

# Annex 11. Terms of Reference (TOR)

Note: This text is taken from the TOR issued by UNDP Georgia for the Green Cities ISTBAR MTR.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

This is the Terms of Reference (ToR) for the UNDP-GEF Midterm Review (MTR) of the full-sized project titled “Green Cities: Integrated Sustainable Transport for the City of Batumi and the Achara Region” (PIMS#4980) implemented through the UNDP, which is to be undertaken in 2017. The project started on 1st August 2015 (start date as indicated on signed Project Document) 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\\_MidtermReview\\_EN\\_2014.pdf](http://web.undp.org/evaluation/documents/guidance/GEF/mid-term/Guidance_MidtermReview_EN_2014.pdf)).

## 2. PROJECT BACKGROUND INFORMATION

The UNDP-GEF project, “Integrated Sustainable Transport for Batumi City and the Achara Region” (ISTBAR or Project) seeks to ensure that urban development in Georgia takes place with a green approach or in an environmentally sustainable manner. In particular, the Project is focusing on the transport sector, a priority sector of the Government of Georgia where GHG emissions are continuously rising. As Georgia’s leading tourist destination located on the Black Sea, the City of Batumi also has a strong interest in sustainable transport. Batumi has been chosen as the main partner for this Project due to its high level of GHG emissions from the transport sector, the active involvement of the city administration in green urban development, and the willingness and ability of the City to provide co-financing for full implementation.

The objective of this Project aside from assisting Batumi adopt a green approach to urban development, is to directly generate GHG reductions from sustainable urban transport demonstrations in Batumi and indirectly generate GHG reductions from regional and national policies on the urban transport that have been informed through the demonstration projects in Batumi.

The key to meeting this objective for Batumi is to holistically plan and implement number of sustainable transport measures centered in the old city where there will be higher visibility of such efforts. This heightened visibility will inform other municipalities of the Achara Region as well as other cities of Georgia on how to successfully reduce the carbon intensity of urban transport. Prior to implementing a pilot demonstration on sustainable urban transport measures, the Project will need to support the formulation of an integrated sustainable urban transport plan (ISUTP). The key to successfully implementing an ISUTP is careful preparation that adopts a holistic approach to all modes of urban transport that assesses their impacts on the City and determines their feasibility as an integrated urban transport system.

This objective will be met through addressing four main components of the project:

- i. The Integrated Sustainable Urban Transport Plans adopted in Batumi and the Ajara Autonomous Republic.
- ii. Feasibility studies and functional plans developed to reduce carbon intensity of urban transport.
- iii. Sustainable urban transport measures implemented along a selected corridor in the City of Batumi.
- iv. Feasibility studies and functional plans developed in other municipalities of the Ajara Autonomous Republic.

Total budget of the project is 1,133,000 USD. 853,000 USD from GEF and additional input of 280,000 USD from UNDP Georgia.

### **3. 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 over the remainder of the project lifetime. The MTR will also review the project's strategy, its risks to sustainability. The main output of the MTR will be specific recommendations for adaptive management to improve the project over the second half of its lifetime.

### **4. MTR APPROACH AND METHODOLOGY**

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

The MTR team is expected to follow a collaborative and participatory approach<sup>19</sup> 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.<sup>20</sup> Stakeholder involvement should include interviews with stakeholders who have project responsibilities, including but not limited to: UNDP, Project Manager and project team, International Chief Technical Adviser (International Consultant on Sustainable Transport), UNDP Georgia staff, UNDP Regional Technical Adviser on Climate Change Mitigation, executing agency, senior officials, key experts and consultants, Project Steering Committee (Board) members, project stakeholders, academia, Achara region and local government and CSOs, partner organizations and entities, etc. MTR team is expected to conduct mission to Batumi and Tbilisi.

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.

### **5. DETAILED SCOPE OF THE MTR**

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

---

<sup>19</sup> For ideas on innovative and participatory Monitoring and Evaluation strategies and techniques, see UNDP Discussion Paper: Innovations in Monitoring & Evaluating Results, 05 Nov 2013.

<sup>20</sup> For more stakeholder engagement in the M&E process, see the UNDP Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results, Chapter 3, pg. 93.

## 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, considered 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?
- Is the project on track to achieve its global environmental benefits in terms of tones of CO<sub>2</sub> to be reduced (direct and indirect GHG emissions) as defined in the project document?
- 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)

For table, please see: *Guidance for Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects*, 2013.

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 the 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 has worked with UNDP Georgia and UNDP Istanbul Regional Hub in identifying and implementing adaptive management measures
- 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 the light of the findings.<sup>21</sup>
- Recommendations should be succinct suggestions for critical intervention that are specific, measurable, achievable, and relevant. A recommendation table should be put in the report’s executive summary. See the Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF- Financed Projects for guidance on a recommendation table.
- The MTR team should make no more than 15 recommendations total.

#### Ratings

The MTR team will include its ratings of the project’s results and brief descriptions of the associated achievements in a MTR Ratings & Achievement Summary Table in the Executive Summary of the MTR report. See Annex E for ratings scales. No overall project rating is required but it is optional.

Table. MTR Ratings & Achievement Summary Table for UNDP-GEF Project “Green Cities: Integrated Sustainable Urban Transport for the City of Batumi and the Achara Region, ISTBAR”

For table, please see: *Guidance for Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects*, 2013.

### 6. TIMEFRAME (SCHEDULE OF WORK)

The total duration of the MTR will be approximately 20 working days over a time period of 4 months from 1st September 2017 to 30 November 2017. The 20 working days is broken down into 11 home based days, 7 days on mission in Georgia, and 2 travel days. The tentative MTR timeframe is as follows:

TIMEFRAME	ACTIVITY
30-04-2017	Application closes
01-06-2017	Select MTR Team
01-08-2017	Prep the MTR Team (handover of Project Documents)
01-08-2017 to 05-08-2017	2 days Document review and preparing MTR Inception Report
06-08-2017 to 31-08-2017	1 day Finalization and Validation of MTR Inception Report- prior to start of MTR mission
03-09-2017	1 day Travel Day
04-09-2017 to 12-09-2017	7 days MTR mission: stakeholder meetings in Batumi and Tbilisi, interviews, field visits

<sup>21</sup> Alternatively, MTR conclusions may be integrated into the body of the report.

12-09-2017	1 day	Mission wrap-up meeting & presentation of initial findings-earliest end of MTR mission
13-09-2017	Travel Day	
14-09-2017 to 31-09-2017	5 days	Preparing draft report, feedback/comments from UNDP
01-10-17 to 22-10-17	1 day	Incorporating audit trail from feedback on draft report/Finalization of MTR report (note: accommodate time delay in dates for circulation and review of the draft report)
06-11-17	1 day	Preparation in discussion related to the Management Response
30-11-17	1 day	Expected date of full MTR completion

The dates for the 7-working days mission to Georgia may be changed by mutual agreement between the international consultant and the project manager at the start of the assignment but it should be carried out prior to the end of September 2017.

## 7. 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	MTR team submits to the Commissioning Unit and project management
2	Presentation	Initial Findings	End of MTR mission	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	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	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.

## 8. MTR ARRANGEMENTS

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

The commissioning unit will contract the consultants. The Project Team will be responsible for liaising with the MTR team to provide all relevant background documents and logistics support during the mission.

## 9. TEAM COMPOSITION, QUALIFICATION AND EXPERIENCE REQUIREMENTS

Team Composition and Consultant Independence:

A team of two independent consultants will conduct the MTR - one team leader (with experience and exposure to projects and evaluations in Europe & CIS region and/or other regions globally) and one national team expert, usually from the country of the project who will support the international consultant provide a stocktaking report of all the work that the project has undertaken to date. 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.

The overall responsibility of the Team Leader will be to produce inception, draft and final reports. S/he will lead and coordinate the work of the MTR team and be responsible for the quality assurance of all deliverables. The Team Leader provides guidance, technical support and oversight to the MTR team members throughout the period, especially in ensuring agreed upon methodologies, field research and writing of assigned sections of the report before the deadline.

Qualifications and competencies required for Team Leader (technical qualifications and experience: sub-total of 70%):

Education:

- At least Master's or equivalent degree in urban transport, urban studies, civil engineering, environment, engineering or related field, PhD will be an asset.

Experience:

- Minimum 10 years of progressive experience in urban transport planning and development, urban planning and development, civil engineering, energy, environment, engineering and in addition experience related to climate change mitigation projects (minimum qualification requirement)
- Minimum 5 years of experience with results-based management evaluation methodologies (minimum qualification requirement)
- Proven experience applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios (minimum qualification requirement)
- Experience in working with the GEF or GEF-evaluations will be a strong advantage;
- Prior knowledge and experience of the political, social and environmental factors and issues related to urban transport planning and management in Georgia will be a strong advantage but not required.
- Experience working on urban transport planning and development, urban planning and development, civil engineering, energy, environment, engineering issues in the Eastern Europe & CIS will be a strong advantage
- Project evaluation / review experience within UN system will be an asset

Language:

- Fluency in English

Core Competencies

- Extensive knowledge in at least two of the following fields: climate change mitigation, green urban development, sustainable urban transport, civil engineering of which one of these fields must include sustainable urban transport.
- Proven ability to interact with and relate to people at all levels and in the field working conditions with different stakeholders
- Proven ability to i) work flexibly and independently with limited supervision and deliver quality results against tight deadlines; and ii) supervise a small team at a distance
- Proven ability to work in a complex environment with different national and international experts/consultants
- Excellent communication skills both in written and oral, cultural sensitivity
- Fluency in English. Excellent writing skills in English
- E-literacy

Functional Competencies

- Strong analytical and writing skills;



- Strong planning, communication, research and analytical skills. Up-to-date knowledge of urban transport area management
- Ability to communicate effectively

Corporate Competencies:

- Displays cultural, gender, religion, race, nationality and age sensitivity and adaptability;
- Highest standards of integrity, discretion and loyalty.

## 10. PAYMENT MODALITIES AND SPECIFICATION

Instalment	Milestone
15 % of total consultancy fee upon approval of the final MTR Inception Report and submission of related invoice and prior to the first mission to Georgia	
35% of total consultancy fee upon submission of the draft MTR report and submission of related invoice and after the first mission to Georgia	
50% of total consultancy fee upon finalization of the MTR report and submission of related invoice	

## 11. APPLICATION PROCESS

Recommended Presentation of Proposal:

- CV and a Personal History Form (P11 form);
- Letter of motivation/interest describing 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 to be sent to the following email: To: lasha.nakashidze@undp.org; Cc: Guranda.kartvelisvhili@undp.org

## 12. EVALUATION

Criteria for Evaluation of Proposals:

Only those applications which are responsive and compliant will be evaluated.

Offers will be evaluated according to the Combined 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. Total scoring will be calculated from technical scores (70%) (70%) (including desk review – 50% and an interview – 20%) + financial scores (30%).

Offerors passing 70% threshold of maximum obtainable scores 50 points as a result of the desk review (criteria 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7), i.e. obtaining minimum 35 points, will be short listed and invited for an interview. Those offerors passing 70% threshold of maximum obtainable scores i.e. obtaining minimum 49 points as a result of the technical evaluation (desk review and interview) will be shortlisted and requested to provide financial proposal.

The applicant receiving the Highest Combined Score that has also accepted UNDP's General Terms and Conditions will be awarded the contract.

The following criteria will be rated as indicated below:

Evaluation Criteria	Points Obtainable
Technical Evaluation Criteria	50

1. Master's or equivalent degree in urban transport, urban studies, civil engineering, environment, engineering or related field, (minimum qualification requirement). Master's degree or equivalent related to urban transport, urban studies, civil engineering, environment, engineering or related field - 8 points. PhD related to urban transport, urban studies, civil engineering, environment, engineering or related field – 10 points
2. Minimum 10 years of progressive experience in urban transport planning and development, urban planning and development, civil engineering, energy, environment, engineering and in addition experience related to climate change mitigation projects (minimum qualification requirement). 10 years – 5 points; 11 and more – 10 points. Minimum 5 years of experience with results-based management evaluation methodologies (minimum qualification requirement) 5 points.
3. Experience with applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios (minimum qualification requirement) 5 points
4. Project evaluation/review experiences within United Nations system will be considered an asset - 5 points.
5. Prior knowledge and experience of the political, social and environmental factors and issues related to urban transport planning and management in Georgia will be a strong advantage but not required. 5 points.
6. Experience working with the GEF or GEF project evaluation will be a strong advantage and is preferred but not required. 5 points
7. Experience working on urban transport planning and development, urban planning and development, civil engineering, energy, environment, engineering issues in the Eastern Europe & CIS will be a strong advantage. 5 points
8. Interview - 20 points
9. Financial Proposal 30 points

Maximum available technical (education, experience and competencies) score – 70 points.

Maximum available financial score – 30 points. The lowest financial offer from a technically compliant offer will score 30 points and all other technically compliant offers will score a percentage of 30 points based on the formula of lowest financial offer divided by financial offer of the applicant x 100 x 30%.

### **13. ANNEXES TO MTR TOR**

ANNEX A. List of documents to be reviewed by the MTR Team

ANNEX B. Guidelines on Contents for the Midterm Review Report

ANNEX C. Midterm Review Evaluative Matrix Template

ANNEX D. UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluators/Midterm Review Consultants

ANNEX E. MTR Required Ratings Table and Ratings Scales

ANNEX F. MTR Report Clearance Form

ANNEX G. Financial Proposal template

Note: Per guidance, annexes to the TOR are not included here in this “TOR” annex to the MTR.