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## UNDP-GEF Midterm Review

## Terms of Reference

**Date:** 07 August 2017

**Duty station:** Baku, Azerbaijan

**Project title:** “Nationally Appropriate Mitigation Actions (NAMAs) for low-carbon end-use sectors in Azerbaijan”

**Position**: Midterm Reviewer

**Duration**: 10th September 2017 to 09th January 2018

**Post Level:** International Consultant

**Contract type:**  IC contract

**Location**: Baku with travels to Sumgayit city and other sites in close proximity to Baku as necessary

Proposal should be submitted by email no later than 22nd August, 2017

[procurement.aze@undp.org](mailto:procurement.aze@undp.org) and copy to [nazim.mammadov@undp.org](mailto:tamirlan.gasimov@undp.org)

Any request for clarification must be sent in writing, or by standard electronic communication to the address or e-mail indicated above. UNDP in Azerbaijan will respond by standard electronic mail and will send written copies of the response, including an explanation of the query without identifying the source of inquiry, to all shortlisted consultants.

1. **INTRODUCTION**

This is the Terms of Reference (ToR) for the UNDP-GEF Midterm Review (MTR) of the full-sized project titled “Nationally Appropriate Mitigation Actions (NAMAs) for low-carbon end-use sectors in Azerbaijan” (PIMS # 5138) implemented through the State Oil Company of Azerbaijan Republic, which is to be undertaken in 2017. The project started on 05.03.2015 and is in its third year of implementation. In line with the UNDP-GEF Guidance on MTRs, this MTR process was initiated before the submission of the second Project Implementation Report (PIR). This ToR sets out the expectations for this MTR. The MTR process must follow the guidance outlined in the document *Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects* (*http://web.undp.org/evaluation/documents/guidance/GEF/mid-term/Guidance\_Midterm%20Review%20\_EN\_2014.pdf*).

1. **PROJECT BACKGROUND INFORMATION**

This project is placed within the existing national framework of Azerbaijan and provides a particular focus on a *programmatic NAMA* approach that reflects specific greenhouse gas mitigation measures to be implemented by SOCAR, the national oil company of Azerbaijan. The specific objective of the project is to support SOCAR in the implementation of its Climate Change Mitigation Strategy by promoting and upscaling GHG mitigation measures through a programmatic NAMA approach in the low-carbon end-use sectors, where pilot investments will be directed into low energy and low carbon technologies. The project is set within the country’s ambitions to reduce GHG emissions and energy intensity of major energy end-use sectors in Azerbaijan and simultaneously introduce innovative energy efficiency and renewable energy technologies in main energy end-use sectors such as buildings and transportation systems. The project is consistent with GEF *Climate Change Mitigation Objective 1 – Implementing innovative low-carbon technologies,* *Objective 2 - Promoting market transformation for energy efficiency in the building sector*, *Objective 4 – Promoting low-carbon transportation technologies, and Objective 6 – Support Enabling Activities under the Convention*.

1. **OBJECTIVES OF THE MTR**

The MTR will assess progress towards the achievement of the project objectives and outcomes as specified in the Project Document, and assess early signs of project success or failure with the goal of identifying the necessary changes to be made in order to set the project on-track to achieve its intended results. The MTR will also review the project’s strategy, its risks to sustainability.

1. **MTR APPROACH AND METHODOLOGY**

The MTR must provide evidence based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The MTR will review all relevant sources of information including documents prepared during the preparation phase (i.e. PIF, UNDP Initiation Plan, UNDP Environmental & Social Safeguard Policy, the Project Document, project reports including Annual Project Review/PIRs, project budget revisions, lesson learned reports, national strategic and legal documents, and any other materials that the MTR reviewer considers useful for this evidence-based review). The MTR reviewer will review the baseline GEF focal area Tracking Tool submitted to the GEF at CEO endorsement, and the midterm GEF focal area Tracking Tool that must be completed before the MTR field mission begins.

The MTR reviewer is expected to follow a collaborative and participatory approach[[1]](#footnote-1) ensuring close engagement with the Project Team, government counterparts (the GEF Operational Focal Point), the UNDP Country Office(s), UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Advisers, and other key stakeholders.

Engagement of stakeholders is vital to a successful MTR.[[2]](#footnote-2) Stakeholder involvement should include interviews with stakeholders who have project responsibilities, including but not limited to MENR, Azerkimya, State Agency on Alternative and Renewable Energy Sources; executing agencies, senior officials and task team/ component leaders, key experts and consultants in the subject area, Project Board, project stakeholders, academia, local government and CSOs, etc. Additionally, the MTR team is expected to conduct field missions to the project sites located in Sumgayit city, Apsheron peninsula and in Siyazan rayon.

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.

1. **DETAILED SCOPE OF THE MTR**

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

1. **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. Discuss if and how lessons from other relevant projects were incorporated in project design.
* Review how the project addresses country priorities and extent of country ownership. Comment on whether the project concept conforms to Azerbaijan’s development priorities and plans.
* Review decision-making processes: including the extent to which 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 were considered during project’s design.
* Review the extent to which relevant gender issues were raised in the project design. See *Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects* for further guidelines.
* If there are any other major areas of concern, recommend areas for improvement in them.

Results Framework/Log-frame:

* Undertake a critical analysis of the project’s log-frame indicators and targets, assess how “SMART” (Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Relevant, Time-bound) the midterm and end-of-project targets are, and suggest specific amendments/revisions to the targets and indicators as necessary.
* Explain whether the project’s objectives and outcomes and its sub-components are clear, practical, and feasible within its time frame.
* Examine if progress so far has led to, or could in the future catalyse beneficial development effects (i.e. income generation, gender equality and women’s empowerment, improved governance etc.) that should be included in the project results framework and monitored on an annual basis.
* Ensure broader development and gender aspects of the project are being monitored effectively. Develop and recommend SMART ‘development’ indicators, including sex-disaggregated indicators and indicators that capture development benefits.

1. **Progress Towards Results**

Progress towards Outcomes Analysis:

* Review the log-frame 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]](#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:** | Indicator (if applicable): |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Outcome 1:** | Indicator 1: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Indicator 2: |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Outcome 2:** | Indicator 3: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Indicator 4: |  |  |  |  |  |
| Etc. |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Etc.** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**Indicator Assessment Key**

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

In addition to the progress towards outcomes analysis:

* Compare and analyse the GEF Tracking Tool at the Baseline with the one completed right before the Midterm Review.
* Identify remaining barriers to achieving the project objective in the remainder of the project.
* By reviewing the aspects of the project that have already been successful, identify ways in which the project can further expand these benefits.

1. **Project Implementation and Adaptive Management**

Management Arrangements:

* Review overall effectiveness of project management as outlined in the Project Document and discuss any changes that have been made and if they were effective. Discuss if the roles, responsibilities and reporting lines are clear and whether the decision-making is transparent and undertaken in a timely manner. Recommend areas for improvement.
* Review the quality of execution of the Executing Agency/Implementing Partner(s) and recommend areas for improvement.
* Review the quality of support provided by the GEF Partner Agency (UNDP) and recommend areas of improvement.

Work Planning:

* Review any delays in project start-up and implementation, identify the causes and examine if they have been resolved.
* Discuss whether work-planning processes are results-based and, if not, suggest ways to re-orientate them to focus on results.
* Examine the use of the project’s results framework/ log-frame 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.
* Assess the appropriateness of financial controls, including reporting and planning, that allow management to make informed decisions regarding the budget and allow for timely flow of funds.
* Using the co-financing monitoring table, provide commentary on whether co-financing is being used strategically to help the objectives of the project and how often the management meets with financing partners to align financing priorities and annual work plans.

Project-level Monitoring and Evaluation Systems:

* Review the monitoring tools currently being used: Do they provide the necessary information? Do they involve key partners? Are they aligned or mainstreamed with national systems? Do they use existing information? Are they efficient? Are they cost-effective? Are additional tools required? How could they be made more participatory and inclusive?
* Examine the financial management of the project monitoring and evaluation budget. Are sufficient resources being allocated to monitoring and evaluation? Are these resources being allocated effectively?

Stakeholder Engagement:

* Project management: Has the project developed and leveraged the necessary and appropriate partnerships with direct and tangential stakeholders?
* Participation and country-driven processes: Do local and national government stakeholders support the objectives of the project? Do they continue to have an active role in project decision-making that supports efficient and effective project implementation?
* Participation and public awareness: To what extent has stakeholder involvement and public awareness contributed to the progress towards achievement of project objectives?

Reporting:

* Assess how adaptive management changes have been reported by the project management and shared with the Project Board.
* Assess how well the Project Team and partners undertake and fulfil GEF reporting requirements (i.e. how have they addressed poorly-rated PIRs, if applicable?)
* Assess how lessons derived from the adaptive management process have been documented, shared with key partners and internalized by partners.

Communications:

* Review internal project communication with stakeholders: Is communication regular and effective? Are there key stakeholders left out of communication? Are there feedback mechanisms when communication is received? Does this communication with stakeholders contribute to their awareness of project outcomes and activities and investment in the sustainability of project results?
* Review external project communication: Are proper means of communication established or being established to express the project progress and intended impact to the public (is there a web presence, for example? Or did the project implement appropriate outreach and public awareness campaigns?)
* For reporting purposes, write one half-page paragraph that summarizes the project’s progress towards results in terms of contribution to sustainable development benefits, as well as global environmental benefits.

**iv. Sustainability**

* Validate whether the risks identified in the Project Document, Annual Project Review/PIRs and the ATLAS Risk Management Module are the most important and whether the risk ratings applied are appropriate and up to date. If not, explain why.
* In addition, assess the following risks to sustainability:

Financial risks to sustainability:

* What is the likelihood of financial and economic resources not being available once the GEF assistance ends (consider potential resources can be from multiple sources, such as the public and private sectors, income generating activities, and other funding that will be adequate financial resources for sustaining project’s outcomes)?

Socio-economic risks to sustainability:

* Are there any social or political risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project outcomes?
* What is the risk that the level of stakeholder ownership (including ownership by governments and other key stakeholders) will be insufficient to allow for the project outcomes/benefits to be sustained?
* Do the various key stakeholders see that it is in their interest that the project benefits continue to flow? Is there sufficient public / stakeholder awareness in support of the long term objectives of the project?
* Are lessons learned being documented by the Project Team on a continual basis and shared/ transferred to appropriate parties who could learn from the project and potentially replicate and/or scale it in the future?

Institutional Framework and Governance risks to sustainability:

* Do the legal frameworks, policies, governance structures and processes pose risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project benefits? While assessing this parameter, also consider if the required systems/ mechanisms for accountability, transparency, and technical knowledge transfer are in place.

Environmental risks to sustainability:

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

**Conclusions & Recommendations**

The MTR team will include a section of the report setting out the MTR’s evidence-based conclusions, in light of the findings.

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.

1. **Ratings**

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

Table. MTR Ratings & Achievement Summary Table

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **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 total duration of the MTR will be approximately 25 days over a time period of 15 weeks starting on or around 10.09.2017 and finishing on or around 09.01.2018*,* and shall not exceed five months from when the consultant is hired.

The tentative MTR timeframe is as follows:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **TIMEFRAME** | **ACTIVITY** |
| *22.08.2017* | Application closes |
| *10.09.2017* | Select MTR consultant |
| *20.09.2017* | Prep the MTR Team (handover of Project Documents) |
| *27.09.2017* | Document review and preparing MTR Inception Report |
| *10.10.2017* | Finalization andValidation of MTR Inception Report- latest start of MTR mission |
| *15-20.10.2017* | MTR mission: stakeholder meetings, interviews, field visits |
| *20.10.2017* | Mission wrap-up meeting & presentation of initial findings- earliest end of MTR mission |
| *10.11.2017* | Preparing draft report |
| *20.11.2017* | Incorporating audit trail from feedback on draft report/Finalization of MTR report |
| *27.11.2017* | Preparation & Issue of Management Response |
| *01.12.2017* | Expected date of MTR full completion |
| *09.02.2018* | Contract is closed |

**Travel:**

In the course of the assignment the selected consultant shall undertake a 1-week mission to Azerbaijan. In her/his financial proposal the potential candidates should include international travel expenses, hotel, food, consultancy fee. In-country transportation will be provided by the Project, therefore, should not be included into the financial proposal. In their financial proposal the interested candidates should show breakdown of financial expenses including the consultancy fee.

1. **MIDTERM REVIEW DELIVERABLES**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **#** | **Deliverable** | **Description** | **Timing** | **Responsibilities** |
| **1** | **MTR Inception Report** | MTR team clarifies objectives and methods of Midterm Review | No later THAN 2 WEEKS before the MTR mission: 27.09.2017 | MTR team submits to the Commissioning Unit and project management |
| **2** | **Presentation** | Initial Findings | End of MTR mission: 20.10.2017 | MTR Team presents to project management and the Commissioning Unit |
| **3** | **Draft Final Report** | Full report (using guidelines on content outlined in Annex B) with annexes | Within 3 weeks of the MTR mission: 10.11.2017 | Sent to the Commissioning Unit, reviewed by RTA, Project Coordinating Unit, GEF OFP |
| **4** | **Final Report\*** | Revised report with audit trail detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final MTR report | Within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft: 01.12.2017 | Sent to the Commissioning Unit |

\*The final MTR report must be in English. If applicable, the Commissioning Unit may choose to arrange for a translation of the report into a language more widely shared by national stakeholders.

1. **MTR ARRANGEMENTS**

The principal responsibility for managing this MTR resides with the Commissioning Unit. The Commissioning Unit for this project’s MTR is UNDP-Azerbaijan Country Office.

The commissioning unit will contract the consultant and ensure the timely provision of per diems and travel arrangements for the MTR team. The IC shall undertake a 1-week mission to Azerbaijan. The Project Team will be responsible for liaising with the MTR team to provide all relevant documents, set up stakeholder interviews, and arrange field visits.

1. **TEAM COMPOSITION**

One Independent Consultant will conduct the MTR, with experience and exposure to projects and evaluations in other regions globally. The IC hired through the competitive process by the announcement at UNDP website will conduct the MTR evaluation. This consultant cannot have participated in the project preparation, formulation, and/or implementation (including the writing of the Project Document) and should not have a conflict of interest with project’s related activities.

The consultant is expected to meet the following qualification requirements:

* A Master’s degree in environmental management, energy economics or other closely related field
* Experience working with renewable energy, energy efficiency, and climate change related project evaluations; GEF or GEF-evaluations will be an asset
* Work experience in relevant technical areas for at least 10 years
* Fluency in English; knowledge of Russian an asset
* Experience working in Europe and CIS regions will be preferred

Required competencies:

* Recent experience with result-based management evaluation methodologies;
* Experience applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios;
* Competence in adaptive management, as applied to climate change and energy efficiency;
* Experience working with the GEF or GEF-evaluations;
* Experience working in Eastern Europe or CIS;
* Work experience in relevant technical areas for at least 10 years;
* Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender and climate change;
* Excellent communication skills;
* Demonstrable analytical skills;
* Project evaluation/review experiences within United Nations system;
* A Master’s degree in climate change, energy efficiency, environmental management, energy economics, engineering, or other closely related field.

1. **PAYMENT MODALITIES AND SPECIFICATIONS**

10% of payment upon approval of the final MTR Inception Report

30% upon submission of the draft MTR report

60% upon finalization of the MTR report

1. **APPLICATION PROCESS[[8]](#footnote-8)**

**Recommended Presentation of Proposal:**

1. **Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability** using the [template](https://intranet.undp.org/unit/bom/pso/Support%20documents%20on%20IC%20Guidelines/Template%20for%20Confirmation%20of%20Interest%20and%20Submission%20of%20Financial%20Proposal.docx)[[9]](#footnote-9) provided by UNDP;
2. **CV** and a **Personal History Form** ([P11 form](http://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/corporate/Careers/P11_Personal_history_form.doc)[[10]](#footnote-10));
3. **Brief description of approach to work/technical proposal** of why the individual considers him/herself as the most suitable for the assignment, and a proposed methodology on how they will approach and complete the assignment; (max 1 page)
4. **Financial Proposal** that indicates the all-inclusive fixed total contract price and all other travel related costs (such as flight ticket, per diem, etc), supported by a breakdown of costs, as per template attached to the Letter of Confirmation of Interest template. Internal transportation will be provided by the Project Team and should not be included into the Financial Proposal. If an applicant 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 applicant must indicate at this point, and ensure that all such costs are duly incorporated in the financial proposal submitted to UNDP.

**Criteria for Evaluation of Proposal:** Only those applications which are responsive and compliant will be evaluated. Offers will be evaluated according to the Combined/Cumulative Scoring method – where the educational background and experience on similar assignments will be weighted at 70%and the price proposal will weigh as 30% of the total scoring. The applicant receiving the Highest Combined Score that has also accepted UNDP’s General Terms and Conditions will be awarded the contract.

Individual consultants will be evaluated based on the following methodologies:

* *Cumulative evaluation that takes into account both financial offer and the technical expertise of the potential candidates*

A two-stage procedure will be utilized in evaluating the proposals, with evaluation of the technical component being completed prior to any price component being reviewed and compared.  The Price Component will be reviewed only for those individuals whose Technical Component meets the requirements for the assignment.  The total number of points which individual may obtain for both components is 100.

Out of this 100 points 70 points maximum could be obtained for the technical proposal, and 30 points maximum for the financial proposal.

The technical component, which has a total possible value of 70 points, will be evaluated using the following criteria:

* A Master’s degree in environmental management, energy economics or other closely related field (**20 points**)
* Experience working with renewable energy, energy efficiency, and climate change related project evaluations; GEF or GEF-evaluations will be an asset (**25 points**)
* Work experience in relevant technical areas for at least 10 years, especially in applying SMART indicators (**25 points**)
* Fluency in English; knowledge of Russian an asset (**15 points**)
* Experience working in Europe and CIS regions is preferred (**15 points**)

Then, this total amount of sub-points (total amounts of sub-points could be 100) will be multiplied by 0.7 to calculate total weighted amount for technical proposal.

If technical proposal achieves the minimum threshold of 49 points (70 points multiplied by 0.7), then, the respective proposal passes the threshold for technical fit, and the competitiveness of the offered fees/consultancy rates will be taken into account in the following manner:

The total amount of points for the fees component is 30. The maximum number of points shall be allotted to the lowest fees proposed that is compared among those invited individuals which obtain the threshold points in the evaluation of the technical proposal. All other proposals shall receive points in inverse proportion to the lowest fees; e.g;

                [30 Points] x [US$ lowest]/[US$other] = points for other proposer’s fees

Then, the proposal, which collects the maximum amount of points, will be selected as the best proposal.

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

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

The following documents will also be available:

1. Project operational guidelines, manuals and systems
2. UNDP country/countries programme document(s)
3. Minutes of the NAMA Project’s Board Meetings and other meetings (i.e. Project Appraisal Committee meetings)
4. Project site location maps

**ToR ANNEX B: Guidelines on Contents for the Midterm Review Report**[[11]](#footnote-11)

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **i.** | Basic Report Information *(for opening page or title page)*   * Title of UNDP supported GEF financed project * UNDP PIMS# and GEF project ID# * MTR time frame and date of MTR report * Region and countries included in the project * GEF Operational Focal Area/Strategic Program * Executing Agency/Implementing Partner and other project partners * MTR team members * Acknowledgements | | |
| **ii.** | Table of Contents | | |
| **iii.** | Acronyms and Abbreviations | | |
| **1.** | Executive Summary *(3-5 pages)*   * Project Information Table * Project Description (brief) * Project Progress Summary (between 200-500 words) * MTR Ratings & Achievement Summary Table * Concise summary of conclusions * Recommendation Summary Table | | |
| **2.** | Introduction *(2-3 pages)*   * Purpose of the MTR and objectives * Scope & Methodology: principles of design and execution of the MTR, MTR approach and data collection methods, limitations to the MTR * Structure of the MTR report | | |
| **3.** | Project Description and Background Context *(3-5 pages)*   * Development context: environmental, socio-economic, institutional, and policy factors relevant to the project objective and scope * Problems that the project sought to address: threats and barriers targeted * Project Description and Strategy: objective, outcomes and expected results, description of field sites (if any) * Project Implementation Arrangements: short description of the Project Board, key implementing partner arrangements, etc. * Project timing and milestones * Main stakeholders: summary list | | |
| **4.** | Findings *(12-14 pages)* | | |
| **4.1** | Project Strategy   * Project Design * Results Framework/Logframe | |
| **4.2** | Progress Towards Results   * Progress towards outcomes analysis * Remaining barriers to achieving the project objective | |
| **4.3** | Project Implementation and Adaptive Management   * Management Arrangements * Work planning * Finance and co-finance * Project-level monitoring and evaluation systems * Stakeholder engagement * Reporting * Communications | |
| **4.4** | Sustainability   * Financial risks to sustainability * Socio-economic to sustainability * Institutional framework and governance risks to sustainability * Environmental risks to sustainability | |
| **5.** | Conclusions and Recommendations *(4-6 pages)* | | |
|  | **5.1** | | Conclusions   * Comprehensive and balanced statements (that are evidence-based and connected to the MTR’s findings) which highlight the strengths, weaknesses and results of the project |
| **5.2** | | Recommendations   * Corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project * Actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the project * Proposals for future directions underlining main objectives |
| **6.** | Annexes   * MTR ToR (excluding ToR annexes) * MTR evaluative matrix (evaluation criteria with key questions, indicators, sources of data, and methodology) * Example Questionnaire or Interview Guide used for data collection * Ratings Scales * MTR mission itinerary * List of persons interviewed * List of documents reviewed * Co-financing table (if not previously included in the body of the report) * Signed UNEG Code of Conduct form * Signed MTR final report clearance form * *Annexed in a separate file:* Audit trail from received comments on draft MTR report * *Annexed in a separate file:* Relevant midterm tracking tools (*METT, FSC, Capacity scorecard, etc.)* | | |

**ToR ANNEX C: Midterm Review Evaluative Matrix Template**

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

**ToR ANNEX D: UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluators/Midterm Review Consultants[[12]](#footnote-12)**

**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. |
| 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: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**Annex G**

**OFFEROR’S LETTER TO UNDP**

**CONFIRMING INTEREST AND AVAILABILITY**

**FOR THE INDIVIDUAL CONTRACTOR (IC) ASSIGNMENT**

Date

*(Name of Resident Representative/Bureau Director)*

United Nations Development Programme

*(Specify complete office address)*

Dear Sir/Madam :

I hereby declare that:

1. I have read, understood and hereby accept the Terms of Reference describing the duties and responsibilities of International Consultant in \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ for “**Nationally Appropriate Mitigation Actions (NAMAs) for low-carbon end-use sectors in Azerbaijan” Project**;
2. I have also read, understood and hereby accept UNDP’s General Conditions of Contract for the Services of the Individual Contractors;

1. I hereby propose my services and I confirm my interest in performing the assignment through the submission of my CV or Personal History Form (P11) which I have duly signed and attached hereto as Annex 1;
2. In compliance with the requirements of the Terms of Reference, I hereby confirm that I am available for the entire duration of the assignment, and I shall perform the services in the manner described in my proposed approach/methodology which I have attached hereto as Annex 3 [delete this item if the TOR does not require submission of this document];
3. I hereby propose to complete the services based on the following payment rate : *[pls. check the box corresponding to the preferred option]:*

* An all-inclusive daily fee of [*state amount in words and in numbers indicating currency]*
* A total lump sum of [*state amount in words and in numbers, indicating exact currency]*, payable in the manner described in the Terms of Reference.

1. For your evaluation, the breakdown of the abovementioned all-inclusive amount is attached hereto as Annex 2;

I recognize that the payment of the abovementioned amounts due to me shall be based on my delivery of outputs within the timeframe specified in the TOR, which shall be subject to UNDP's review, acceptance and payment certification procedures;

1. This offer shall remain valid for a total period of 90 days after the submission deadline;
2. I confirm that I have no first degree relative (mother, father, son, daughter, spouse/partner, brother or sister) currently employed with any UN agency or office *[disclose the name of the relative, the UN office employing the relative, and the relationship if, any such relationship exists];*
3. If I am selected for this assignment, I shall *[pls. check the appropriate box]:*

* Sign an Individual Contract with UNDP;
* Request my employer *[state name of company/organization/institution]* to sign with UNDP a Reimbursable Loan Agreement (RLA), for and on my behalf. The contact person and details of my employer for this purpose are as follows:

1. I hereby confirm that *[check all that applies]*:

* At the time of this submission, I have no active Individual Contract or any form of engagement with any Business Unit of UNDP;
* I am currently engaged with UNDP and/or other entities for the following work :

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Assignment** | **Contract Type** | **UNDP Business Unit / Name of Institution/Company** | **Contract Duration** | **Contract Amount** |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

* I am also anticipating conclusion of the following work from UNDP and/or other entities for which I have submitted a proposal :

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Assignment** | **Contract Type** | **Name of Institution/ Company** | **Contract Duration** | **Contract Amount** |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

1. I fully understand and recognize that UNDP is not bound to accept this proposal, and I also understand and accept that I shall bear all costs associated with its preparation and submission and that UNDP will in no case be responsible or liable for those costs, regardless of the conduct or outcome of the selection process.
2. ***If you are a former staff member of the United Nations recently separated, pls. add this section to your letter:*** I hereby confirm that I have complied with the minimum break in service required before I can be eligible for an Individual Contract.
3. I also fully understand that, if I am engaged as an Individual Contractor, I have no expectations nor entitlements whatsoever to be re-instated or re-employed as a staff member.

Full Name and Signature: Date Signed:

**Annexes** *[pls. check all that applies]***:**

* CV or Duly signed P11 Form
* Breakdown of Costs Supporting the Final All-Inclusive Price as per Template

Brief Description of Approach to Work

**BREAKDOWN OF COSTS**

**SUPPORTING THE ALL-INCLUSIVE FINANCIAL PROPOSAL**

1. **Breakdown of Cost by Components:**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Cost Components** | **Unit Cost** | **Quantity** | **Total Rate for the Contract Duration** |
| 1. **Personnel Costs** |  |  |  |
| Professional Fees |  |  |  |
| Life Insurance |  |  |  |
| Medical Insurance |  |  |  |
| Communications |  |  |  |
| Land Transportation |  |  |  |
| Others (pls. specify) |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| 1. **Travel Expenses to Join duty station** |  |  |  |
| Round Trip Airfares to and from duty station |  |  |  |
| Living Allowance |  |  |  |
| Travel Insurance |  |  |  |
| Terminal Expenses |  |  |  |
| Others (pls. specify) |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| 1. **Duty Travel** |  |  |  |
| Round Trip Airfares |  |  |  |
| Living Allowance |  |  |  |
| Travel Insurance |  |  |  |
| Terminal Expenses |  |  |  |
| Others (pls. specify) |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

1. **Breakdown of Cost by Deliverables\***

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Deliverables**  *[list them as referred to in the TOR]* | **Percentage of Total Price (Weight for payment)** | **Amount** |
| Deliverable 1 | 10% |  |
| Deliverable 2 | 30% |  |
| Deliverable 3 | 60% |  |
| Total | 100% | USD …… |

*\*Basis for payment tranches*

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 Log-frame and scorecards [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. Populate with data from the Project Document [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. Populate with data from the Project Document [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. Color 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. Engagement of the consultants should be done in line with guidelines for hiring consultants in the POPP: <https://info.undp.org/global/popp/Pages/default.aspx> [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. <https://intranet.undp.org/unit/bom/pso/Support%20documents%20on%20IC%20Guidelines/Template%20for%20Confirmation%20of%20Interest%20and%20Submission%20of%20Financial%20Proposal.docx> [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. <http://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/corporate/Careers/P11_Personal_history_form.doc> [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
11. The Report length should not exceed 40 pages in total (not including annexes). [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
12. [www.undp.org/unegcodeofconduct](http://www.undp.org/unegcodeofconduct) [↑](#footnote-ref-12)