



Empowered lives.
Resilient nations.

Terms of Reference (ToR) for Individual Consultant

Post Title	International Consultant for Midterm Review of Development of Sustainable Renewable Energy Power Generation (SREPGen) in Bangladesh
Post Level:	International Consultant
Agency/Project	Development of Sustainable Renewable Energy Power Generation (SREPGen) Project
Type of Contract:	Individual Contract
Country of Assignment	Bangladesh
Languages Required:	English
Expected Duration of Assignment:	25 working days over a period of 2 months (from June to July 2017 on intermittent basis) (Mission in Dhaka with Field 15 days, Home 10 days)

(a) OBJECTIVES:

The specific objectives of this midterm review/evaluation assignment are to:

- a) Assess the progress of the project achieved so far, identify bottlenecks in achieving targets set in the project document. In doing so, emphasis needs to be given to identify any change of context and if the project design is still relevant.
- b) Identify the impact of the project and recommend ways that can be improved and sustained to reduce the annual growth rate of GHG emissions from the fossil fuel-based power generation by exploiting Bangladesh's renewable energy resources for electricity generation.
- c) Assess the extent to which the project targeted and met the needs of the poorest and most vulnerable people by promoting renewable energy in Bangladesh to achieve a greater share of renewable energy (RE) in its energy mix.
- d) Record and share lessons learnt and explore best practices from the pilot initiatives to scale up the dissemination and investment in on-grid RE projects and RETs (Renewable Energy Technologies).
- e) Measure the role of SREDA as a strong RE project facilitation center and determine any distinctive or value-added contribution of SREPGen project to increase the capacities of appropriate government agencies.
- f) Verify whether the funds were used effectively and efficiently to deliver results.
- g) Identify how the project can be further improved or corrected to achieve overall project goals based on a number of assessment above

(b) BACKGROUND:

Power Division, Ministry of Power Energy and Mineral Resources, GoB is implementing GEF-Funded Project “Development of Sustainable Renewable Energy Power generation (SREPGen)”. The objective of the Project is to reduce the annual growth rate of GHG emissions from the fossil fuel-based power generation by exploiting Bangladesh’s renewable energy resources for electricity generation. The basic approach of the Project will be to promote renewable energy in Bangladesh through the recently established Sustainable and Renewable Energy Development Authority (SREDA). For Bangladesh to achieve a greater share of renewable energy (RE) in its energy mix, the Project will support activities that will (i) transform SREDA into a strong RE project facilitation center to bring confidence to private RE investors and increase the number of approved RE projects; (ii) increase the capacities of appropriate government agencies to generate, process, obtain and disseminate reliable RE resource information for use by potential project developers and investors; (iii) increase the affordability of photo-voltaic solar lanterns (PVSLs) for low income households by supporting pilot PVSL diffusion activities; and (iv) increase the share of RE in Bangladesh’s power mix through facilitating the financing, implementation and operation of pilot (RE) energy projects using rice husk and solar panels. The lessons learned from the pilot plants will be utilized to scale-up the dissemination of PVSLs and investment in on-grid RE projects and RE technologies.

Bangladesh is an agriculture-based country where more than 65 percent of the people live in rural areas and major portion of primary energy consumed in rural area is supplied by biomass, mainly agricultural residues, animal dung and wood fuels.

Electricity production in Bangladesh mainly depends on non-renewable fossil fuels having limited reserves. The government is now focusing on the alternative sources of energy to harness electricity to meet the continuous increasing demand. To reduce the dependency on fossil fuels, conversion of biomass to electricity could play an important role in this regard.

(c) Review Questions/SCOPE OF WORK:

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, lessons 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 will be completed before the MTR field mission begins.

The MTR team is expected to follow a collaborative and participatory approach¹ ensuring close engagement with the Project Team, government counterparts (implementing entity), the UNDP Country Office, UNDP Regional Technical Advisers, and other key stakeholders.

Engagement of stakeholders is vital for a successful MTR². 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, etc. Additionally, the MTR team is expected to conduct field missions within Bangladesh.

The final MTR report should describe the full MTR approach taken and the rationale for the approach making explicit the underlying assumptions, challenges, strengths and weaknesses about the methods and approach of the review.

The 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.

The MTR report should also elaborate recommendations and lessons learned for course correction of the project based on the assessment.

The International consultant will work closely with UNDP and the Power Division and SREDA of Ministry of Power Energy and Mineral Resources (MoPEMR) in fulfilling his/her responsibilities. The following review questions represent only an indicative list at this stage:

Relevance of Project Document

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. Details of the project's significance with respect to specific needs and its relevance to country's RE priorities

- To what extent was the project aligned with the needs and priorities of the target populations?
- How well did the project relate to the country's RE plans and UNDP's country assistance plan
- Assess project's overall results and impacts in terms of development outcomes (identify specific beneficiaries, directly related benefits for primary stakeholders, and potential benefits to be achieved during the remaining project implementation period).
- Discuss with the implementing agencies and project beneficiaries the continued relevance of the project development objectives and likelihood of achievement during the remaining implementation period (taking into account current sector/government priorities).

¹ For ideas on innovative and participatory Monitoring and Evaluation strategies and techniques, see [UNDP Discussion Paper: Innovations in Monitoring & Evaluating Results](#), 05 Nov 2013.

² For more stakeholder engagement in the M&E process, see the [UNDP Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results](#), Chapter 3, pg. 93.

- Are the result matrix still relevant with the changing context of the RE sector of the country? Check the alignment of project outcomes with current RE policy of the govt.
- Are the project outcomes, outputs and activities still justified and relevant?
- Does the project need more time to implement fully? If yes, how long (given the limitations of project extension duration under GEF policies)?

Participation

How were the stakeholders involved in the different stages of the project, how effective was their participation and what have been the benefits of or difficulties with their involvement?

Efficiency

How far funding, personnel, regulatory, administrative, time, other resources and procedures contributed to or hindered the achievement of results.

- How well did the partnership and management arrangements work and how did they develop over time?
- How well did the financial systems work?
- Were the risks properly identified and well managed?

Effectiveness and Adequacy of Project Design

Assessment of how far the intended outputs and results were achieved in relation to targets set in the original results framework.

- How effective and appropriate was the project approach?
- With hindsight, how could the implementers have done things differently?
- Review progress (physical or otherwise) and adequacy of each project component in terms of delivery of project inputs, activities, and outputs.
- Review quality of outputs and conformity with technical specifications (visit project sites), analyze financial progress under each project component and assess whether the use of funds matches the progress, efficacy, quality, and timeliness of procurement and disbursement activities.
- Discuss/assess whether current project design (components, scope, activities, timeframe) continues to be an adequate mechanism to achieve expected project results.
- Assess adequacy of project implementation plan in terms of the remaining timeframe and the implementation of remaining procurement activities and disbursement schedule.
- Review the logframe indicators against progress made towards the end-of-project targets using the Progress Towards Results Matrix and following the *Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects*; colour code progress in a “traffic light system” based on the level of progress achieved; assign a rating on progress for each outcome; make recommendations from the areas marked as “Not on target to be achieved” (red).

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

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

Indicator Assessment Key

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

Adequacy of implementation and management arrangement

- Review the adequacy of project implementation and management arrangements in terms of staff, effectiveness in use of existing systems (fiduciary, safeguards, M&E), contract management capacity, reporting, etc.
- Assess quality of cooperation with other relevant donors, partners, and institutions within the sector as well as the clarity of roles and responsibilities, effectiveness of decision-making, etc.
- Assess adequacy of implementation support arrangements (approach, resources), usefulness to anticipate problems, and effectiveness of follow-up recommendations
- Assess adequacy and timeliness of counterpart funds flowing into the project

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.

³ Populate with data from the Logframe and scorecards

⁴ Populate with data from the Project Document

⁵ If available

⁶ Colour code this column only

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

- 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?

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.

Value for Money

- What processes were put in place in order to ensure good value for money
- How could the funds have been used more efficiently?
- Were unit costs appropriate?
- Has efficient funding mechanism been established to channel funds to implementing partner to fund SREPGen Project activities?

Impact:

Details of the broader economic, social, and political consequences of the project.

- What was the project's overall impact and how did this compare with what was expected?
- Did the project address the needs of the intended target group and what was the actual coverage?
- Who were the direct and indirect/wider beneficiaries of the project?
- What difference has been made to reduce the annual growth rate of GHG emissions in the project? Compare with respect to the baseline.

Sustainability:

Potential for the continuation of the impact achieved and of the delivery mechanisms, following the withdrawal of external support.

- What are the prospects for the benefits of the project being sustained after the funding stops? Did this match with the intentions?

Replicability:

How replicable is the process that introduced the changes/had impact?

- What aspects of the project are replicable elsewhere?
- Under what circumstances and/or in what contexts would the project be replicable?

Innovation:

Key aspects of the initiative which appear innovative in the context; why they are seen as innovative. What potential is there for disseminating and /or scaling up the innovative aspects and who the audiences would be?

Lessons:

Key lessons identified, which can be utilized to guide future strategies, projects or agencies working in development. These should be divided into project, sector and broader developmental lessons.

- Were there any significant changes in the project design or the project context? What were the reasons for these and can any useful lessons be learned from this for application elsewhere?
- How did the project engage with poor, marginalized groups and support their empowerment most effectively?
- For whom could these lessons have relevance?
- How do the lessons relate to any innovative aspects of the project that were highlighted in the project proposal?
- How has the design of the project been amended as a result of lessons learned during implementation?

Recommendations:

Recommendations for improvements based on observations during the review process (e.g. for sustainability, future project design and management) would be the most contributing part of the assignment. Only identifying gaps and bottlenecks are not enough. Recommending appropriate and specific remedies, actions and structural adjustments are very important and must be included in the final MTR report.

Recommendations should be succinct suggestions for critical intervention that are specific, measurable, achievable, and relevant. A recommendation table should be put in the report's executive summary. See the *Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects* for guidance on a recommendation table.

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

Ratings

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. Ratings scales may be proposed in the inception report and agreed to work further. No rating on Project Strategy and no overall project rating is required.

Table. MTR Ratings & Achievement Summary Table for SREPGen Project

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)	
	Outcome 4 Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale)	
	Etc.	
Project Implementation & Adaptive Management	(rate 6 pt. scale)	
Sustainability	(rate 4 pt. scale)	

The assignment will require travel to the selected sites in Bangladesh, for extensive consultation with major stakeholders including the private sector and NGOs.

(D) DELIVERABLES:

The consultant shall submit the following pieces of work within this time frame. The activities done by the incumbent will be receive full cooperation from the PMU of SREPGen Project and report to Assistant Country Director, Environmental Sustainability & Energy, CO, UNDP, Bangladesh. The incumbent will be paid on the following deliverables basis.

- i. A review plan/evaluation plan and approach of the work;
- ii. **Inception Report:** The consultant will submit an inception report with detailed work plan (in line with the Time Schedule mentioned in indicative review timeline) of ToR), a detail methodology, for this assignment agreed by both UNDP and GoB within 5 working days of signing the agreement for this assignment. An inception report should be prepared by the reviewer before going into the full-fledged execution. Detailed evaluation methodologies should be elaborated in the inception report and duly approved by both UNDP and GoB. It should detail the evaluators’ understanding of what is being evaluated and why, showing how each evaluation question will be answered by way of, proposed methods, proposed sources of data and data collection procedures. The inception report should elaborate and finalize proposed schedule of tasks, activities and deliverables, designating a team member with the lead responsibility for each task or product. The inception report provides the project team and the evaluators with an opportunity to verify that they share the same understanding about the evaluation and clarify any misunderstanding at the outset.
- iii. A presentation detailing initial review findings, for face-to-face discussion with UNDP and GoB
- iv. A first draft report submitted to UNDP-GoB for consultation

- v. **A final evaluation report of publishable quality:** The report should be written in Plain English and in such a way that it is accessible to non-specialists, including UNDP and GoB stakeholders. The final report will reflect the comments and feedback from stakeholders, including feedback provided during the presentation.
- vi. **Evaluation Brief:** A concise summary of the evaluation findings in plain language that can be widely circulated. This can be in a form of a PowerPoint presentation or a two-page briefing document;

A draft and a final report of the study both in hard (five copies) and soft copy (in CD) will be submitted to UNDP-GoB by the consultant. The final evaluation report should be no more than 100 A4 pages long plus appendices (in Microsoft Word using Arial font, 12 point). The report should include but not limited to the following contents:

- Title Page
- Contents page
- Abbreviations and acronyms page
- Executive summary (3 A4 page maximum)
- Background, objectives, rationale, scope, methods, quality control of data and limitations
- A short introduction to the project
- The evaluation methodology
- Basic tables for all variables of the survey
- Description of findings based on variables
- Full evaluation of project: Findings from the evaluation in relation to the final agreed evaluation questions.
- Challenges
- Summary of lessons indicating with whom and how lessons should be shared
- Recommendations
- Conclusion
- The final terms of reference for the evaluation must be included as an annex, as well as names and contact details of the evaluators.
- Other annexes should include the evaluation schedule, people met, documents consulted, and statistical data on baselines and end of project surveys. Note that the original and final results framework must also be included. The report will include the assessment regarding relevance of the project documents, adequacy of project design to achieve expected results, adequacy of implementation plan, adequacy of implementation and management arrangements, compliance with fiduciary/safeguards aspects of the project and overall implementation risks.
- PPT of findings

TEAM COMPOSITION

A team of two independent consultants will conduct the MTR - one Team Leader (International Consultant with experience and exposure to projects and evaluations in other regions globally) and one National Consultant to support the Team leader.

The international consultant will be responsible for finalizing the report. The international consultant will have the overall responsibility for developing the evaluation methodology, leading the evaluation, and delivering the key products expected from the evaluation, including coordinating the inputs from the national consultant. The national consultant will provide professional back up and support with local consultations, translation, and arrangement of local meetings.

The consultants cannot have participated in the project preparation, formulation, and/or implementation (including the writing of the Project Document) and should not have a conflict of interest with project's related activities.

(E) SUPERVISION AND PERFORMANCE EVALUATION:

The Team Leader will directly report to Assistant Country Director, Resilience and Inclusive Growth Cluster, UNDP Bangladesh and supported by Programme Specialist, Environmental Sustainability & Energy, CO, UNDP, Bangladesh. He/she also needs to consult with relevant stakeholders of the Government of Bangladesh, other stakeholders and UNDP during preparation and finalization of the report.

(e) TIMEFRAME AND DEADLINE:

The assignment is for maximum 25 working days over a period from June to July 2017. (Mission in Dhaka with Field 15 days, Home 10 days)

Task	Days required
1. Inception report: An inception report in consultation with, and incorporating written inputs from the team member to be shared and agreed with UNDP-GoB. The report will consist of detailed methodology of the evaluation, stakeholders to be met and detailed work plan approved by UNDP and GoB.	5 Days
2. Presentation of evaluation findings and draft evaluation report: Present the draft findings by the consultant at a debriefing to UNDP, GoB, and submit the draft report (both hard and soft copy).	10 Days
3. Final report including Evaluation Brief: Submit a final report with evaluation brief both in soft and hard copy. The report will incorporate feedback from all concerned (UNDP, GoB, and accepted by UNDP and GoB)	10 Days
	25 Days

(f) DOCUMENTS:

The Consultant will prepare and submit the documents mentioned above at the end of the assignment. Further work, or revision of the documents, may be required if it is considered that the report does not meet the UNDP and the government's standards, TOR, there are errors of fact or the document is incomplete or not of an acceptable standard.

(g) INPUTS:

UNDP will provide office space and transport for the consultant as required and also arrange meetings, consultations, and interviews and ensure access to key officials as mentioned in proposed methodology. However, other than transport, subsistence costs during field trip outside Dhaka require to be paid by the individual consultants. A local consultant will be recruited to support the international consultant for the whole period.

REQUIREMENTS

(a) ACADEMIC QUALIFICATIONS

- i. Advanced university degree (Masters or higher level) in a discipline relevant to renewable energy, environmental engineering, environmental science, development planning, project management or other relevant discipline;

(b) EXPERIENCE

- i. Must be an expert in project monitoring and evaluation preferably with sound knowledge in renewable energy Sector with at least 10 years of professional experience in the design, implementation, and monitoring of (renewable energy) development projects; Engagement with GEF funded project is desirable;
- ii. Must have been engaged with at least 10 projects related to renewable energy across the world specially for underdeveloped and developing countries
- iii. Knowledge of RE and policy issues;
- iv. Demonstrable experience of producing high-quality, credible evaluations (an example will be required with the tender)
- v. Excellent knowledge of evaluation methodologies. Familiarity with different participatory methods for evaluation
- vi. Extensive international experience of leading evaluation of similar projects;
- vii. Demonstrated analytical ability and excellent report writing skills with relevant experience and produced at least 10 reports for donor agencies
- viii. Project review or evaluation experiences are desirable and experience of working as Team Leader of any such mission will be an advantage
- ix. Must also have an excellent technical and planning background
- x. Preferred skills include project management, technical writing, capacity building, facilitation and project implementation

- xi. Working experience in government, UN, private sector and development partner consultation and communication;
- xii. Experience communicating effectively with a diversity of partners with leadership skills;
- xiii. Extensive experience in policy analysis, legislative analysis and institutional capacity building;
- xiv. Experience of managing evaluation teams, and the capability to handle necessary logistics.
- xv. Ability to produce concise, readable and analytical reports

(c) COMPETENCIES

- i. Ability to work independently and participate in team-based environment.
- ii. Good leadership capacity
- iii. Demonstrable analytical skills
- iv. Knowledge management and learning. Constantly build and apply thematic expertise
- v. Integrity and modelling of UN corporate values.
- vi. Ability to engage with high ranking Government Officials and provide policy advisory support services;
- vii. Good understanding of Renewable Energy Issues including field experience;
- viii. Excellent communication and interpersonal skills, team oriented work style, interest and experience of working in multi-cultural environment;
- ix. Excellent writing skills in the compilation of high level quality documents in English language;
- x. Proficiency in the use of the computer

FINANCIAL PROPOSAL

The financial proposal shall specify a total lump sum amount, and payment terms around specific and measurable (qualitative and quantitative) deliverables (i.e. whether payments fall in installments or upon completion of the entire contract). Payments are based upon output, i.e. upon delivery of the services specified in the TOR. To assist the requesting unit in the comparison of financial proposals, the financial proposal will include a breakdown of this lump sum amount (including travel, per diems, costs for consultations/meetings and number of anticipated working days).

Deliverables are linked with payment schedule:

Deliverables	Deadline of deliverable	Payment Schedule
---------------------	--------------------------------	-------------------------

1. Inception report: An inception report in consultation with, and incorporating written inputs agreed with UNDP and GoB. The report will consist of detailed methodology of the evaluation, stakeholders to be met and detailed work plan approved by UNDP	In 1 week- after signing of the contract and arrival In Dhaka	20% of the contracted amount
2. Presentation of evaluation findings and draft evaluation report: Present the draft findings by the consultant at a debriefing to UNDP, GoB, and submit the draft report (both hard and soft copy).	In 3 weeks - signing the contract	40% of the contracted amount
3. Final report including Evaluation Brief: Submit a final report with evaluation brief both in soft and hard copy. The report will incorporate feedback from all concerned (UNDP, GoB, and accepted by UNDP and GoB)	End of assignment subject to acceptance of MTR Report by RTA, Regional Bangkok Hub and UNDP CO Management	40% of the contracted amount

(h) EVALUATION

Individual Consultant will be evaluated based on the following methodologies:

Cumulative analysis

When using this weighted scoring method, the award of the contract should be made to the individual Consultant whose offer has been evaluated and determined as:

- a) responsive/compliant/acceptable, and
- b) Having received the highest score out of a pre-determined set of weighted technical and financial criteria specific to the solicitation.

* Technical Criteria weight; 70%

* Financial Criteria weight; 30%

Only candidates obtaining a minimum of 70% point in technical criteria would be considered for the Financial Evaluation.

<i>Criteria</i>	<i>Weight</i>	<i>Max. Point</i>
<u>Technical</u>	70%	70
• Experience in designing, implementing, and managing project evaluation, preferably in the field of renewable energy	20%	20
• Knowledge in evaluation methodologies and data collection tools	20%	20
• Work experience in relevant technical areas specially in Renewable Energy and Climate Change Mitigation	15%	15

• Experience in evaluating similar GEF Funded Project	15%	15
<u>Financial</u>	30%	30

Financial Evaluation: (Total obtainable score – 30)

All technically qualified proposals will be scored out 30 based on the formula provided below. The maximum points (30) will be assigned to the lowest financial proposal. All other proposals receive points according to the following formula:

$$p = y (\mu/z)$$

Where:

- p = points for the financial proposal being evaluated
- y = maximum number of points for the financial proposal
- μ = price of the lowest priced proposal
- z = price of the proposal being evaluated

Recommended Presentation of Offer

Interested individuals must submit the following documents/information to demonstrate their qualifications.

- a) Duly accomplished **Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability** using the template provided by UNDP;
- b) **Personal CV or P11**, indicating all past experience from similar projects, as well as the contact details (email and telephone number) of the Candidate and at least three (3) professional references;
- c) **Brief description** of why the individual considers him/herself as the most suitable for the assignment and a methodology on how they will approach and complete the assignment.
- d) **Financial Proposal** that indicates the all-inclusive fixed total contract price, supported by a breakdown of costs, as per template provided. If an Offeror is employed by an organization/company/institution and he/she expects his/her employer to charge a management fee in the process of releasing him/her to UNDP under Reimbursable Loan Agreement (RLA), the Offeror must indicate this at this point and ensure that all such costs are duly incorporated in the financial proposal submitted to UNDP.

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. Finalized GEF focal area Tracking Tools at CEO endorsement and midterm
9. Oversight mission reports
10. All monitoring reports prepared by the project
11. Financial and Administration guidelines used by Project Team

The following documents will also be available:

12. Project operational guidelines, manuals and systems
13. UNDP country/countries programme document(s)
14. Minutes of the Project Board Meetings
15. Project site location maps

ToR ANNEX B: Guidelines on Contents for the Midterm Review Report⁸

- 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

⁸ The Report length should not exceed **40** pages in total (not including annexes).

- Progress towards outcomes analysis
 - Remaining barriers to achieving the project objective
- 4.3 Project Implementation and Adaptive Management
- Management Arrangements
 - Work planning
 - Finance and co-finance
 - Project-level monitoring and evaluation systems
 - Stakeholder engagement
 - Reporting
 - Communications
- 4.4 Sustainability
- Financial risks to sustainability
 - Socio-economic to sustainability
 - Institutional framework and governance risks to sustainability
 - Environmental risks to sustainability
5. Conclusions and Recommendations (4-6 pages)
- 5.1 Conclusions
- Comprehensive and balanced statements (that are evidence-based and connected to the MTR's findings) which highlight the strengths, weaknesses and results of the project
- 5.2 Recommendations
- Corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project
 - Actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the project
 - Proposals for future directions underlining main objectives
6. Annexes
- MTR ToR (excluding ToR annexes)
 - MTR evaluative matrix (evaluation criteria with key questions, indicators, sources of data, and methodology)
 - Example Questionnaire or Interview Guide used for data collection
 - Ratings Scales
 - MTR mission itinerary
 - List of persons interviewed
 - List of documents reviewed
 - Co-financing table (if not previously included in the body of the report)
 - Signed UNEG Code of Conduct form
 - Signed MTR final report clearance form
 - *Annexed in a separate file:* Audit trail from received comments on draft MTR report
 - *Annexed in a separate file:* Relevant midterm tracking tools

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?			
	(i.e. relationships established, level of coherence between project design and implementation approach, specific activities conducted, quality of risk mitigation strategies, etc.)	(i.e. project documents, national policies or strategies, websites, project staff, project partners, data collected throughout the MTR mission, etc.)	(i.e. document analysis, data analysis, interviews with project staff, interviews with stakeholders, etc.)

Progress Towards Results: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved thus far?			
Project Implementation and Adaptive Management: Has the project been implemented efficiently, cost-effectively, and been able to adapt to any changing conditions thus far? To what extent are project-level monitoring and evaluation systems, reporting, and project communications supporting the project's implementation?			
Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, socio-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?			

Evaluators/Consultants:

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

MTR Consultant Agreement Form

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

Name of Consultant: _____

Name of Consultancy Organization (where relevant): _____

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

Signed at _____ (Place) on _____ (Date)

Signature: _____

ToR ANNEX E: MTR Ratings

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

⁹ www.undp.org/uneccodeofconduct

1	Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)	The objective/outcome has failed to achieve its midterm targets, and is not expected to achieve any of its end-of-project targets.
---	----------------------------	--

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

Ratings for Sustainability: (one overall rating)		
4	Likely (L)	Negligible risks to sustainability, with key outcomes on track to be achieved by the project’s closure and expected to continue into the foreseeable future
3	Moderately Likely (ML)	Moderate risks, but expectations that at least some outcomes will be sustained due to the progress towards results on outcomes at the Midterm Review
2	Moderately Unlikely (MU)	Significant risk that key outcomes will not carry on after project closure, although some outputs and activities should carry on
1	Unlikely (U)	Severe risks that project outcomes as well as key outputs will not be sustained

ToR ANNEX F: MTR Report Clearance Form

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

Midterm Review Report Reviewed and Cleared By:	
Commissioning Unit	
Name: _____	
Signature: _____	Date: _____
UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Advisor	
Name: _____	
Signature: _____	Date: _____