**TERMS OF REFERENCES (ToR)**

Location: UNDP Premises, Ankara

Type of Contract: Individual Contract

Post Level: National Consultant

Languages Required: English and Turkish

Duration of the Contract: 05 February 2018 – 01 June 2018 (up to a maximum of 25 man/days during contract validity)

Terms of Reference

**National Consultant for UNDP-GEF Mid-Term Review**

# Background and Context

This is the Terms of Reference (ToR) for the UNDP-GEF Midterm Review (MTR) of the -full-sized project titled POPs Legacy Elimination and POPs Release Reduction Project (PIMS# 4833) and (UNIDO SAP# 140288) implemented through the UNDP-UNIDO/MOEU, which is to be undertaken in 2018. The project started on the 21 May 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; which can be found through the link: <http://web.undp.org/evaluation/documents/guidance/GEF/mid-term/Guidance_Midterm%20Review%20_EN_2014.pdf>

UNDP in collaboration with UNIDO and Ministry of Environment and Urbanization implements the project which objective is to protect human health and the environment globally as well as locally through addressing POPs legacies including elimination of POPs Pesticide and PCB stockpiles, and initiating clean-up of associated POPs and chemical pollutant contaminated sites, as well as dealing with longer term PCB phase out consistent with the country’s Stockholm Convention obligations, reducing U-POPs release in major industrial sectors , and providing targeted institutional, regulatory and technical capacity strengthening, all within a sound chemicals management framework. The project is directed by the Ministry of Environment and Urbanization. It will meet this objective by eliminating a large POPs pesticide stockpile consisting of pure HCH and associated high concentration POPs waste and PCB stockpiles as well as supporting assessment, cleanup and monitoring of priority POPs contaminated sites involving representative range of site contamination situations, remediation approaches and clean-up financing modalities. The project will also demonstrate the sustainable treatment of cross contaminated PCB transformer units by means of de-halogenation technologies, will provide technical assistance for setting up a national plan for treatment of PCB contaminated transformers, and will provide technical assistance for the establishment of BAT/BEPs among priority U-POPs emitting sectors Additionally the project will support the qualification of needed hazardous waste infrastructure and national technical capability for the ongoing management of POPs and other chemical hazardous wastes as well as supporting the strengthening of institutional and regulatory capacity within an overall chemicals management framework.

**2. Description of Responsibilities**

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.

Please see the detailed technical description of the MTR in Annex A.

**3. Duration and Deliverables**

The total duration of the MTR will be approximately over a time period starting from 5 February 2018 and ending on 01 June 2018. The number of days presented as ‘estimated number of man/days to be invested’ is indicative. Inputs, articulated in man/days, to be invested by the expert are based on UNDP’s estimations. They are provided herein to facilitate provision of lump sum price proposals by the applicants. The expert will agree to produce the below deliverables to the satisfaction of UNDP and its partners. The ICs may invest less/more than expected number of days to finalize each output. The actual number of days invested will not change the amount of payments. For further detail please refer to the table illustrating the payment details below:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **NO.** | **ACTIVITY** | **OUTPUT** | **ESTIMATED NUMBER OF MAN/DAYS TO BE INVESTED\*** | **DUE DATE** | **PAYMENT\*\*** |
| 1 | Document review and preparation of Inception Report | Submission of draft MTR Inception Report\*\* | 3 days | 09 February 2018 | N/A |
| 2 | Finalization andValidation of MTR Inception Report- latest start of MTR mission | Submission of final MTR Inception Report | 2 days | 15 February 2018 | 10% |
| 3 | MTR mission: stakeholder meetings, interviews, field visits | Submission of minutes of the meetings for MTR mission | 10 days | 09 March 2018 | N/A |
| 4 | Mission wrap-up meeting & presentation of initial findings- earliest end of MTR mission | Initial findings presentation of the MTR mission | 1 day | 26 March 2018 | N/A |
| 5 | Preparing draft report | Submission of the draft MTR report | 5 days | 06 April 2018 | 30% |
| 6 | Incorporating audit trail from feedback on draft report/Finalization of MTR Inception report | Submission of the 2nd draft MTR | 2 days | 20 April 2018 | N/A |
| 7 | Preparation & Issue of Management Response | Submission of the Management Response | 1 day | 26 April 2018 | N/A |
| 8 | Expected date of finalized MTR completion | Submission of final MTR report revised as per comments | 1 day | 01 June 2018 | 60% |

\* While the Consultant may invest less or more than the estimated number of man/days stated above, this shall not make any changes to the lump-sum payment amount.

\*\* The payments stated in this column represent the corresponding percentage of the whole lump-sum payment amount for the respective Deliverable.

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

In cases where the expert may need to invest additional man/days to perform the tasks and produce the deliverables listed and defined in the present Terms of Reference, the expert shall do so without any additional payment.

The expert will be submitting the reports based Annex A, Detailed Description of the MTR Report.

All information should be provided in electronic versions. The expert shall be solely liable for the accuracy and reliability of the data provided, links to sources of information used. The title rights, copyrights and all other rights whatsoever nature in any material produced under the provisions of this ToR will be vested exclusively in UNDP.

# Institutional Arrangement

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

The commissioning unit will contract the consultant and ensure the timely provision of per diems and travel arrangements within the country for the MTR expert.

UNDP is not required to provide any physical facility for the work of the IC. However, depending on the availability of physical facilities (e.g. working space, computer, printer, telephone lines, internet connection etc.) and at the discretion of UNDP, such facilities may be provided at the disposal of the IC.

Payments will be made against submission of the second, fifth and last deliverables in the contract by the IC and approval of such deliverables by UNDP.

The Individual Consultant will report to the UNDP Cluster Lead. All deliverables will be subject to approval of UNDP. The Project Team will be responsible for liaising with the MTR expert to provide all relevant documents, set up stakeholder interviews, and arrange field visits.

# Place of Work and Guidance for Price Proposal

Place of work for the assignment is, home-based. It may be required that the Consultant will travel within Turkey. All travel, accommodation and living costs in duty station (home based) will be covered by the Consultant through inclusion of these costs in the price proposal. However, in case travel out of the duty station is needed, the travel and accommodation costs of these missions will be borne by UNDP. The costs of these missions may either be;

• Arranged and covered by UNDP CO from the respective project budget without making any reimbursements to the consultant (Any assignment-related travel (economy class), accommodation (bed & breakfast) outside duty station will be arranged by the travel agency UNDP works with, when necessary, by receiving prior approval of UNDP) or

• Reimbursed to the consultant upon the submission of the receipts/invoices of the expenses by the consultant and approval of the UNDP. The reimbursement of each cost item is subject to the following constraints/conditions provided in below table;

• Covered by the combination of both options

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Cost item** | **Constraints** | **Conditions of Reimbursement** |
| Travel (intercity transportation) | full-fare economy class tickets | 1-  Approval by UNDP of the cost items before the initiation of travel  2-   Submission of the invoices/receipts, etc. by the consultant with the UNDP’s F-10 Form  3-   Acceptance and Approval by UNDP of the invoices and F-10 Form. |
| Accommodation | Up to 50% of the effective DSA rate of UNDP for the respective location |
| Breakfast | Up to 6% of the effective DSA rate of UNDP for the respective location |
| Lunch | Up to 12% of the effective DSA rate of UNDP for the respective location |
| Dinner | Up to 12% of the effective DSA rate of UNDP for the respective location |
| Other Expenses (intra city transportations, transfer cost from /to terminals, etc.) | Up to 20% of effective DSA rate of UNDP for the respective location |

# 6. Minimum Qualification Requirements

**Education**

* A Master’s Degree in chemistry/chemical engineering, or other closely related field

**General Professional Experience**

* Work experience in relevant technical areas for at least 10 years

**Specific Professional Experience**

* Competence in adaptive management, as applied to POPs/Chemicals and Waste
* Experience working with the GEF or GEF-evaluations
* Recent experience with result-based management evaluation methodologies
* Experience applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios
* Experience working in EECCA Countries
* Demonstrated understanding of issues related to Chemicals and Waste especially Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs)
* Experience in gender sensitive evaluation and analysis is an asset
* Project evaluation/review experiences within United Nations system will be considered an asset
* Fluent written and verbal communication skills in English
* Excellent communication skills is an asset
* Demonstrable analytical skills is an asset

**Notes:**

* Internships (paid/unpaid) are not considered professional experience.
* Obligatory military service is not considered professional experience.
* Professional experience gained in an international setting is considered international experience.
* Experience gained prior to completion of undergraduate studies is not considered professional experience.

# 7. Payments

The expert shall be paid in US$ if he/she resides in a country different than Turkey. If he/she resides in Turkey, the payment shall be realized in TRY through conversion of the US$ amount by the official UN exchange rate valid on the date of money transfer.

The amount paid to the expert shall be gross and inclusive of all associated costs such as social security, pension and income tax etc.

Payments will be made within 30 days upon the approval of the corresponding deliverable and UNDP Certificate of Payment Form (COP) on a lump sum basis irrespective from the number of days invested by the expert for this particular deliverable.

If the deliverables subject to a payment are not produced and delivered by the expert to the satisfaction of UNDP, no payment will be made even if the expert has invested man/days to produce and deliver such deliverables.

Tax Obligations: The IC is solely responsible for all taxation or other assessments on any income derived from UNDP. UNDP will not make any withholding from payments for the purposes of income tax. UNDP is exempt from any liabilities regarding taxation and will not reimburse any such taxation to the IC.

**ANNEX A**

**DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF MTR PROCESS**

**1. MTR APPROACH & METHODOLOGY**

The MTR must provide evidence based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The MTR expert will review all relevant sources of information including documents prepared during the preparation phase (i.e. PIF, UNDP Initiation Plan, UNDP Environmental & Social Safeguard Policy, the Project Document, project reports including Annual Project Review/PIRs, project budget revisions, lesson learned reports, national strategic and legal documents, and any other materials that the team considers useful for this evidence-based review). The MTR expert 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 expert 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, UNIDO Country Office 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 Merkim A.Ş., İZAYDAŞ, Erdemir, İSDEMİR, Brissa, EUAŞ, KARDEMİR, ETI BAKIR, BEDAŞ, SEDAŞ, TURK TELEKOM, MOFAL, MOEU; 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 expert is expected to conduct field missions to Ankara, Kocaeli, Zonguldak, Hatay, Karabuk, Samsun, Istanbul, including the following project sites Merkim Site, İZAYDAŞ HTI Facility, PCB Owners in Kocaeli, KARDEMİR Factory, ETI BAKIR Factory, Zonguldak and Hatay.

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.

**2. DETAILED SCOPE OF THE MTR**

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

**i. Project Strategy**

Project design:

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

Results Framework/Logframe:

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

**ii. Progress Towards Results**

Progress Towards Outcomes Analysis:

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

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

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Project Strategy** | **Indicator[[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.

**iii. Project Implementation and Adaptive Management**

Management Arrangements:

* Review overall effectiveness of project management as outlined in the Project Document. Have changes been made and are they effective? Are responsibilities and reporting lines clear? Is decision-making transparent and undertaken in a timely manner? Recommend areas for improvement.
* Review the quality of execution of the Executing Agency/Implementing Partner(s) and recommend areas for improvement.
* Review the quality of support provided by the GEF Partner Agency (UNDP) and recommend areas for improvement.

Work Planning:

* Review any delays in project start-up and implementation, identify the causes and examine if they have been resolved.
* Are work-planning processes results-based? If not, suggest ways to re-orientate work planning to focus on results?
* Examine the use of the project’s results framework/ logframe as a management tool and review any changes made to it since project start.

Finance and co-finance:

* Consider the financial management of the project, with specific reference to the cost-effectiveness of interventions.
* Review the changes to fund allocations as a result of budget revisions and assess the appropriateness and relevance of such revisions.
* Does the project have the appropriate financial controls, including reporting and planning, that allow management to make informed decisions regarding the budget and allow for timely flow of funds?
* Informed by the co-financing monitoring table to be filled out, provide commentary on co-financing: is co-financing being used strategically to help the objectives of the project? Is the Project Team meeting with all co-financing partners regularly in order to align financing priorities and annual work plans?

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 expert will include a section of the report setting out the MTR’s evidence-based conclusions, in light of the findings.[[8]](#footnote-8)

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

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

**Ratings**

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

Table. MTR Ratings & Achievement Summary Table for (POPs Legacy Elimination and POPs Release Reduction 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) |  |
| Etc. |  |
| **Project Implementation & Adaptive Management** | (rate 6 pt. scale) |  |
| **Sustainability** | (rate 4 pt. scale) |  |

1. **TEAM COMPOSITION**

A National Independent Consultant will conduct the MTR. The 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.

**List of Documents to be reviewed by the MTR Expert**

1. PIF
2. UNDP Initiation Plan
3. UNDP / UNIDO 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
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 POPs Legacy Elimination and POPs Release Reduction Project Board Meetings and other meetings (i.e. Project Appraisal Committee meetings)
4. Project site location maps

**Guidelines on Contents for the Midterm Review Report**[[9]](#footnote-9)

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **i.** | Basic Report Information *(for opening page or title page)*   * Title of UNDP / UNIDO supported GEF financed project * UNDP PIMS#, UNIDO SAP# 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 Expert * 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.)* | | |

**Midterm Review Evaluative Matrix Template**

This Midterm Review Evaluative Matrix must be fully completed/amended by the consultant and included in the MTR inception report and as an Annex to the MTR report.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **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?** | | | |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

**UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluators/Midterm Review Consultants[[10]](#footnote-10)**

**Evaluators/Consultants:**

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

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

**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 |

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

**Audit Trail Template**

*Note:* The following is a template for the MTR Expert to show how the received comments on the draft MTR report have (or have not) been incorporated into the final MTR report. This audit trail should be included as an annex in the final MTR report.

**To the comments received on (*date*) from the Midterm Review of (*project name*) (UNDP Project ID-*PIMS #)***

*The following comments were provided in track changes to the draft Midterm Review report; they are referenced by institution (“Author” column) and track change comment number (“#” column):*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Author** | **#** | **Para No./ comment location** | **Comment/Feedback on the draft MTR report** | **MTR Expert**  **response and actions taken** |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

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