## UNDP-GEF Midterm Review

## Terms of Reference

**Standard Template 2: Formatted information to be entered in** [**UNDP Jobs website**[[1]](#footnote-1)](https://jobs.undp.org/)

**BASIC CONTRACT INFORMATION**

**Location: Dili, Timor-Leste**

**Application Deadline:** 12thMay 2017

**Category:** Energy and Environment

**Type of Contract:** Individual Contract

**Assignment Type:** International Consultant

**Languages Required:** English

**Starting Date:** 5th June 2017

**Duration of Initial Contract:** 26 working days between 5th June – 10th July 2017

**Expected Duration of Assignment:** 26 working days

**BACKGROUND**

**A. Project Title**

Strengthening Community Resilience to Climate-induced disasters in the Dili to Ainaro Road Development Corridor, Timor-Leste

##### **B. Project Description**

Timor-Leste is already subjected to unpredictable extreme weather events. Furthermore, climate change projections indicate that these trends are likely to intensify in the future, increasing the frequency and severity of climate-induced disasters, such as floods and landslides. These disasters are likely to put road infrastructure and community assets at increased risk and as a consequence the vulnerability of communities will increase.

The Dili to Ainaro Road Development Corridor (DARDC) comprises a joint investment by the Government of Timor-Leste and the World Bank to upgrade and strengthen the climate resilience of the road infrastructure linking Dili to the capitals of Aileu and Ainaro Municipalities The problem that the proposed LDCF project seeks to address is that climate change is expected to increase damage to road infrastructure in the DARDC resulting from an increased intensity of climate-induced disasters. Damage to road infrastructure is expensive to repair and restricts: i) economic development; ii) market access; iii) access to services such as education and health care; iv) evacuation during natural disasters; and v) provision of disaster relief. Furthermore, this threat of damage to road infrastructure is exacerbated by ecosystem degradation resulting from existing land-use practices. Such ecosystem degradation increases the risk of floods and landslides owing to reduced water infiltration and increased soil erosion.

The solution to this problem is to strengthen the resilience of communities living along road infrastructure in DARDC to climate-induced disasters such as floods and landslides and to reduce the risk of damage to road infrastructure. This will also safeguard associated social and economic benefits such as access to markets and essential services. Strengthening livelihoods assets on which communities depend also safeguards household income as households are less prone to – and in a better position to recover from – climate-induced disasters. The proposed project mainstreams gender considerations into its various activities and deliverables

The project aims to achieve this by specifically targeting and strengthening institutional and technical capacities of sub-national government officials to plan for and implement disaster risk management (DRM) measures using ecosystem-based approaches. Significant barriers to achieving the implementation of DRM using ecosystem-based approaches include: i) limited knowledge and understanding of climate-induced disasters; ii) limited capacity of sub-national officials to plan for and respond to disasters; and iii) insufficient financial resources to deliver DRM measures using ecosystem-based approaches.

The project will contribute to overcoming these barriers by: i) enhancing integration of climate change into national DRM policy; ii) providing access to knowledge and training on DRM; iii) strengthening institutional capacity for planning, budgeting and delivering investments into DRM, particularly at sub-national level; iv) developing early warning systems to reduce risks posed by climate-induced disasters; and v) reducing vulnerabilities of communities along the DARC by reducing damage to road infrastructure through implementing climate-resilient and ecosystem-based approaches to DRM. The ecosystem-based approach to DRM will support community livelihoods and restore ecosystems to reduce the risks posed by climate-induced disasters. Communities in the vicinity of the project area will be included in the selection and implementation of project activities, with a particular focus on ensuring that the interests of local women are adequately represented through implementation of a gender action plan. The project will also clarify the link between climate risk reduction and sustainable agricultural practices. Although local and international NGOs are actively promoting such practices, these programmes currently do not focus on the reduction of climate change risks, nor are they systematically used within road development corridors and other types of infrastructure to increase climate resilience.

The proposed LDCF project is part of a joint project with the World Bank. The implementing partner is the National Disaster Management Directorate within the Ministry of Social Solidarity. Other responsible parties include the National Directorate for Climate Change of the Ministry of Commerce, Industry and Environment, Ministry of State Administration, Ministry of Public Works, Ministry of Finance and the Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries.

This is the Terms of Reference for the UNDP-GEF Midterm Review (MTR) of the full -sized project titled Strengthening Community Resilience to Climate-induced disasters in the Dili to Ainaro Road Development Corridor, Timor-Leste (PIMS 5108) implemented through the Ministry of Social Solidarity (MSS), Ministry of State Administration (MSA), Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries (MAF) and Ministry of Commerce, Industry and Environment (MCIE), which is to be undertaken in 2014-2018. The project started on the 10th October 2014 and is in its third year of implementation. In line with the UNDP-GEF Guidance on MTRs, this MTR process was initiated before the submission of the second Project Implementation Report (PIR). The MTR process must follow the guidance outlined in the document *Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects* (see Annex).

**DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES**

##### **C. Scope of Work and Key Tasks**

|  |
| --- |
| The MTR team will consist of two independent consultants that will conduct the MTR - one team leader (with experience and exposure to projects and evaluations in other regions globally) and one team expert, usually from the country of the project. The MTR team will first conduct a document review of project documents (i.e. PIF, UNDP Initiation Plan, Project Document, ESSP, Project Inception Report, PIRs, Finalized GEF focal area Tracking Tools, Project Appraisal Committee meeting minutes, Financial and Administration guidelines used by Project Team, project operational guidelines, manuals and systems, etc.) provided by the Project Team and Commissioning Unit. Then they will participate in a MTR inception workshop to clarify their understanding of the objectives and methods of the MTR, producing the MTR inception report thereafter. The MTR mission will then consist of interviews and site visits to:1. Suco Madabeno, Laulara, Aileu Municipality (Water source rehabilitation, Nursery site)
2. Suco Malere, Aileu Vila, Aileu Municipality (Water source rehabilitation)
3. Suco Aisirimou, Aileu Vila, Aileu Municipality (Check dams, water harvesting, compost, nursery, Agroforestry, terracing and Reforestation)
4. Suco Bandudato, Aileu Vila, Aileu Municipality (Check dams, water harvesting and compost)
5. Suco Lahae, Aileu Vila, Aileu Municipality (Check dams, water harvesting, compost, terracing, Agroforestry and reforestation)
6. Suco Liurai, Aileu Vila, Aileu Municipality (Check dams)
7. Suco Cotolau, Laulara, Aileu Municipality (Check dams, compost, water harvesting, Water roof harvesting, water infiltration and Reforestation)
8. Suco Talimoro, Ermera Vila, Ermera Municipality (Construction of retain wall and reforestation)
9. Suco Poetete, Ermera Vila, Ermera Municipality (Water rehabilitation)
10. Suco Hilokomau, Ainaro Vila, Ainaro Municipality (Water rehabilitation)
11. Suco Horaiikiik, Maubisse, Ainaro Muncipality (Check dams and nursery)
12. Suco Aitutu, Maubisse, Ainaro Municipality (Check dams, dew ponds, reforestation and terracing)
13. Suco Mulo, Hatobilico, Ainaro Municipality (Check dams, dewponds, and compost)
14. Suco Nunumogue, Hatubuilico, Ainaro Municipality (Check dams and compost)
15. Suco Bulico, Ainaro Municipality (Water rehabilitation)
16. Suco Casa, Ainaro Municipality (Nursery, Reforestation and terracing)
17. Suco Holarua, Same, Manufahi Municipality (Water rehabilitation)

The MTR team will assess the following four categories of project progress and produce a draft and final MTR report. See the *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*](http://web.undp.org/evaluation/documents/guidance/GEF/mid-term/Guidance_Midterm%20Review%20_EN_2014.pdf)for requirements on ratings. No overall rating is required.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.
* Review how the project addresses country priorities
* Review decision-making processes

*Results Framework/Log-frame:** Undertake a critical analysis of the project’s log-frame 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.
* 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.
1. **Progress Towards Results**
* Review the log-frame indicators against progress made towards the end-of-project targets; populate the Progress Towards Results Matrix, as described in 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 the project objective and each outcome; make recommendations from the areas marked as “not on target to be achieved” (red).
* 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.
* 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**

Using the *Guidance for Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects*; assess the following categories of project progress:* Management Arrangements
* Work Planning
* Finance and co-finance
* Project-level monitoring and evaluation systems
* Stakeholder Engagement
* Reporting
* Communications
1. **Sustainability**

Assess overall risks to sustainability factors of the project in terms of the following four categories:* Financial risks to sustainability
* Socio-economic risks to sustainability
* Institutional framework and governance risks to sustainability
* Environmental risks to sustainability

The MTR consultant/team will include a section in the MTR report setting out the MTR’s evidence-based **conclusions**, in light of the findings.Additionally, the MTR consultant/team is expected to make **recommendations** to the Project Team. 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. The MTR consultant/team should make no more than 15 recommendations total.  |

##### **D. Expected Outputs and Deliverables**

The MTR consultant/team shall prepare and submit:

* MTR Inception Report: MTR team clarifies objectives and methods of the Midterm Review no later than 2 weeks before the MTR mission. To be sent to the Commissioning Unit and project management. Approximate due date: (05 June 2017)
* Presentation: Initial Findings presented to project management and the Commissioning Unit at the end of the MTR mission. Approximate due date: (10 July 2017)
* Draft Final Report: Full report with annexes within 3 weeks of the MTR mission. Approximate due date: (26 June 2017)
* Final Report\*: Revised report with annexed audit trail detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final MTR report. To be sent to the Commissioning Unit within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft. Approximate due date: (3rd July 2017)

\*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.

**E. Institutional Arrangement**

**F. Duration of the Work**

The principal responsibility for managing this MTR resides with the Commissioning Unit. The Commissioning Unit for this project’s MTR is UNDP Timor-Leste.

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

|  |
| --- |
| Identify the consultant’s duty station/location for the contract duration, mentioning ALL possible locations of field works/duty travel in pursuit of other relevant activities, specially where traveling to locations at security Phase I or above will be required.**Travel:*** International travel will be required to Timor -Leste and the select project sites in the municipalities outside of the capital, Dili during the MTR mission;
* The Basic Security in the Field II and Advanced Security in the Field courses must be successfully completed prior to commencement of travel;
* Individual Consultants are responsible for ensuring they have vaccinations/inoculations when travelling to certain countries, as designated by the UN Medical Director.
* Consultants are required to comply with the UN security directives set forth under <https://dss.un.org/dssweb/>
* All related travel expenses will be covered and will be reimbursed as per UNDP rules and regulations upon submission of an F-10 claim form and supporting documents.

The total duration of the MTR will be approximately *(8 of weeks)* starting *5th June 2017),* and shall not exceed five months from when the consultant(s) are hired. The tentative MTR timeframe is as follows: * *(12th May 2017):* Application closes
* *(19th May 2017):* Selection of MTR Team
* *(5th June2017):* Prep the MTR Team (handover of project documents)
* *(5th – 8th June2017) 4 -days (recommended 2-4):* Document review and preparing MTR Inception Report
* *(9th – 12th June 2017)2-days:* Finalization andValidation of MTR Inception Report- latest start of MTR mission
* *(13th – 26th June2017) 10- days (r: 7-15):* MTR mission: stakeholder meetings, interviews, field visits
* *(27th June 2017):* Mission wrap-up meeting & presentation of initial findings- earliest end of MTR mission
* *(28th June – 4th July2017) 5- days (r: 5-10):* Preparing draft report
* *(18th – 19th July2017) 2- days (r: 1-2):* Incorporating audit trail on draft report/Finalization of MTR report
* *(20th – 21th July 2017):* Preparation & Issue of Management Response (no working days for the consultant)
* *(24th July 2017):* (optional)Concluding Stakeholder Workshop (not mandatory for MTR team)
* *(28th July 2017):* Expected date of full MTR completion

The date start of contract is (5th June 2017). |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Deliverable /output**  | **Estimated Duration Complete**  | **Target Due date**  | **Review and approvals required**  |
| Document review and preparing inception workshop  | 4-days  | 5 - 8 June 2017  | DARDC PM /CTA |
| MTR Inception report  | 2-days  | 9-12 June 2017 | DARDC PM/CTA, Head of RBU |
| Conducting meeting with stakeholders and field trips  | 10 days  | 13-26 June 2017  | DARDC PM/CTA  |
| Integrate comments from key stakeholders | One day | 29 June 2017  | DARDC PM/CTA  |
| Preparing of draft MTR report | 5-days  | 28 June – 4 July 2017  | DARDC PM/CTA  |
| Present a final draft report (optional)  | 1-day | 19 July 2017  | DARDC PM/CTA  |
| Submit final MTR report  | 3 weeks  | 28 July 2017  | DARDC PM/CTA, Head of RBU, Regional Office Bangkok  |

**G. Duty Station**

**REQUIRED SKILLS AND EXPERIENCE**

**H. Qualifications of the Successful Applicants**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 1. ***Technical Criteria***
 | ***Weight******70%*** |
| Education: A Master’s degree in environmental studies, developmental studies, climate change, or other closely related field. | 20% |
| Years of Experience: Minimum 10 years professional experience in climate change adaptation, gender sensitive evaluation, and analysis and experience working with the GEF or GEF-evaluations.  | 20 % |
| Recent experience with result-based management evaluation methodologies, project evaluation/review within United Nations system applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios, competence in adaptive management, as applied to climate change adaptation | 15 % |
| Experience working in the South East Asia. experience in other relevant languages  | 10%  |
| Experience in consulting with various stakeholders including government officials and community members, demonstrate in analytical skills.  | 10 %  |
| 1. ***Financial proposal***
 | ***30%*** |

The selection of consultants will be aimed at maximizing the overall “team” qualities in the following areas:

* Recent experience with result-based management evaluation methodologies;
* Experience applying SMART targets and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios;
* Competence in adaptive management, as applied to climate change adaptation;
* Experience working with the GEF or GEF-evaluations;
* Experience working in South East Asia
* Work experience in relevant technical areas for at least 10 years;
* Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender and (*Climate change Adaptation)*; experience in gender sensitive evaluation and analysis;
* Excellent communication skills;
* Demonstrable analytical skills;
* Project evaluation/review experiences within United Nations system will be considered an asset;
* A Master’s degree in in Environmental, Climate Change or other closely related field.

***Consultant Independence:***

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.

**APPLICATION PROCESS**

**I. Scope of Price Proposal and Schedule of Payments**

***Financial Proposal:***

* Financial proposals must be “all inclusive” and expressed in a lump-sum for the total duration of the contract. The term “all inclusive” implies all cost (professional fees, travel costs, living allowances etc.);
* For duty travels, the UN’s Daily Subsistence Allowance (DSA) rates are (fill for all travel destinations), which should provide indication of the cost of living in a duty station/destination *(Note: Individuals on this contract are not UN staff and are therefore not entitled to DSAs. All living allowances required to perform the demands of the ToR must be incorporated in the financial proposal, whether the fees are expressed as daily fees or lump sum amount.)*
* The lump sum is fixed regardless of changes in the cost components.

***Schedule of Payments:***

10% of payment upon approval of the MTR Inception Report

30% upon submission of the draft MTR Report

60% upon finalization of the MTR Report

Or, as otherwise agreed between the Commissioning Unit and the MTR team.

**J. Recommended Presentation of Offer**

1. Completed **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) provided by UNDP;
2. **Personal CV or a** [**P11 Personal History form**](http://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/corporate/Careers/P11_Personal_history_form.doc), 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;
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, supported by a breakdown of costs, as per template provided. 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. See Letter of Confirmation of Interest template for financial proposal template.

Incomplete applications will be excluded from further consideration.

**K. Criteria for Selection of the Best Offer**

The award of the contract will be made to the Individual Consultant who has obtained the highest Combined Score and has accepted UNDP’s General Terms and Conditions. Only those applications which are responsive and compliant will be evaluated. The offers will be evaluated using the “Combined Scoring method” where:

1. The educational background and experience on similar assignments will be weighted a max. of 70%;
2. The price proposal will weigh as 30% of the total scoring.

**L. Annexes to the MTR ToR**

**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 [GEF CCA Tracking Tool (AMAT)]
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 Strengthening the resilience of small scale rural infrastructure (DARDC) and local Governance Systems to Climate Change Variability and Risk 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**[[2]](#footnote-2)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **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:* midterm GEF CCA Tracking Tool (AMAT)]
 |

**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[[3]](#footnote-3)**

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

**ToR ANNEX G: Audit Trail Template**

*Note:* The following is a template for the MTR Team 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 team****response and actions taken** |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

1. https://jobs.undp.org/ [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. The Report length should not exceed *40* pages in total (not including annexes). [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. [www.undp.org/unegcodeofconduct](http://www.undp.org/unegcodeofconduct) [↑](#footnote-ref-3)