## Adaptation Fund Midterm Evaluation

## Terms of Reference

1. **INTRODUCTION.**

This is the Terms of Reference (ToR) for the Mid-Term Evaluation (MTE) for the UNDP-supported Adaptation Fund financed project titled ***Reduction of vulnerability to coastal flooding through ecosystem-based adaptation in the south of Artemisa and Mayabeque provinces*** (PIMS 5090) implemented through the Ministry of Foreign Trade and Foreign Investment (*Executing Agency)* and Ministry of Science, Technology and Environment (*Implementing Partner)*, which is to be undertaken in *2017.* The project started on the June 19 / 2014 and is in its *third* year of implementation.). This ToR sets out the expectations for this MTE.

**2. PROJECT BACKGROUND INFORMATION**

The objective of the project is to increase the resilience of populations in the coastal regions of Artemisa and Mayabeque provinces to the effects of climate change. It will focus on delivering concrete and direct benefits along an 84km stretch of coastline in one of the areas of the country that is most vulnerable to climate change (CC) related sea level rise (SLR) and storm impacts, and where such phenomena have the greatest risk of generating negative socioeconomic and developmental impacts. This will be achieved through Ecosystem Based Adaptation (EBA), taking advantage of the proven potential of mangrove forests and associated coastal wetlands to limit the effects of wave erosion and coastal flooding, which are among the most damaging results of climate-change related SLR and storms.



Fig 1: Project intervention area.

This area, is one of the most vulnerable in the country to tropical storms and hurricanes, and associated storm surges. It is particularly to subject to the problem of saline intrusion into its subterranean aquifers, which are vital for the irrigation of the coastal plains, which are some of the most productive agricultural in the country, and as a source of drinking water for the city of Havana. Some of the highest levels of beach erosion in the country have occurred in this area, and the mangroves of the area also have some of the lowest health indices in the western region of the country.

Mangroves in this area have been heavily impacted in the past by the extraction of timber and poles, and by infrastructural works such as the construction of drainage channels, a 50km long retention wall and a coastal road. There is clear evidence that those parts of the coast with intact mangrove forests have been less affected by CC-related phenomena than those that have undergone significant anthropogenic modification, due largely to the role of mangroves in retaining sediment and buffering wave impact. Furthermore, benthic environments in coastal waters are generally less degraded in the areas where the seaward belt of red mangrove is intact.

The project is designed to enhance the ability of ecosystems to supply this buffering function. The project will focus in particular on restoring and rehabilitating the areas, covering a total of 7,318ha, which have suffered severest degradation and which constitute flooding hotspots.

The project’s objective will be achieved through investments in three complementary components.

**Component 1** will focus on concrete investments in ecosystem recovery, leading to improved coastline resilience to the impacts of wave action, and improvements to coastal morphology which will reduce seawater incursion; this will be achieved by re-establishing the coastal belt of red mangrove between Surgidero de Batabanó and Punta Mora, restoring mangrove ecosystems between Majana and Surgidero de Batabanó, eliminating and/or controlling invasive alien species and restorating and enriching woodlands along the landward limit of the coastal wetland belt.

**Component 2** will focus on integrated and participatory management of coastal ecosystems, through mainstreaming EBA into integrated coastal zone planning and productive sector activities, 3 promoting buy-in, participation and governance in local communities and developing knowledge management systems at community level.

**Component 3** will focus on establishing a favourable enabling environment at regional level for the effectiveness and sustainability of adaptation investments, through the provision of consolidated information on costs and benefits of EBA to decision makers and planners and the strengthening of institutions supporting EBA actions, within the framework of updated and actively implemented action plans

To meet the outflows, the project is earmarked for US $ 5 592 000, by the financier and 5 052 000 CUP, as part of the co-financing.

The main stakeholders in project are the Ministry of Science, Technology and Environment (CITMA) that is the principal executing entity of the Project, through its Environment Agency (AMA). AMA presides the Project Board. It will direct the Project in technical and administrative terms and participates through the National Risk Evaluation Group and through key research institutions such as the IES.

The IES will contribute its resource of knowledge regarding the impacts of climate change on local projects; territorial risk evaluations; processing of environmental information (gathered in situ and from remote sensing); models of municipal and community based environmental land use planning; coordination and integration of the capacities of scientific entities to manage natural resources. The IES has a group of specialists which has decades of experience in studying Cuban mangrove systems. The IES will also contribute to the application of ecotechnology for the reforestation of mangroves, and the monitoring of the target areas. It will participate in components 1 and 2 of the project.

The principal role of the National Institute for Agroforestry Research (IINAF), which belong to the Ministry of Agriculture (MINAG), is to provide a scientific and technical base to guarantee the sustainable and competitive development of forestry production chains and accompanies in the monitoring system of coastal wetlands. They scientifically advice to the forestry activity of the Forestry Enterprises.

Through the agroforestry group (GAF), the National Direction Wildlife (DNFFFS), MINAG will be a member of the inter-institutional committee governing the project. MINAG will participate through the two forest companies operating in the target area and the INAF. The Forestry Enterprises of *Mayabeque* and *South Coast*, are responsible for carrying out reforestation in the south of Artemisa and Mayabeque provinces, as the owners of the forest resource in the area.

The mission of the Forest Guard Corps (CGB) is to safeguard and protect forest resources, wildlife and other natural resources of the country, in association with other related organisms and state institutions. Its responsibility in the Project will be to strengthen compliance with environmental protection.

These Governments are the key organisms for the execution of activities related to the coordination of the control, supervision and analysis of the results of components 2 and 3. The Provincial Directorates of

CITMA (DPCITMA) and the State Forest Service (SSF) are responsible for protecting the areas and for supporting activities of inspection, oversight and environmental control, in conjunction with other organisms. The Government will be the principal actor in relation to knowledge management for CC adaptation.

The project proposes to develop activities in local communities in support of education and participation in actions to protect ecosystems. These actions will include the following:

* Community work on adaptation measures in Surgidero de Batabanó.
* Demonstration activities to ensure sustainability of Project results
* Training of families which have houses on Mayabeque Beach.
* Training programme for key stakeholders and decision-makers on measures to reduce climate related risks.
* Training, information and dissemination programme for local communities.

The schools in the target areas, which are closely integrated with community plans and activities, will play a leading role in relation to the raising awareness of EBA issues.

**3. OBJECTIVES OF THE MTE**

The MTE 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 MTE will also review the project’s strategy, its risks to sustainability.

**4. MTE APPROACH & METHODOLOGY**

The MTE must provide evidence based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The MTE team will review all relevant sources of information including documents prepared during the preparation phase (i.e. AF Concept, AF Proposal, UNDP Initiation Plan, UNDP Environmental & Social Safeguard Policy, the Project Document, project reports including Project Performance Reports/PPRs, 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 MTE team is expected to follow a collaborative and participatory approach[[1]](#footnote-1) ensuring close engagement with the Project Team, government counterparts, the UNDP Country Office(s), UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Advisers, and other key stakeholders.

Engagement of stakeholders is vital to a successful MTE.[[2]](#footnote-2) Stakeholder involvement should include interviews with stakeholders who have project responsibilities, including but not limited to; 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, Directors of provincial governments, specialists and experts, rangers, protected area technicians, school teachers, chiefs of forest brigades, inhabitants of the area. Additionally, the MTE team is expected to conduct field missions to Artemisa and Mayabeque province, including the following project sites: Batabanó and Guira de Melena Municipality

The final MTE report should describe the full MTE 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.

**5. DETAILED SCOPE OF THE MTE**

The Evaluation Team (EE) is expected to develop the evaluation work using the criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact, as defined and explained in the Guide for final evaluations of UNDP-supported projects funded by The GEF. A series of questions was drafted covering each of these criteria included in these TOR (Annex C). It is expected that the EE will modify, complete and present this matrix as part of the initial Evaluation Report, and include it as an annex in the Final Report.

The MTE team will assess the following four categories of project progress.

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

Results Framework/Logframe:

* 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.

**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; 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]](#footnote-3)** | **Baseline Level[[4]](#footnote-4)** | **Level in 1st PIR (self- reported)** | **Midterm Target[[5]](#footnote-5)** | **End-of-project Target** | **Midterm Level & Assessment[[6]](#footnote-6)** | **Achievement Rating[[7]](#footnote-7)** | **Justification for Rating** |
| **Objective:** | Area with increases in  indices of mangrove and  wetland conditions | Coastal ecosystems that cover 7 318 ha are degraded, have excessive levels of salinity due to seawater intrusion and the obstruction of channels and have a limited protection regime. | The project has established 1145 ha (total area) of mangrove along the coast doing works to promote mangrove forest ecosystem restoration, and the enrichment of 1401.2 ha (total area) of inland forest through work for promoting natural regeneration and planting native species. In connection with the final goal of the project this indicator is at 34.7%. | 3439,5 ha, this represent 47 % in relation to the target | 7,318ha (the total area where  mangrove reforestation, restoration of  mangrove ecosystems and restoration  and enrichment of landward edge  woodlands will be carried out): |  |  |  |
|  | Numbers of people (men and women) with reduced vulnerability due to proximity of functioning mangrove forest and wetland ecosystems. | 17 524 People in 47 communities are directly affected by coastal flooding. | Awareness raising activities about the project have been conducted with the local government and inhabitants of local communities. These included coastal flooding, mitigation measures, mangrove forest restoration, and opportunities that the Project can bring to the communities to implement national policies on climate change adaptation.  Training activities on response and adaptation to CC impacts have been conducted, focusing on 17 coastal communities (34 %) with 20014 inhabitants 57 %), of which at least 45% are women.  2 provincial and 6 municipal groups were trained (88 people), with at least 15 members from Artemisa and Mayabeque municipalities, and they review CC adaptation topics in the development strategies, to include EBA approaches. |  | 21 502 People (of which at least 45% are women) directly affected by the reduction of coastal flooding. |  |  |  |
|  |  | 270,705 People are indirectly affected by the impacts of the phenomena associated with the CC on economic activities. | Awareness raising activities about the project have been conducted with the provincial governments, decision makers of selected productive sectors, and regulatory authorities. These included coastal flooding, mitigation measures, mangrove restoration and opportunities that the project can bring to the communities to implement national policies about CC adaptation.  2 provincial groups were trained, with at least 15 members from Artemisa and Mayabeque municipalities, and they review CC adaptation topics in the development strategies, to include EBA approaches. |  | 270,705 People (at least 45% are women) benefit indirectly by the reduction of the impact of the phenomena associated with the CC on economic activities. |  |  |  |
| **Outcome 1:**  **Reduction of**  **the impacts of**  **coastal flooding**  **through the**  **recovery of**  **coastal**  **ecosystems** | 1.1: Area (ha) of red mangrove is established along shore between Batabanó and Punta Mora. | 533ha | "418.5 ha have been planted with red mangrove propagules that are growing, thus encouraging natural regeneration along the coast.  32.4% of implementation in relation to the ultimate goal of the Project has been achieved." | 408,3 ha | 1290,6 ha of which 85% survived\* (1097 ha)  \*Survival can only be measured 3 years after planting |  |  |  |
| 1.2 Cumulative area of mangrove ecosystem restored between Majana and Surgidero de Batabanó. | 144ha | 726.5 ha of mangrove ecosystem has improved its conditions through planting native tree species and the restoration of hydrological conditions.  42.4% of implementation has been achieved in relation to the ultimate goal of the Project. | 757,8 ha | 1290,6 ha of which 85% survived\* (1097 ha)  \*Survival can only be measured 3 years after planting |  |  |  |
|  | 1.3 Cumulative area of landward edge woodlands restored and enriched. | 939 ha | "1401.2 ha of landward edge woodlands were enriched by planting native species and encouraging natural regeneration.  32.4% of implementation has been achieved in relation to the ultimate goal of the project." | 1401,2 ha | " 4315,5 ha of which 85% survived\* (3668,2 ha)  \*Survival can only be measured 3 years after planting " |  |  |  |
|  | 1.4 Numbers of IAS management plans developed. | 0 | "20 invasive alien species (IAS) were identified by site, with proposals for control and management.  4 exotic species are under control in eradication process in 13 ha of the effective intervention area." | 0 | 1 covering 7,318 ha |  |  |  |
| **Outcome 2: Integrated and participatory management of coastal ecosystems to increase resilience to climate change.** | 2.1 Numbers of provincial and municipal development plans that make specific provision for EBA. | 2 provincial and 6 municipal governments are preparing development plans that do not include EBA. | Development strategies were reviewed in 2 provincial and 6 municipal governments to assess whether they include EBA approaches in CC adaptation measures, as well as the Territorial Development Indices.  Government representatives and officials of political organizations were trained in 2 provinces and 6 municipalities, through exchanges and discussion of materials (brochures and videos) on CC-related impacts and adaptation in these territories.  9 exchange meetings were carried out with the productive sector and government agencies operating in the area to encourage them to ensure that the activities they undertake and their development plans do not undermine the Project's actions.  The learning module on "strategic ecosystems" was taught as part of the second edition of the Diploma Course on Local Development, for government representatives of the Assembly and the Administration Council in 3 municipalities (Melena, Güines and Artemisa). |  | 2 provincial plans and 6 municipal  plans |  |  |  |
| 2.2 Numbers of provincial and municipal governments with EBA-related knowledge management systems in place. | 0 | Outreach products on best practices were prepared: electronic bulletin “Living Mangrove Forest” (“Manglar Vivo”), pilot experiences of educational –communicational workshops with students from elementary schools in Batabano and Güira de Melena municipalities, packages of audiovisual products on the mangrove forest ecosystem in Cuba, and production of documentary films on chronicles or life-time stories. |  | 2 provincial and 6 municipal governments |  |  |  |
| 2.3 Numbers of community members (men and women) belonging to local voluntary groupsaddressing environmental and adaptation issues. | 0 | 2 groups of volunteers were created and trained: one in Surgidero de Batabano (with 16 members, including 9 women) and one in Cajio (with 10 members, including 2 women).  A participatory diagnosis was conducted in 3 municipalities, to create a baseline and define indicators to measure knowledge progress in the communities on the state of the coastal area and the importance of implementing EBA measures, through the application of an info-communications management system that supports the Project objectives and ensure the exchange of information, experiences and knowledge between people and entities involved in the implementation and/or benefitting from the actions taken.  19 settlements and 9 People’s Councils promote the formation of voluntary groups and community leaders conduct training, outreach and awareness raising actions gathering materials produced by local media on environmental and adaptation issues. |  | 1 group with at least 15 members (of which at least 45% are women) in four municipalities |  |  |  |
|  | 2.4 Numbers of local schools with study programmes incorporating adaptation issues. | 0 | 34 schools in the two provinces are providing methodological guidance to teachers on how to include CC and EBA issues in the syllabus for 2015-2016 course, of which: 5 are mixed centers, 18 primary schools, 4 secondary schools, 1 pre-university school of basic science, and 6 municipal university centers.  62 professors were trained in 6 schools of Artemisa province, and 10 professors in 1 school of Mayabeque province, through the methodological training on CC adaptation and EBA issues for the syllabus.  A plan of activities and methodological work was developed in 11 primary schools with “Interest Circles” (gatherings to encourage the vocational interests of students) on mangrove forests (5 in Artemisa and 6 in Mayabeque).  An environmental education workshop was conducted in Batabano primary school, as a pilot for generalization to other schools, to generate best practices and develop skills to promote coastal protection. |  | 16 primary schools 15 secondary schools 3 municipal universities  1 teacher training institute |  |  |  |
|  | 2.5 Numbers of dissemination  and awareness raising  materials on adaptation  issues, produced by local  media | 0 | The documentary film “Change of Time” that describes the Project purpose and expected benefits was published in 3 national TV programs with national and international reach.  A video clip entitled “Living Mangrove Forest” was released on social networks and national TV programs.  More than 200 copies of a DVD with audiovisual materials on mangrove forests and their protection, produced by Mundo Latino Studio, were disseminated and promoted in over 10 events, schools and government entities in the territories of both provinces.  TV programs and other mass media release devoted to the issues addressed by the Project were produced  2 juvenile national TV programs called “Route 5” (“Ruta 5”), with 25-minute duration.  2 local TV programs in Mayabeque, and 11 local radio programs (6 in Mayabeque and Artemisa 5)  1 articles in the national printed press about the Project actions.  2 programs in provincial TV (1 in every provincial station)  2 programs in municipal TV (1 in every local radio station)  2 radio programs in provincial stations (1 in every provincial station)  2 articles in the printed press (1 in each provincial newspaper).  A communication campaign was developed to promote Project purposes: radio spot, printing of materials for the Project promotional campaign (posters, stickers, totem, paper bracelets, banner, screens, and billboards).  A promotion strategy was developed on social networks, (Facebook) with more than 200 visits. |  | 17 audiovisual  3 local television.  5 local radio  2 articles |  |  |  |
| Establishment  of a favourable  enabling  environment at  regional level for  the effectiveness  and sustainability  of adaptation  investments | 3.1 Frequency of training and technical support visits  carried out by provincial  and municipal governments to coastal communities in support of EBA | 0 | 3 training actions on forest fires prevention and fighting, and protection of natural resources were conducted, 2 in Artemisa for professional brigades (16 men) and specialized brigade of Cajio Forestry Unit (10 men), and 1 in Mayabeque for the specialized brigade in Batabano (10 men).  3 training activities were carried out by technical authorities in coastal areas of Artemisa and 3 in those of Mayabeque regarding the regulatory framework, protection and sustainable management of coastal ecosystems.  113 prevention actions were developed, including talks and lectures in outlying communities or within the Project intervention area, in coordination with the local organizations of People’s Power, as part of the preparation of the population to face the critical period of forest fires occurrence and for the protection of natural resources. |  | 3 training and technical assistant activities undertaken per year by technical authorities to coastal areas. |  | S |  |
| 3.2 Frequency of inspection visits to coastal areas by provincial and municipal governments in support of EBA | 0 | A guide with revised local and provincial regulations regarding the protection and sustainable management of coastal ecosystems was prepared and is implementation process, for the visits to coastal areas by provincial and municipal governments in support of EBA regulations.  83 maritime journeys along the coast and 180 on land were carried out for the monitoring and protection of natural resources within the Project intervention area.  3 integrated inspection visits were conducted to the Project intervention areas, 2 in Artemisa (Alquizar and Guira Municipalities) and 1 in Mayabeque (Batabano, Melena, Güines) using land and naval means with the participation of regulatory authorities (PNR, CGB, SEF, CITMA and Coastguards). | 0 | 3 inspection activities undertakern per year by provincial municipal government and other regulatorities authorities |  |  |  |
| 3.3 Number of studies and methodologies carried out to estimate the cost - benefit from the implementation of the approach ABE, available for planners and policy makers. | 0 | 4 training actions were conducted for specialists from different agencies, 2 in provincial governments and 2 in municipal governments, with participatory approaches in economic valuation of ecosystem goods and services.  Information was gathered on the value of fixed asset, forest heritage, flora and fauna, volume of agricultural, fishery and livestock raising production, for the assessment of the current state the coastal zone in the 6 municipalities. | 0 | 3 |  |  |  |

**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 AF Results Tracker within the PPR 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 AF 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?

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 AF reporting requirements (i.e. how have they addressed poorly-rated PPRs, 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, PPRs, 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 AF 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 MTE team will include a section of the report setting out the MTE’s evidence-based conclusions, in light of the findings.[[8]](#footnote-8)

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.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Rec #** | **Recommendation** | | **Entity Responsible** |
| A | *(State Outcome 1)* (Outcome 1) |  | |
| A.1 | **Key recommendation:** |  | |
| A.2 |  |  | |
| A.3 |  |  | |
| B | *(State Outcome 2)* (Outcome 2) |  | |
| B.1 | **Key recommendation:** |  | |
| B.2 |  |  | |
| B.3 |  |  | |
| C | *(State Outcome 3)* (Outcome 3), etc. |  | |
| C.1 | **Key recommendation:** |  | |
| C.2 |  |  | |
| C.3 |  |  | |
| D | Project Implementation & Adaptive Management |  | |
| D.1 | **Key recommendation:** |  | |
| D.2 |  |  | |
| D.3 |  |  | |
| E | Sustainability |  | |
| E.1 | **Key recommendation:** |  | |
| E.2 |  |  | |
| E. |  |  | |

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

**Ratings**

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

Table. MTE Ratings & Achievement Summary Table for “*Reduction of vulnerability to coastal flooding through ecosystem-based adaptation in the south of Artemisa and Mayabeque provinces*”.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **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) |  |

1. **TIMEFRAME**

The evaluation will be carried out during the period from September to December 2017 and shall not exceed five months from when the consultant(s) are hired. The tentative MTR timeframe is as follows:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **TIMEFRAME** | **ACTIVITY** |
| *August 1-31* | Select MTE Team |
| *August 1-31* | Prep the MTE Team (handover of Project Documents) |
| *September 8-28 (3 days)* | Document review and preparing MTE Inception Report |
| *September 29* | Submitted MTE Inception Report to the UNDP Co. |
| *October 16-20 (5 days)* | MTE mission: stakeholder meetings, interviews, field visits |
| *October 20* | Mission wrap-up meeting & presentation of initial findings- earliest end of MTE mission |
| *October 23- November 13 (10 days)* | Prepared and submitted the draft report to the UNDP Co. |
| *November 23-30 (2 days)* | Incorporating audit trail from feedback on draft report/Finalization of MTE report |
| *December 1-8* | Preparation & Issue of Management Response |
| *December 22* | Expected date of full MTE completion |

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

1. **MIDTERM EVALUATION DELIVERABLES**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **#** | **Deliverable** | **Description** | **Timing** | **Responsable** |
| **1** | **MTE Inception Report** | MTE Team prepare and submits MTE Inception Report to the UNDP Co and project management, in which clarifies objectives and methods of Midterm Evaluation. | No later than 2 weeks before the MTE mission | MTE Team |
| **2** | **Presentation** | MTE Team prepare and presents the Initial Findings to Project Management Unit and the UNDP Co. | At the end of MTE mission | MTE Team. |
| **3** | **Draft Final Report** | MTE Team prepare and submit full report (using guidelines on content outlined in Annex B) with annexes to UNDP Co for review by RTA, Project Coordination Unit and GEF OFP. | Within 3 weeks of the MTE mission | MTE Team |
| **4** | **Final Report** | Finalization of MTE report. Revised report with audit trail detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final MTE report is sent to the UNDP Co. | Within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft | MTE Team |

Notes:

* The MTE Inception Report, the Draft Final Report and the Final Report of MTE must be presented in English and Spanish version.
* The Final Report of MTE will be considered completed when the expectations of the evaluation have been met and its quality meets UNDP / GEF standards or requirements. The UNDP Country Office and UNDP Regional Office will sign the form in Annex G to confirm their acceptance of the final report.

1. **MTE ARRANGEMENTS**

The UNDP Country Office in conjunction with the Project Management Unit will assume the responsibility for the coordination and logistical arrangements of the MTE.

The Project Management Unit will contract the consultants and also will be responsible to provide all relevant documents, set up stakeholder interviews, arrange field visits, and on time will provide per diem and contractual payments.

The MTE Team will meet with UNDP Cuba at the beginning and at end of the mission. Teleconferences will be organized with the Regional Technical Advisor in charge of the project at the UNDP Regional Center. Other meetings may be arranged if deemed necessary by one of the parties.

1. **TEAM COMPOSITION**

The Evaluation Team will be composed of two international consultants and one national, all with more than 10 years of professional experience and a postgraduate training according to the interests of the project.

One of the evaluators will serve as Team Leader and will be responsible for presenting the Evaluation Report. The Team Leader will coordinate with the rest of the Team to define the methodology of work and the timing of their inputs for the report and the final reviews.

The Evaluation Team should have work experiences in Latin America and the Caribbean. Also, its members must have an excellent communication skills in Spanish and English languages.

The evaluators 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 evaluators in charge of the MTE will be subject to ethical standards and must sign the Code of Conduct (Annex D) upon accepting the mission.

**Profiles of the evaluators**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Evaluator** | **Responsibility** | **Technical knowledge** | **Experience** |
| 1 (international) | Team Leader | Graduated in biological, ecology or forestry sciences. | Demonstrated knowledge in Management of environmental projects and conservation of biodiversity, especially in coastal wetland ecosystems.  Team Leader of Project evaluation/review experiences within United Nations system or Multilateral Environmental Founds. |
| 2 (international) | Member Team | Graduated in biological, ecology or forestry sciences. | Demonstrated knowledge in ecological restoration of tropical coastal zone.  Participation in Project evaluation/review experiences within United Nations system or Multilateral Environmental Founds will be considered an asset. |
| 3 (national) | Member Team | Graduated in biological, ecology, forestry or social sciences. | Demonstrated knowledge in management of environmental projects in the Cuban context.  Participation in Project evaluation/review experiences within United Nations system or Multilateral Environmental Founds will be considered an asset. |

1. **PAYMENT MODALITIES AND SPECIFICATIONS**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **%** | **Milestone** |
| *10%* | Upon approval of the final MTE Inception Report by Project Management Unit and the UNDP Co. |
| *40%* | Upon submission of the Draft MTE Report to UNDP Co. |
| *50%* | Upon approval of the MTE Final Report by the UNDP Country Office and UNDP RTA. |

Or, as otherwise agreed between the UNDP Co and the MTE team.

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

1. UNDP Project Document
2. Project Inception Report
3. All Project Performance Reports (PPR’s)
4. Quarterly progress reports and work plans of the various implementation task teams
5. Audit reports
6. Finalized AF Tracking Tools at CEO endorsement and midterm (*fill in specific TTs for this project’s focal area*)
7. Oversight mission reports
8. All monitoring reports prepared by the project

The following documents will also be available:

1. UNDP - Country Programme Document. 2014-2018
2. Minutes of the *“Reduction of vulnerability to coastal flooding through ecosystem-based adaptation in the south of Artemisa and Mayabeque provinces”* Board Meetings and other meetings
3. Project site location maps

**ToR ANNEX B: Guidelines on Contents for the Midterm Evaluation Report**[[9]](#footnote-9)

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **i.** | Basic Report Information *(for opening page or title page)*   * Title of UNDP supported GEF financed project * UNDP PIMS# and GEF project ID# * MTE time frame and date of MTE report * Region and countries included in the project * GEF Operational Focal Area/Strategic Program * Executing Agency/Implementing Partner and other project partners * MTE 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) * MTE Ratings & Achievement Summary Table * Concise summary of conclusions * Recommendation Summary Table | | |
| **2.** | Introduction *(2-3 pages)*   * Purpose of the MTE and objectives * Scope & Methodology: principles of design and execution of the MTE, MTE approach and data collection methods, limitations to the MTE * Structure of the MTE 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 MTE’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   * MTE ToR (excluding ToR annexes) * MTE evaluative matrix (evaluation criteria with key questions, indicators, sources of data, and methodology) * Example Questionnaire or Interview Guide used for data collection * Ratings Scales * MTE 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 MTE final report clearance form * *Annexed in a separate file:* Audit trail from received comments on draft MTE report * *Annexed in a separate file:* Relevant midterm tracking tools (*METT, FSC, Capacity scorecard, etc.)* | | |

**ToR ANNEX C: Midterm Evaluation 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?** | | | |
| Were lessons from other relevant projects properly incorporated into the project design? | Relationships established, level of coherence between project design and implementation approach, specific activities conducted, quality of risk mitigation strategies. | * Project documents, national policies or strategies, websites, project staff, project partners, data collected throughout the MTR mission. | Document analysis, data analysis. Interviews with project staff and stakeholders. |
| How does the project support environmental priorities and development at the national level? | There is a tangible contributions made by the Project to the National Biodiversity Strategy.  There is a tangible contributions made by the Project to the National Plan for climate change. | * National Strategy for Biological Diversity and Action Plan 2014-2020, Cuba. Published by CITMA / UNDP (2016) * "Hazards and vulnerabilities of the marine and coastal zone of Cuba: current state and perspectives for climate change up to 2100". Document prepared by M. Iturralde and H. Serrano (2015) | Documents analysis. Interviews with project staff and stakeholders. Intervention areas visits. |
| **Progress Towards Results: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved thus far?** | | | |
| What is the behavior and what are the advances in qualitative terms of the indicators of Project Objective? Is the project on track to achieve its objective? | Compliance of the target indicators to the middle of the Project, according to their MML. | * Project Document. * Project Performance Reports. | Documents analysis. Interviews with project staff and stakeholders. Intervention areas visits. |
| Are the activities carried out in each Project Component according to its design and the expected scope at the middle of its execution? | There are achieved the Results Indicators expected thus far in each component, according to the Logical Framework Matrix (LFM) of the Project. | * Project Document. * Annual Operative Plan. * Project Performance Reports. | Documents analysis. Interviews with project staff and stakeholders. Intervention areas visits. |
| **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?** | | | |
| Have the financial resources been used efficiently? Is the project's financial management adequate? | Difference between the planned and executed budget.  Planned vs. actual co-financing.  Costs related to the reached results in comparison with the costs of similar projects from other organizations. | * Project financial reports. * Reports of analysis of budget execution and adjustments made by the Project Team with the UNDP Co. * Annual Operating Plan * Project team. * UNDP Co. * Stakeholders involved. | Documents analysis. Interviews with project staff and stakeholders. Intervention areas visits. |
| Does the Project have an M&E System, which it uses to complete, document and ensure the activities of its Components and Results? | Available and updated M & E system. | * Document prepared by the Project team. | Document analysis. |
| Have the tasks scheduled in the Project's Annual Operational Plans (AOPs) been fulfilled in each of its Components, so that they point to the expected results at the end of the Project? | Number of activities programmed / fulfilled according to the POA in the period being evaluated. | * Annual Operating Plan. * Project Performance Reports. * Minutes of the activities carried out (workshops, visits, technical documents intended to be elaborated and published, promotional done and their distribution. | Documents analysis. Interviews with project staff and stakeholders. Intervention areas visits. |
| Has the programmed activities in each Component been documented to facilitate follow-up? | Activities scheduled by Component / year of project execution. | * Annual Operating Plan. * Project Performance Reports. | Documents analysis. Interviews with project staff and stakeholders. Intervention areas visits. |
| Do national stakeholders continue to have an active role in project decision-making that supports efficient and effective project implementation? | Participation level of the stakeholders in the decision making. | * Project Document. * Annual Operative Plan. * Project Performance Reports. * Minutes of Steering Committee. * Stakeholders involved | Documents analysis. Interviews with project staff and stakeholders. Intervention areas visits. |
| **Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, socio-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?** | | | |
| * What are the main challenges that could affect the sustainability of project results? Have they been addressed during project management? * What potential measures could contribute to the sustainability of the results achieved by the project? | Financial, institutional, socioeconomic and / or environmental changes that could be challenges for the project. | * Project document. * Project team. * UNDP Co. * Stakeholders involved. | Documents analysis. Interviews with project staff and stakeholders. Intervention areas visits. |
| * Is the level of stakeholder’s ownership sufficient to allow for continuation of project benefits? | Institutional and private actors include project objectives in their planning frameworks | Relevant planning frameworks, strategies, programmers, manuals, proceedings and relevant stakeholders | Interviews with project staff and stakeholders. Qualitative perception questionnaire. |

**ToR ANNEX D: UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluation Consultants[[10]](#footnote-10)**

**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.

**MTE 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: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**ToR ANNEX E: MTE 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 Evaluation |
| 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: MTE Report Clearance Form**

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

**Midterm Evaluation Report Reviewed and Cleared By:**

**Commissioning Unit**

Name: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Advisor**

Name: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

1. For ideas on innovative and participatory Monitoring and Evaluation strategies and techniques, see [UNDP Discussion Paper: Innovations in Monitoring & Evaluating Results](http://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/librarypage/capacity-building/discussion-paper--innovations-in-monitoring---evaluating-results/), 05 Nov 2013. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. For more stakeholder engagement in the M&E process, see the [UNDP Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results](http://www.undg.org/docs/11653/UNDP-PME-Handbook-(2009).pdf), Chapter 3, pg. 93. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Populate with data from the Logframe and scorecards [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. Populate with data from the Project Document [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. If available [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. Colour code this column only [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. Use the 6 point Progress Towards Results Rating Scale: HS, S, MS, MU, U, HU [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. Alternatively, MTE conclusions may be integrated into the body of the report. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. The Report length should not exceed *40* pages in total (not including annexes). [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. [www.undp.org/unegcodeofconduct](http://www.undp.org/unegcodeofconduct) [↑](#footnote-ref-10)