## UNDP-AF Midterm Evaluation

## 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: Seychelles**

**Application Deadline: 12th November 2017**

**Category:** Energy and Environment

**Type of Contract:** Individual Contract

**Assignment Type:** National Consultant

**Languages Required: English**

**Starting Date: 20th November 2017**

**Duration of Initial Contract: 20 Days over 11 weeks not exceeding 5 months**

**Expected Duration of Assignment: November 2017- April 2018**

**BACKGROUND**

**A. Project Title**

**Ecosystem-based Adaptation to Climate Change in Seychelles**

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

##### This is the Terms of Reference (ToR) for the UNDP-Adaptation Fund Midterm EvaluationE(MTE) of the project titled **Ecosystem-based Adaptation to Climate Change in Seychelles** (PIMS 4775) implemented through the Ministry of Environment, Energy and Climate Change, GOS-UNDP-GEF Programme Coordination Unit, which is to be undertaken in *October-February 2017*. The project started on the 4th June 2014 and it is in its *fourth* year of implementation. This ToR sets out the expectations for this MTE.

The project seeks to reduce the vulnerability of the Seychelles to climate change, focusing on two key issues—water scarcity and flooding. The climate change projections in the Seychelles show that rainfall, while increasing in overall terms, will become even more irregular. Much of the precipitation is falling in sharp bursts, creating heavy flooding in the wet season, while imposing extended period of drought during the dry season. As the country does not have a large water storage capacity, and the topography of the islands constrains such infrastructure, water supplies are heavily dependent on rainfall. Furthermore, the coastal zone is vulnerable to flooding as a consequence of rising sea surface levels, and increased storm surges from cyclonic activity in the Western Indian Ocean. The project will reduce these vulnerabilities by spearheading ecosystem-based adaptation as climate change risk management—restoring ecosystem functionality, and enhancing ecosystem resilience and sustaining watershed and coastal processes in order to secure critical water provisioning and flood attenuation ecosystem services from watersheds and coastal areas.

The project has three components:

**Component 1** aims to maintain and enhance upland wetlands in watersheds and strengthen the integrity of the forest landscape and the forest water provisioning services (through reforestation and removal of invasive alien species and re-colonize with native plants), retain and improve water holding capacity (and biodiversity features), improving run-of-river barrages and water control structures, sustainably managing watercourses and promoting local stewardship of watersheds. The watershed rehabilitation is being implemented in selected watersheds covering 1,800 ha on Mahe Island and about 1,200 hectares on Praslin Island.

**Component 2** aims to maintain and enhance tidal wetlands, beach berms and coral reef functions with EbA measures that include (a) selective shoreline re-vegetation and protection, (b) wetland enhancement and improvement of tidal exchange, (c) coral reef rehabilitation, enhancement and protection to enhance their climate change adaptation role in flood attenuation, and (d) measures that address saltwater intrusion effects on low lying agricultural areas focusing strategically on sites with high vulnerability to climate change (assets at risk). The interventions focus on two priority sites where coastal development, erosion and climate change have diminished the natural coastal defenses and opportunities exist to strengthen the ecosystem attributes and processes. These physical measures are complemented with policy, legal and institutional capacity development support measures in Component 3. The coastal rehabilitation is being implemented at two sites covering an impact area of about 1,000 ha.

**Component 3** aims to develop the policy framework for watershed management which is needed to support EbA measures to address water scarcity and flooding problems, and to increase the capacity to respond to climate change through watershed and coastal management. It is generating appropriate legislation, regulations, standards and guidelines for watershed and coastal protection, and training government, university faculty and NGO staff in applying EbA measures in development decision making in the Seychelles, influencing watershed and coastal management throughout the Mahe and Praslin Islands (covering approximately 20,000 hectares). This component increases the awareness, skills and responsibilities of a wide range of stakeholders including district authorities and community organisations in ecosystem-based adaptation for watersheds and coastal areas, and builds the lasting basis for further education, training and application in watershed and coastal ecosystem rehabilitation.

The underlying principle of the project is that healthy ecosystems can play a vital role in maintaining and increasing resilience to climate change and in reducing climate-related risk and vulnerability. The project invests in measures to restore ecosystem functionality, building on techniques that have been piloted in Seychelles, and adapting these by incorporating other good practices. Ecosystem based adaptation is being integrated into the country’s development planning, policy and land and water management systems – through this project and three other EBA projects running concurrently - ensuring that environmental impact assessments and management measures protect these ecosystem services.

The project is for six years (2014-2020). It has a budget from Adaptation Fund of US$ 5,950,000. The project is managed by the GOS-UNDP-GEF Programme Coordination Unit (PCU) of the Ministry of Environment, Energy and Climate Change (MEECC).

**DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES**

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

The MTE team will consist of two independent consultants that will conduct the MTE - one team leader (with experience and exposure to projects and evaluations in other regions globally) and one team expert from the country of the project.

The MTE team will first conduct a document review of project documents (i.e. AF Concept, AF Proposal, , UNDP Initiation Plan, Project Document, ESSP, Project Inception Report, PPRs, Finalized AF 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 MTE inception workshop to clarify their understanding of the objectives and methods of the MTE, producing the MTE inception report thereafter. The MTE mission will then consist of interviews and site visits to (Baie Lazare, Mare aux Cochons and Praslin sites).

The MTE team will assess the following four categories of project progress and produce a draft and final MTE report. 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. 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.
* 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.
1. **Progress Towards Results**
* Review the logframe indicators against progress made towards the end-of-project targets using the Progress Towards Results Matrix; 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[[2]](#footnote-2)** | **Baseline Level[[3]](#footnote-3)** | **Level in 1st PIR (self- reported)** | **Midterm Target[[4]](#footnote-4)** | **End-of-project Target** | **Midterm Level & Assessment[[5]](#footnote-5)** | **Achievement Rating[[6]](#footnote-6)** | **Justification for Rating**  |
| **Objective:**  | Indicator 1-3: |  |  | n/a |  |  |  |  |
| **Outcome 1:** | Indicator 4-12: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Etc. |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Outcome 2:** | Indicator 13-17: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 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 AF Tracking Tool at the Baseline with the one completed right before the Midterm Evaluation.
* 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**

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 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 AF reporting requirements (i.e. how have they addressed poorly-rated PPRs, 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.
1. **Sustainability**
* Validate whether the risks identified in the Project Document, PPRs 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 AF 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?
* Institutional framework and governance risks to sustainability
* Environmental risks to sustainability
1. **Conclusions & Recommendations**

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

Additionally, the MTE 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 MTE consultant/team should make no more than 15 recommendations total.

1. **Ratings**

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

Table. MTE Ratings & Achievement Summary Table for EBA project

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Measure** | **MTE 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) |  |
| **Project Implementation & Adaptive Management** | (rate 6 pt. scale) |  |
| **Sustainability** | (rate 4 pt. scale) |  |

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

The MTE consultant/team shall prepare and submit:

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

\*The final MTE 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.

*Please see Section F on duration of work and estimated timelines*

**E. Institutional Arrangement**

The principal responsibility for managing this MTE resides with the Commissioning Unit. The Commissioning Unit for this project’s MTE is UNDP Seychelles Unit.

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

**F. Duration of the Work**

The total duration of the MTE will be approximately *11 weeks* starting 20th *November 2017* and shall not exceed five months from when the consultant(s) are hired. The tentative MTE timeframe is as follows:

* *12th November 2017:* Application closes
* *15th November 2017 :* Selection of MTE Team
* *20th November 2017:* Prep the MTE Team (handover of project documents)
* *27-29th November 2017 (2 days):* Document review and preparing MTE Inception Report
* *14th-15th December 2017 (1days):* Finalization andValidation of MTE Inception Report- latest start of MTE mission
* *7th-2OTh January 2018 (14 days):* MTE mission: stakeholder meetings, interviews, field visits
* *19th January 2018:* Mission wrap-up meeting & presentation of initial findings- earliest end of MTE mission
* *2nd Feb 2018 (7 days):* Preparing draft report
* *16th February 2018 (2 days)* Incorporating audit trail on draft report/Finalization of MTE report
* *23RD February 2018:* Preparation & Issue of Management Response
* *(date):* (optional)Concluding Stakeholder Workshop (not mandatory for MTE team)
* *16TH March 2018* Expected date of full MTE completion

The date start of contract is 20th November 2017.

**G. Duty Station**

All related travel expenses will be covered and will be reimbursed as per UNDP rules and regulations. All proposals should make provisions for all travel related expenses. Local transportation will only be provided by the project for meetings and travel to other islands.

The consultant’s duty station (home-based) and in country (Seychelles) location will be applicable 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 Seychelles during the MTE 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/>

**H. Team Composition**

One international and one national independent consultant will conduct the MTE – one international team leader (with experience and exposure to projects and evaluations in other regions globally) and one national expert (with experience in the local environmental policy environment and in EBA methodology generally). 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 selection of consultants will be aimed at maximizing the qualifications in the below areas. 70% of points will be awarded for the technical qualifications and 30% for the financial bid.

International consultant (team leader):

* Recent experience with result-based management evaluation methodologies;
* Experience applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios;
* Competence in adaptive management
* Experience working with the Donor project evaluations;
* Experience working with AF evaluations;
* Experience working in SIDS, preferably in the Western Indian Ocean;
* Work experience in relevant technical areas for at least 10 years;
* Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender and environmental management; 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 Environmental Management, or other closely related field.

National consultant (environment expert)

* At least 10 years’ experience in environmental management in Seychelles, with particular knowledge of environmental policy and practice;
* Demonstrated understanding of ecosystem-based adaptation approaches;
* Excellent communication skills;
* Demonstrable analytical skills;
* Project evaluation/review experiences within United Nations system will be considered an asset;
* A Master’s degree in Environment, or other closely related field, is desirable.

The selection of consultants will be aimed at maximizing the overall “team” qualities in the following areas: *(give a weight to all these qualifications so applicants know what is the max amount of points they can earn for the technical evaluation)*

**Evaluation Criteria.**

**The CVs/proposal will be evaluated based on the following Criteria.**

* **EDUCATION:**  A Master’s degree in Environmental Sciences, or other closely related field. (15)
* **EXPERIENCE**: Experience applying SMART targets and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios; Competence in adaptive management, as applied to climate change mitigation/environment; (30)
* Recent experience with result-based management evaluation methodologies; Experience working with the AF, GEF or GEF-evaluations, AF evaluations; Project evaluation/review experiences within United Nations system will be considered an asset; (25)
* **ANALYTICAL AND STAKEHOLDER SKILLS** :Ability to work in a multi-stakeholder environment; (10)
* Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender and Environment/Climate change experience in gender sensitive evaluation and analysis; (10)
* **REPORTING AND LANGUAGE SKILLS** :Excellent communication skills/ Fluency in English;(10)

***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 $303, 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 MTE Inception Report

30% upon submission of the draft MTE Report

60% upon finalization of the MTE Report

**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 and 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.

Candidates scoring 70% or above in the Technical Evaluation will be considered for the Financial Proposal.

**L. Annexes to the MTE ToR**

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

1. Project concept
2. UNDP Initiation Plan
3. UNDP Project Document
4. UNDP Environmental and Social Screening results
5. Project Inception Report
6. All Project Progress (Performance) Reports (PPR’s)
7. Quarterly progress reports and work plans of the implementation task team
8. Audit reports
9. Oversight mission reports
10. All monitoring reports prepared by the project
11. Financial and Administration guidelines used by Project Team
12. Technical reports

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 EBA Project Steering Committee Meetings and other meetings (i.e. Project Appraisal Committee meetings)
4. Project site location maps
5. Documentation related to three other on-going EBA projects in Seychelles: EBA South-South project (GEF funded), GCCA+ project (EU funded), EBA coastal adaptation project (UNEP).

**ToR ANNEX B: Guidelines on Contents for the Midterm Review Report**[[7]](#footnote-7)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **i.** | Basic Report Information *(for opening page or title page)** Title of UNDP supported AF financed project
* UNDP PIMS# and AF project ID#
* MTE time frame and date of MTE report
* Region and countries included in the project
* Executing Agency/Implementing Partner and other project partners
* MTE 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)
* MTE Ratings & Achievement Summary Table
* Concise summary of conclusions
* Recommendation Summary Table
 |
| **2.** | Introduction *(2-3 pages)** Purpose of the MTE and objectives
* Scope & Methodology: principles of design and execution of the MTE, MTE approach and data collection methods, limitations to the MTE
* Structure of the MTE 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 MTE’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* MTE ToR (excluding ToR annexes)
* MTE evaluative matrix (evaluation criteria with key questions, indicators, sources of data, and methodology)
* Example Questionnaire or Interview Guide used for data collection
* Ratings Scales
* MTE 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 MTE final report clearance form
* *Annexed in a separate file:* Audit trail from received comments on draft MTE report
* *Annexed in a separate file: Relevant midterm tracking tools (METT, FSC, Capacity scorecard, etc.)*
 |

**This TOR is approved by** : Roland Alcindor

Signature 

Date of Signing 1st November 2017

**ToR ANNEX C:**

**UNDP-GEF Midterm Review Terms of Reference ANNEX D: UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluators/Midterm Review Consultants[[8]](#footnote-8)**

**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.

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

**MTE 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 E:**

**SAMPLE MTE Evaluative Matrix**

*(Note: This is a sample matrix. This matrix should be completed by the CO and/or Project Team based on the particulars of the project)*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **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?**  |
| To what extent are lessons from other relevant projects incorporated into the project design? | Lessons learned identified and appearing in project documents.  | Project documents; UNDP CO  | Document analysis |
| To what extent does the project address country priorities and is country-driven? Is the project concept in line with national development priorities and plans of the country (or of participating countries in the case of multi-country projects)? | Policy, legislation and safeguard analyses | Project documents; UNDP documents; Government documents; Inception report | Document analysis |
| Were stakeholders thoroughly consulted? | Stakeholder analysis | Project documents; stakeholders | Document analysis; Stakeholder consultation |
| How well are gender issues identified and addressed? | Gender strategies | Project documents | Document analysis |
| How thoroughly were environmental and social risks – including externalities – identified, and addressed with mitigation strategies?  | Risk management strategies; Sustainability plan | Project documents | Document analysis |
| **Progress Towards Results: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved thus far?** |
| By each Outcome, to what progress has been made towards the Mid-Term target? | Progress towards project indicators  | Project documents; Project Annual & Quarterly Reports; APRs; PIRs; GEF Tracking Tool; Stakeholders in Project Team and implementing partners | Document analysis; Stakeholder consultation; Site visits |
| What are the reasons for success in reaching/ exceeding Mid-Term targets? What are the reasons/ challenges in slower-than-expected progress? | Candid and useful project commentaries | Project Annual & Quarterly Reports; APRs/ PIRs; GEF TT; Stakeholders in Project Team and implementing partners | Document analysis; Stakeholder consultation; Site visits |
| **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?** |
| **Management arrangements** |
| How do current management arrangements compare with those originally outlined? Have changes been made and are they effective? Are reporting and responsibility lines clear? Is decision-making transparent and timely? | Clear and effective project implementation manual, management arrangements | Project documents; Project Annual & Quarterly Reports; UNDP/ Project team  | Document analysis; Stakeholder consultation |
| Is there appropriate focus on results, by Partner Agency and Implementing Partner? Is reporting candid and realistic?  | Results-based, cogent reporting by UNDP and BEDO | Project documents; Project Annual & Quarterly Reports | Document analysis |
| Is technical support by UNDP and consultants to Implementing Partner adequate?  | Form and results of support provided  | Project Annual & Quarterly Reports; APRs/ PIRs; Stakeholders | Document analysis; Stakeholder consultation |
| Are risks to progress – environmental, social, administrative – identified and mitigated in a timely manner? | Risk management approaches and outcomes | Project Annual & Quarterly Reports; APRs/ PIRs | Document analysis |
| **Work planning** |
| Were there any delays in project implementation" If so, what were the reasons and have they been solved? | Achievement of project implementation milestones | Project Annual & Quarterly Reports | Document analysis; Stakeholder consultation |
| Are work-planning processes results-based? How is the Results Framework used as a management tool, (including any changes made)?  | Quality of work planning; "Correct" Results Framework  | Project documents; Results Framework; Project Annual & Quarterly Reports; APR/s PIRs | Document analysis; Stakeholder consultation |
| **Finance and co-finance** |
| Are financial controls, allowing transparent decision-making and timely flow of funds, well established? | Effectiveness of financial controls | Inception Report; Project Annual & Quarterly Reports; Audit reports | Document analysis; Stakeholder consultation |
| Are funds well-managed? Have there been any well-justified budget revisions, based on evidence from reporting? | Effectiveness, efficiency of financial management | Project Annual & Quarterly Reports; Audit reports; Project Team | Document analysis; Stakeholder consultation |
| What co-financing has been mobilised since inception, and what (if any) additional funds have been leveraged? | Co-financing sustained and extended | Project documents; Project Annual & Quarterly Reports; Project Team | Document analysis; Stakeholder consultation |
| **Project level Monitoring & Evaluation** |
| Has the M&E plan been appropriate, sufficiently funded and well-implemented? | Active implementation of M&E plan | Project documents; Inception Report; Project Annual & Quarterly Reports | Document analysis; Stakeholder consultation |
| Has adaptive management been implemented in response to PIRs?  | Adaptive management applied | Project Annual & Quarterly Reports; APR/s PIRs; Project Team  | Document analysis; Stakeholder consultation |
| Are monitoring tools and systems relevant, cost-effective and inclusive of stakeholder concerns?  | Monitoring tools developed and in use | Project Annual & Quarterly Reports; Project Team; Stakeholders | Document analysis; Stakeholder consultation |
| Are risks identified and managed via the M&E system? | Risks identified and mitigated | Project Annual & Quarterly Reports; APR/s PIRs; Project Team | Document analysis; Stakeholder consultation |
| **Stakeholder engagement** |
| Has the project engaged local and national stakeholders effectively in support of project objectives and sustainability?  | Stakeholders at different levels engaged | Project Team; Stakeholders | Stakeholder consultation; Site visits |
| **Reporting** |
| How has adaptive management been reported by the Project Team and shared with the Project Board? How have any lessons from adaptive management been documented and incorporated into project management?  | Regular reporting to Project Board, used for decision-making | Project Annual Reports; Minutes of Project Board meetings; Project Board members | Document analysis; Stakeholder consultation |
| How well does the Project Team fulfil GEF reporting requirements? | GEF reporting requirements satisfied | APRs/PIRs; UNDP CO | Document analysis; Stakeholder consultation |
| **Communication** |
| Is internal and external communication with project and national stakeholders regular and effective? Does this communication contribute to sustainability?  | Communications by project active and engaging  | Communication material; Stakeholder reports | Document analysis; Stakeholder consultation |
| Are there ways to extend the communication aspects of the project? | Communication strategy in place | Project documents; Project Team  | Document analysis; Stakeholder consultation |
| **Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, socio-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?** |
| What risks or opportunities are there for financial sustainability once GEF financing ends? Are there plans, or steps taken, for establishing mechanisms for financial sustainability?  | Financial sustainability plans and actions | Project documents; Project Team  | Document analysis; Stakeholder consultation |
| What are the social or political risks to stakeholder ownership allowing sustainability of project outcomes? Are the project's successful aspects being transferred to appropriate parties for replication or scaling up? | Social and political risk mitigation strategy, with actions taken | Project documents; Project Team  | Document analysis; Stakeholder consultation |
| Are there institutional or governance structures or processes that pose risks to sustainability of project outcomes, or is the project putting such structures/ processes into place to encourage sustainability?  | Institutional sustainability plans and actions | Project documents; Project Team  | Document analysis; Stakeholder consultation |
| Has the project developed appropriate institutional capacity that will be self-sufficient after the End of Project date? Has the project identified "champions" in government or civil society who will promote sustainability of outcomes?  | Institutional capacity built and/or identified and encouraged.  | Project documents; Project Annual & Quarterly Reports; Project Team; Stakeholders in government and local areas  | Document analysis; Stakeholder consultation; Site visits |
| Does the project have a Theory of Change and/ or a sustainability strategy? | Theory of Change; Sustainability strategy developed | Project documents; Project Team | Document analysis; Stakeholder consultation |

**ToR ANNEX F:**

**MTE Report Clearance Form**

*(to be completed by the Commissioning Unit and RTA and annexed to the final report)*

**Midterm Review Report Reviewed and Cleared By:**

**Commissioning Unit**

Name: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Advisor**

Name: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**ToR ANNEX G:**

## UNDP-AF MTE Report Audit Trail Template

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

**To the comments received on (*date*) from the Midterm Evaluation of (*project name*) (UNDP Project**

**ID-*PIMS #)***

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

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

1. https://jobs.undp.org/ [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Populate with data from the Logframe and scorecards [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Populate with data from the Project Document [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. If available [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. Colour code this column only [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. Use the 6 point Progress Towards Results Rating Scale: HS, S, MS, MU, U, HU [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. The Report length should not exceed *40* pages in total (not including annexes). [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. [www.undp.org/unegcodeofconduct](http://www.undp.org/unegcodeofconduct) [↑](#footnote-ref-8)