTR mission: stakeholder meetings, interviews, field visits
21st July 2017	1 working day	Mission wrap-up meeting & presentation of initial findings- earliest end of MTR mission
4th August 2017	10 working days	Preparing draft report
18th August 2017	5 working days	Incorporating audit trail from feedback on draft report/Finalization of MTR report (note: accommodate time delay in dates for circulation and review of the draft report)
1st September 2017		Preparation & Issue of Management Response
30th September 2017		Expected date of full MTR completion

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

7.   Duty Station:

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

8. <u>Competencies:</u>

- Demonstrates commitment to the Gov. of Samoa mission, vision and values.
- Displays cultural, gender, religion, race, nationality and age sensitivity and adaptability
- Focuses on result for the client and responds positively to feedback
- Consistently approaches work with energy and a positive, constructive attitude
- Demonstrates openness to change and ability to manage complexities
- Good inter-personal and teamwork skills, networking aptitude, ability to work in multicultural environment

<u>Qualifications of the Successful Contractor</u>:

- Post-graduate degree in environmental/climate science, disaster risk management or other closely related field
- Minimum 8 years of relevant professional experience in climate change adaptation and disaster risk management
- Minimum of 5 years' experience with evaluations, results-based monitoring, and/or evaluation methodologies
- Experience working with the GEF/GEF-LDCF programs and in the targeted focal areas: Climate Change Adaptation
- Experience working in the Pacific region
- Fluency in English (oral and written) is a requirement

Evaluation criteria: 70% Technical, 30% financial combined weight:

Technical Evaluation Criteria (based on the information provided in the CV and the relevant documents must be submitted as evidence to support possession of below required criteria):

- Post-graduate degree in environmental/climate science, disaster risk management, or other closely related field (25%)
- Minimum 8 years of relevant professional experience in climate change adaptation and disaster risk management (30%)
- Minimum of 5 years' experience with evaluations, results-based monitoring, and/or evaluation methodologies (30%)
- Experience working with the GEF/GEF-LDCF programs and in the targeted focal areas: climate change adaptation (5%)

- Experience working in the Pacific region (5%)
- Fluency in English (oral and written) is a requirement (5%)

9. Scope of Bid Price & Schedule of Payments:

DELIVERABLES	DUE DATE (%)	AMOUNT IN USD TO BE PAID AFTER CERTIFICATION BY UNDP OF SATISFACTORY PERFORMANCE OF DELIVERABLES
Upon approval and certification by UNDP/MNRE of the final MTR Inception Report	23rd June 2017 (20%)	$xxx
Upon approval and certification by UNDP/MNRE of the draft MTR report	4th August 2017 (40%)	$xxx
Upon approval and certification by UNDP/MNRE of the final MTR report	18th August 2017 (40%)	$xxx
TOTAL		$xxx

10. 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 2nd June 2017 electronically via email: procurement.ws@undp.org. Incomplete applications will not be considered and only candidates for whom there is further interest will be contacted. Proposals must include:

- **CV** or P11 form addressing the evaluation criteria and why you consider yourself the most suitable for this assignment. The selected candidate must submit a signed P11 prior to contract award.
- **3 professional references most recent**
- **A brief methodology** on how you will approach and conduct the work,
- **Financial Proposal** specifying the daily rate and other expenses, if any

Empowered lives.
Resilient nations.

- **Letter of interest and availability specifying the available date to start and other details**

Queries about the consultancy can be directed to the UNDP Procurement Unit
procurement.ws@undp.org

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

1. PIF
2. UNDP Initiation Plan
3. UNDP Project Document
4. UNDP 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 Report[10]

  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
       4.2 Progress Towards Results
       - Progress towards outcomes analysis

---

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

- 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.)*

United Nations Development Programme

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?			

Empowered lives.
Resilient nations.

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

ToR ANNEX D: UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluators/Midterm Review Consultants[11]

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

---

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

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: _____