Terms of Reference for Project-level Midterm Reviews, Terminal Evaluations and a Protected Areas Thematic Learning Review for the UNDP-Global Environmental Finance Unit

INTRODUCTION

As an implementing agency of the Global Environment Facility (GEF), UNDP oversees a portfolio of projects in the Focal Areas of biodiversity, climate change, international waters, ozone-depleting substance phase-out, land degradation, and persistent organic pollutants. These are implemented through UNDP’s network of more than 130 Country Offices located in developing countries, as well as numerous UN and other agency partners.

UNDP’s work in Ecosystems and Biodiversity has as an overall strategic objective to maintain and enhance the goods and services provided by biodiversity and ecosystems in order to secure livelihoods, food, water and health, enhance resilience, conserve threatened species and their habitats, and increase carbon storage and sequestration. The value of all UNDP-managed biodiversity and ecosystems projects currently in planning or under implementation is US$1.6 billion, with UNDP supporting 132 countries to access Global Environment Facility (GEF) and other vertical funds’ grant finance. Through this project portfolio UNDP provides support to work in three programming areas: (i) Integrating biodiversity and ecosystem management into development planning and production sector activities; (ii) Unlocking the potential of protected areas, including indigenous and community-conserved areas to contribute towards sustainable development; and, (iii) Managing and rehabilitating ecosystems for climate change adaptation and mitigation.

In accordance with UNDP and GEF M&E policies and procedures, all full and medium-sized UNDP supported GEF financed projects are required to undergo a Terminal Evaluation (TE) upon completion of implementation. All full-sized UNDP supported GEF financed projects are also required to undergo a Midterm Review (MTR) at the midpoint of implementation.

The UNDP Global Environmental Finance (UNDP-GEF) Unit is seeking the services of international consultants to work as part of a team that will undertake MTRs and or TEs of selected protected area projects, and contribute to the development of a Thematic Learning Review based on the findings of the MTR/TE reports, as well as existing MTR/TE Reports that have already been completed. One of these consultants will serve as the overall Team Leader, and will have additional responsibilities, which are detailed later in this Terms of Reference.

Although each consultant will undertake their designated evaluations independently, they will work as part of a coordinated approach. Cross-fertilization and joint learning between individual evaluation exercises will be facilitated by the Team Leader, culminating in a wider protected area portfolio review, and the production of a knowledge management product, and associated materials, that will be widely disseminated to support future project/programme design and implementation by UNDP and beyond.

The services of up to 7 evaluation specialists are sought to form a team to collectively undertake up to 25 TEs/MTRs across all regions from the list provided in Annex 1, as well as contributing to the thematic portfolio-wide review based on the TEs/MTRs done for protected area projects under GEF-3, 4 and 5, and the compilation of a thematic review report to be launched in October 2018.

Objective and scopE

1. **Project-level Terminal Evaluations**

In accordance with UNDP and GEF M&E policies and guidelines, GEF-financed projects are required to undergo a Terminal Evaluation (TE) when implementation has completed. This evaluation must follow detailed guidance outlined in the [*UNDP Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-supported GEF-financed Projects*](http://web.undp.org/evaluation/documents/guidance/GEF/UNDP-GEF-TE-Guide.pdf).

The objectives of the TE are to: assess the project design, implementation and achievement of project results; draw lessons that can both improve the sustainability of benefits from this project; and aid in the overall enhancement of UNDP programming.

For details on the scope of the TEs, please see Annex A1.

1. **Project-level Midterm Reviews**

In accordance with UNDP and GEF M&E policies and guidelines, some GEF-financed projects are required to undergo a Midterm Review (MTR) at the mid-point of project implementation. This review must follow detailed guidance outlined in the [*UNDP 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).

The objectives of the MTR are to: 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.

For details on the scope of the MTRs, please see Annex B2.

1. **Thematic Learning Review on Protected Areas**

To distill learning across a number of MTRs/TEs, the team of consultants will contribute to and collaborate on a *Thematic Learning Review* in conjunction with selected MTR/TE assignments. The Review, which will be coordinated by the Team Leader, will focus on a collection of GEF-financed protected area projects under the GEF-3, 4 and 5 funding cycles, including, but not limited to those projects that undergo an MTR/TE as part of this contract. Thus, in addition to delivering the standard MTR/TE reports required for adaptive management and accountability purposes, the consultants will contribute to delivery of a Thematic Learning Review report for publication in September 2018, and to be launched in October 2018 at the CBD COP 14 in Egypt.

The Thematic Review will be based on a review framework developed and agreed to at the beginning of the assignment. The report will include an in-depth exploration of themes (to be identified by the team) that advance understanding of solutions that have worked or not worked within the UNDP-GEF protected areas portfolio of projects, so as to improve the design and implementation of ongoing and/or future projects.

Implementation arrangements

The principal responsibility for managing these MTRs/TEs and the Thematic Learning Review resides with the UNDP-GEF Unit in New York *.* The UNDP-GEF Unit will contract and manage the consultants, and the UNDP Country Offices will ensure the timely provision of per diems and travel arrangements within the country/ies for the evaluation team. The Project Teams will be responsible for liaising with the consultant teams to set up stakeholder interviews, arrange field visits, coordinate with the government, etc.

timeframe

The overall duration of service for the selected Team Leader will be approximately 172 days, including at least one specific project MTR/TE.

The overall duration for all other contributors will be between 64 – 192 days depending on the number of project evaluations the consultant will undertake.

The timeframe for MTRs/TEs is from August 2017 – July 2018, with additional time inputs for contributing to the Thematic Learning Review extending up to September 2018. Time allocations are broken down as follows:

1. **Terminal Evaluations**

The total duration of each individual Terminal Evaluation will be approximately 32 days over a time period of 10-12 weeks according to the following plan:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Activity** | **Indicative Timing** |
| **Document Review and Preparation of TE Inception Report** | 4 days |
| **TE Mission** | 7-18 days |
| **Draft TE Report** | 5-8 days |
| **Final TE Report** | 3 days |
| **Thematic Review Participation per TE** | 3 days |

Note: The specific allocation of time spent in-country (i.e. the TE Mission) will vary between evaluations.

1. **Midterm Reviews**

The total duration of each individual Midterm Review will be approximately 32days over a time period of 10-12 weeksaccording to the following plan:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Activity** | **Indicative Timing** |
| **Document Review and Preparation of MTR Inception Report** | 4 days |
| **MTR Mission** | 7-18 days |
| **Draft MTR Report** | 5-8 days |
| **Final MTR Report** | 3 days |
| **Thematic Review Participation** | 3 days |

Note: The specific allocation of time spent in-country (i.e. the MTR Mission) will vary between evaluations.

1. **Thematic Learning Review on Protected Areas**

The Team Leader will have the primary role of coordinating the Thematic Learning Review, and compiling a report for publication, and developing a compendium of technical lessons learned that could be easily searched so that specific lessons could be included in future project design. The total duration of this component of the workwill be approximately *140* days over a time period of one yearaccording to the following plan:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Activity** | **Indicative Timing** | **Completion Date** |
| **Development of the thematic learning framework** based on desk review of relevant MTRs/TEs conducted since 2015 and current scientific literature | 6 days | September 2017 |
| **Draft Thematic Learning Review Report** (includes liaising with UNDP-GEF, consultants within the review team, other consultants, UNDP Country Offices, project team and publication designer) | 104 days | July 2018 |
| **Final Thematic Learning Review Report in publication format** with a compendium of technical lessons learned that could be easily searched so that specific lessons could be included in future project design. | 30 days | August 2018 |

Note: The Team Leader may be requested undertake up to two (2) TEs/MTRs, with additional days added for those evaluations, in time with the indicative timing indicated above.

deliverables

1. **Terminal Evaluations**

For each individual project-level Terminal Evaluation, the consultants are expected to deliver the following:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Terminal Evaluations | | | |
| Deliverable | Content | Timing | Responsibilities |
| **Inception Report** | Consultant provides clarifications on timing and method | No later than 2 weeks before the evaluation mission | Evaluator submits to UNDP-GEF Unit and UNDP CO |
| **Presentation** | Initial Findings | End of evaluation mission | To project management, UNDP-GEF Unit and UNDP CO |
| **Draft Final Report** | Full report, (per annexed template) with annexes | Within 3 weeks of the evaluation mission | Sent to UNDP-GEF Unit and UNDP CO, reviewed by CO, RTA, PCU, GEF OFPs |
| **Final Report\*** | Revised report | Within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft | Sent to UNDP-GEF Unit and UNDP CO; UNDP CO will upload to UNDP ERC. |

\*When submitting the final evaluation report, the evaluator is required also to provide an 'audit trail', detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final evaluation report. See Annex A8 for an audit trail template.

As part of the TE process, consultants will be required to gather information required for the Thematic Learning Review, according to the framework agreed to at the start of the process.

1. **Midterm Reviews**

For each individual project-level Midterm Review, the consultants are expected to deliver the following:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Midterm Reviews | | | |
| Deliverable | Content | Timing | Responsibilities |
| **Inception Report** | Consultant provides clarifications on timing and method | No later than 2 weeks before the MTR mission | Evaluator submits to UNDP-GEF Unit and UNDP CO |
| **Presentation** | Initial Findings | End of MTR mission | To project management, UNDP-GEF Unit and UNDP CO |
| **Draft Final Report** | Full report, (per annexed template) with annexes | Within 3 weeks of the evaluation mission | Sent to UNDP-GEF Unit and UNDP CO, reviewed by CO, RTA, PCU, GEF OFPs |
| **Final MTR Report\*\*** | Revised report | Within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft | Sent to UNDP-GEF Unit and UNDP CO; UNDP CO will upload to UNDP ERC. |

\*\*When submitting the final MTR report, the MTR team is required also to provide an 'audit trail', detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final MTR report. See Annex B9 for an audit trail template.

As part of the MTR process, consultants will be required to gather information required for the Thematic Learning Review, according to the framework agreed to at the start of the process.

1. **Thematic Learning Review**

For the Thematic Learning Review, the consultants are expected to deliver the following

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Thematic Learning Review  TEAM LEADER | |
| Deliverable | Timing |
| Development of thematic review framework, review questions, Thematic Learning Review report structure and detailed timeline | September 2017 |
| Coordinate, assign and manage tasks among the contributors; review the MTR/TEs already conducted for GEF 3,4 and 5 protected area projects | September 2017 – August 2018 |
| Compile inputs from contributors, and synthesize for the draft Thematic Learning Review report | October 2017 – July 2018 |
| Finalize full Thematic Learning Review report and a compendium of technical lessons learned that could be easily searched so that specific lessons could be included in future project design. | August 2018 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Thematic Learning Review  CONTRIBUTORS | |
| Deliverable | Timing |
| Contribute to development of thematic questions, Thematic Learning Review report structure and detailed timeline | September 2017 |
| Provide inputs to draft Thematic Learning Review report as assigned by Team Leader | November 2017 – March 2018 |
| Provide feedback on draft full Thematic Learning Review report | July 2018 |

Team Composition

The Team will be composed of senior consultants: one (1) Team Leader and up to six (6) contributors. For each individual MTR/TE, the senior consultant will be supported in-country by national evaluation consultant(s) hired by the UNDP Country Offices under a separate contract. The selected consultants should not have participated in the project preparation and/or implementation of particular projects they evaluate, and should not have conflict of interest with project related activities.

The Team members must present the following qualifications:

**Education**

* A Master’s degree or higher in sustainable development, environmental science, natural or social sciences, or other relevant field. [max. 10 points]

**Experience**

* Specialist technical knowledge in the field of biodiversity conservation and ecosystem management, in particular protected area system strengthening in relation to the 2030 Agenda. [max. 20 points]
* Leader must have:
  + At least ten (10) years of professional experience with applying results‐based monitoring and evaluation methodologies [max. 20 points];
  + Demonstrated capacity to co-ordinate a team, conduct the thematic review/research (and co-ordinate inputs of others into it) and compile a portfolio-level knowledge management products [max. 20 points];
* Contributors must have:
  + At least seven (7) years of professional experience with applying results‐based monitoring and evaluation methodologies [max. 20 points];
  + Experience as part of an evaluation team for at least two (2) Midterm Reviews and/or Terminal Evaluations of projects in the UNDP-GEF portfolio or of other environment-focused projects with sustainable development objectives in developing countries. [max. 20 points]

**Language**

* Proficient in written and spoken English. [max. 10 points]
* Knowledge of Spanish, Russian and French is a distinct asset. [max. 10 points]

ConSULTANT Ethics

Consultants will be held to the highest ethical standards and are required to sign a Code of Conduct (Annex A6 for TEs; Annex B6 for MTRs) upon acceptance of the assignment. UNDP evaluations are conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the [UNEG 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluations'](http://www.unevaluation.org/ethicalguidelines).

Payment modalities and specifications

Individual Terminal Evaluations and Midterm Reviews

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| % | Milestone |
| *10%* | At submission and approval of inception report |
| *40%* | Following submission and approval of the 1ST draft terminal evaluation report |
| *50%* | Following submission and approval (UNDP-CO and UNDP RTA) of the final terminal evaluation report |

Thematic Learning Review (Team Leader only)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| % | Milestone |
| *20%* | Submission and approval of the workplan, thematic review framework and publication outline |
| *20%* | Submission and approval of the report for TEs/MTRs already conducted for GEF 3,4 and 5 protected area projects |
| *40%* | Submission and approval of draft thematic report and a compendium of lessons and best practices |
| *20%* | Submission and approval of the final draft thematic report and a compendium of lessons and best practices |

**ANNEXES**

Annex 1: List of project with MTRs and TEs due in 2017

**TERMINAL EVALUATION ANNEXES:**

* Annex A1: Detailed Scope of Terminal Evaluation
* Annex A2: List of documents to be reviewed for the Terminal Evaluation
* Annex A3: Evaluation Report Outline
* Annex A4: Evaluation Questions
* Annex A5: Terminal Evaluation Ratings
* Annex A6: Evaluation Consultant Code of Conduct and Agreement Form
* Annex A7: Evaluation Report Clearance form
* Annex A8: Audit Trail template for Terminal Evaluation report

**MIDTERM REVIEW ANNEXES:**

* Annex B1: Midterm Review Approach and Methodology
* Annex B2: Detailed scope of Midterm Review
* Annex B3: List of documents to be reviewed for the Midterm Review
* Annex B4: Midterm Review Report Outline
* Annex B5: Midterm Review Evaluative Matrix Template
* Annex B6: Midterm Review Consultant Code of Conduct and Agreement Form
* Annex B7: Midterm Review Ratings
* Annex B8: Midterm Review Report Clearance Form
* Annex B9: Audit Trail Template for Midterm Review Report

**THEMATIC LEARNING REVIEW ANNEXES:**

* Annex C1:Initial Outline of the Thematic Review Report
* Annex C2: *Add as required*

**TERMINAL EVALUATION ANNEXES**

Annex A1: Detailed scope of terminal evaluation

An overall approach and method[[1]](#footnote-1) for conducting project terminal evaluations of UNDP supported GEF financed projects has developed over time. The evaluator is expected to frame the evaluation effort using the criteria of **relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and impact,** as defined and explained in the UNDP Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-supported, GEF-financed Projects. A set of questions covering each of these criteria have been drafted and are included with this TOR (*fill in Annex A4*) The evaluator is expected to amend, complete and submit this matrix as part of an evaluation inception report, and shall include it as an annex to the final report.

The evaluation must provide evidence‐based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The evaluator is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with government counterparts, in particular the GEF operational focal point, UNDP Country Office, project team, UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based in the region and key stakeholders. The evaluator is expected to conduct a field mission to (*location),* including the following project sites *(list).* Interviews will be held with the following organizations and individuals at a minimum: (*list key stakeholders*).

The evaluator will review all relevant sources of information, such as the project document, project reports – including Annual APR/PIR, project budget revisions, midterm review, progress reports, GEF focal area tracking tools, project files, national strategic and legal documents, and any other materials that the evaluator considers useful for this evidence-based assessment. A list of documents that the project team will provide to the evaluator for review is included in Annex A3 of this Terms of Reference.

EVALUATION CRITERIA AND RATINGS

An assessment of project performance will be carried out, based against expectations set out in the Project Logical Framework/Results Framework (see Annex A1), which provides performance and impact indicators for project implementation along with their corresponding means of verification. The evaluation will at a minimum cover the criteria of: **relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact.** Ratings must be provided on the following performance criteria. The completed table must be included in the evaluation executive summary. The obligatory rating scales are included in Annex A5.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Evaluation Ratings:** | | | |
| **1. Monitoring and Evaluation** | ***rating*** | **2. IA & EA Execution** | ***rating*** |
| M&E design at entry |  | Quality of UNDP Implementation – Implementing Agency (IA) |  |
| M&E Plan Implementation |  | Quality of Execution - Executing Agency (EA) |  |
| Overall quality of M&E |  | Overall quality of Implementation / Execution |  |
| **3. Assessment of Outcomes** | ***rating*** | **4. Sustainability** | ***rating*** |
| Relevance |  | Financial resources |  |
| Effectiveness |  | Socio-political |  |
| Efficiency |  | Institutional framework and governance |  |
| Overall Project Outcome Rating |  | Environmental |  |
|  |  | Overall likelihood of sustainability |  |

PROJECT FINANCE / CO FINANCE

The TEs will assess the key financial aspects of the project, including the extent of co-financing planned and realized. Project cost and funding data will be required, including annual expenditures. Variances between planned and actual expenditures will need to be assessed and explained. Results from recent financial audits, as available, should be taken into consideration. The evaluator(s) will receive assistance from the Country Office (CO) and Project Team to obtain financial data in order to complete the co-financing table below, which will be included in the terminal evaluation report.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Co-financing  (type/source) | UNDP own financing (mill. US$) | | Government  (mill. US$) | | Partner Agency  (mill. US$) | | Total  (mill. US$) | |
| Planned | Actual | Planned | Actual | Planned | Actual | Planned | Actual |
| Grants |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Loans/Concessions |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| * In-kind support |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| * Other |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Totals |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

MAINSTREAMING

UNDP supported GEF financed projects are key components in UNDP country programming, as well as regional and global programmes. The evaluation will assess the extent to which the project was successfully mainstreamed with other UNDP priorities, including poverty alleviation, improved governance, the prevention and recovery from natural disasters, and gender.

IMPACT

The consultants will assess the extent to which the project is achieving impacts or progressing towards the achievement of impacts. Key findings that should be brought out in the evaluations include whether the project has demonstrated: a) verifiable improvements in ecological status, b) verifiable reductions in stress on ecological systems, and/or c) demonstrated progress towards these impact achievements.[[2]](#footnote-2)

CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND LESSONS

The TE report must include a chapter providing a set of **conclusions**, **recommendations** and **lessons**. Conclusions should build on findings and be based in evidence. Recommendations should be prioritized, specific, relevant, and targeted, with suggested implementers of the recommendations. Lessons should have wider applicability to other initiatives across the region, the area of intervention, and for the future.

Annex A2: List of Documents to be reviewed by TerMINAL EVALUATION TEAMs

*(to be added, for example:)*

*GEF Project Information Form (PIF), Project Document, and Log Frame Analysis (LFA)*

*Project Implementation Plan*

*Implementing/Executing partner arrangements*

*List and contact details for project staff, key project stakeholders, including Project Boards, and other partners to be consulted*

*Project sites, highlighting suggested visits*

*Mid Term Review (MTR) Report*

*Annual Project Implementation (APR/PIR) Reports*

*Project budget and financial data*

*Project Tracking Tool, at baseline, at mid-term, and at terminal points*

*UNDP Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF)*

*UNDP Country Programme Document (CPD)*

*UNDP Country Programme Action Plan (CPAP)*

*GEF focal area strategic program objectives*

Annex A3: Evaluation Report Outline[[3]](#footnote-3)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **i.** | Opening page:   * Title of UNDP supported GEF financed project * UNDP and GEF project ID#s * Evaluation time frame and date of evaluation report * Region and countries included in the project * GEF Operational Program/Strategic Program * Implementing Partner and other project partners * Evaluation team members * Acknowledgements |
| **ii.** | Executive Summary   * Project Summary Table * Project Description (brief) * Evaluation Rating Table * Summary of conclusions, recommendations and lessons |
| **iii.** | Acronyms and Abbreviations  (See: UNDP Editorial Manual[[4]](#footnote-4)) |
| **1.** | Introduction   * Purpose of the evaluation * Scope & Methodology * Structure of the evaluation report |
| **2.** | Project description and development context   * Project start and duration * Problems that the project sought to address * Immediate and development objectives of the project * Baseline Indicators established * Main stakeholders * Expected Results |
| **3.** | Findings  (In addition to a descriptive assessment, all criteria marked with (\*) must be rated[[5]](#footnote-5)) |
| **3.1** | Project Design / Formulation   * Analysis of LFA/Results Framework (Project logic /strategy; Indicators) * Assumptions and Risks * Lessons from other relevant projects (e.g., same focal area) incorporated into project design * Planned stakeholder participation * Replication approach * UNDP comparative advantage * Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector * Management arrangements |
| **3.2** | Project Implementation   * Adaptive management (changes to the project design and project outputs during implementation) * Partnership arrangements (with relevant stakeholders involved in the country/region) * Feedback from M&E activities used for adaptive management * Project Finance * Monitoring and evaluation: design at entry (\*), implementation (\*), and overall assessment (\*) * Implementing Agency (UNDP) execution (\*) and Executing Agency execution (\*), overall project implementation/ execution (\*), coordination, and operational issues |
| **3.3** | Project Results   * Overall results (attainment of objectives) (\*) * Relevance (\*) * Effectiveness (\*) * Efficiency (\*) * Country ownership * Mainstreaming * Sustainability: financial resources (\*), socio-economic (\*), institutional framework and governance (\*), environmental (\*), and overall likelihood (\*) * Impact |
| **4.** | Conclusions, Recommendations & Lessons   * 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 * Best and worst practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance and success |
| **5.** | Annexes   * ToR * Itinerary * List of persons interviewed * Summary of field visits * List of documents reviewed * Evaluation Question Matrix * Questionnaire used and summary of results * Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form * Report Clearance Form * *Annexed in a separate file:* TE audit trail * *Annexed in a separate file:* Terminal GEF Tracking Tool, if applicable |

Annex A4: Evaluation Questions

*(Note: This is a generic list, to be further detailed with more specific questions by CO and UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based on the particulars of the project. Refer to Annex 4 of the TE Guidance for a completed, sample evaluation criteria matrix)*

This Evaluation Criteria Matrix must be fully completed/amended by the consultant and included in the TE inception report and as an Annex to the TE report.

| **Evaluative Criteria Questions** | | **Indicators** | **Sources** | **Methodology** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Relevance: How does the project relate to the main objectives of the GEF focal area, and to the environment and development priorities at the local, regional and national levels? | | | | |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved? | | | | | |
|  |  |  |  |  | |
|  |  |  |  |  | |
|  |  |  |  |  | |
| Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards? | | | | | |
|  |  |  |  |  | |
|  |  |  |  |  | |
|  |  |  |  |  | |
| Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, social-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results? | | | | | |
|  |  |  |  |  | |
|  |  |  |  |  | |
|  |  |  |  |  | |
| Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward, reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status? | | | | | |
|  |  |  |  |  | |
|  |  |  |  |  | |

Annex A5: Terminal evaluation Rating Scales

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| ***Ratings for Effectiveness, Efficiency, Overall Project Outcome Rating, M&E, IA & EA Execution*** | ***Sustainability ratings:*** | ***Relevance ratings*** |
| 6. Highly Satisfactory (HS): no shortcomings  5. Satisfactory (S): minor shortcomings  4. Moderately Satisfactory (MS): moderate shortcomings  3. Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): significant shortcomings  2. Unsatisfactory (U): major shortcomings  1. Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): severe shortcomings | 4. Likely (L): negligible risks to sustainability | 2. Relevant (R) |
| 3. Moderately Likely (ML): moderate risks | 1. Not relevant (NR) |
| 2. Moderately Unlikely (MU): significant risks  1. Unlikely (U): severe risks |  |
| *Additional ratings where relevant:*  Not Applicable (N/A)  Unable to Assess (U/A) | | |

Annex A6: Evaluation Consultant Code of Conduct and Agreement Form

**Evaluators:**

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 imitations, findings and recommendations.
7. Should reflect sound accounting procedures and be prudent in using the resources of the evaluation.

**Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form[[6]](#footnote-6)**

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

Annex A7: Evaluation Report Clearance Form

*(to be completed by CO and UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based in the region and included in the final document)*

Evaluation Report Reviewed and Cleared by

UNDP Country Office

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

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

UNDP GEF RTA

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

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

Annex A8: TE Report audit trail

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

**To the comments received on (*date*) from the Terminal Evaluation of (*project name*) (UNDP *PIMS #)***

*The following comments were provided in track changes to the draft Terminal 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 TE report** | **TE team response and actions taken** |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

**MIDTERM REVIEW ANNEXES**

**(Annexes B1 through B9)**

Annex B1: 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[[7]](#footnote-7) 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.[[8]](#footnote-8) Stakeholder involvement should include interviews with stakeholders who have project responsibilities, including but not limited to *(list*); executing agencies, senior officials and task team/ component leaders, key experts and consultants in the subject area, Project Board, project stakeholders, academia, local government and CSOs, etc. Additionally, the MTR team is expected to conduct field missions to (*location),* including the following project sites *(list)*.

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.

Annex B2: 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.

**i. Project Strategy**

Project design:

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

Results Framework/Logframe:

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

**ii. Progress Towards Results**

Progress Towards Outcomes Analysis:

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

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

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Project Strategy** | **Indicator[[9]](#footnote-9)** | **Baseline Level[[10]](#footnote-10)** | **Level in 1st PIR (self- reported)** | **Midterm Target[[11]](#footnote-11)** | **End-of-project Target** | **Midterm Level & Assessment[[12]](#footnote-12)** | **Achievement Rating[[13]](#footnote-13)** | **Justification for Rating** |
| **Objective:** | Indicator (if applicable): |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Outcome 1:** | Indicator 1: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Indicator 2: |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Outcome 2:** | Indicator 3: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Indicator 4: |  |  |  |  |  |
| Etc. |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Etc.** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**Indicator Assessment Key**

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

In addition to the progress towards outcomes analysis:

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

**iii. Project Implementation and Adaptive Management**

Management Arrangements:

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

Work Planning:

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

Finance and co-finance:

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

Project-level Monitoring and Evaluation Systems:

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

Stakeholder Engagement:

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

Reporting:

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

Communications:

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

**iv. Sustainability**

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

Financial risks to sustainability:

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

Socio-economic risks to sustainability:

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

Institutional Framework and Governance risks to sustainability:

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

Environmental risks to sustainability:

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

**Conclusions & Recommendations**

The MTR team will include a section of the report setting out the MTR’s evidence-based conclusions, in light of the findings.[[14]](#footnote-14)

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 rating on Project Strategy and no overall project rating is required.

Table. MTR Ratings & Achievement Summary Table

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Measure** | **MTR Rating** | **Achievement Description** |
| **Project Strategy** | N/A |  |
| **Progress Towards Results** | Objective Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale) |  |
| Outcome 1 Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale) |  |
| Outcome 2 Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale) |  |
| Outcome 3 Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale) |  |
| Etc. |  |
| **Project Implementation & Adaptive Management** | (rate 6 pt. scale) |  |
| **Sustainability** | (rate 4 pt. scale) |  |

Annex B3: List of Documents to be reviewed by MIDSTERM REVIEW TEAMs

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 (*fill in specific TTs for this project’s focal area*)
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 (*Project Title*) Board Meetings and other meetings (i.e. Project Appraisal Committee meetings)
4. Project site location maps

Annex B4: midterm review Report Outline[[15]](#footnote-15)

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

Annex B5: mtr evaluative matRix template

*(Questions to be filled out by the Commissioning Unit)*

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

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

Annex B6: UNEG code of conduct for evaluators/midterm review consultants

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

Annex B7: 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 |

Annex B8: mtr report clearance form

*(to be completed by the Commissioning Unit and UNDP-GEF RTA and included in the final document*

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

**Commissioning Unit**

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

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

**UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Advisor**

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

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

Annex B9: mTR 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** |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

**THEMATIC LEARNING REVIEW ANNEXES**

**(Annexes C1 through CX)**

Annex C1: initial outlien of the thematic review report

The Thematic Review Report will be compiled through reviews of reports from the Terminal Evaluations (TEs) and Mid-Term Reviews (MTRs) for protected area project financed under the GEF-3, 4 and 5 funding cycles. It will codify lessons and show what worked and what didn’t work and why, and will provide practical guidance that can strengthen project design and implementation and contribute to capacity development. The publication should inform future design of projects and future strategy for PA support by various individuals and institutions including UNDP. A detailed thematic review framework will be developed as part of this consultancy by the Team Leader.

**Initial and Rough Publication Outline**

**Lessons and Best Practices from UNDP-GEF PA Projects (2004 – 2018):**

For future project design and field application

*Note: The title will be further developed*

**Initial Outline:**

1. Overview of GEF4/5 PA portfolio – Size, coverage, GEF strategies etc.
2. Collective impact (environmental/social/economic) – Coverage (area covered, new PAs, strengthened PAs etc, biomes/ecosystems, key aggregated outcomes, key innovation highlights)
3. Lessons – portfolio level and individual.
4. Best PA System Strengthening Practices from the portfolio, under different categories – maybe with questions that often are asked. (including some practical information on what you need to apply certain tools or approaches; i.e. what is needed in terms of knowledge or policy or resources for something to work).
5. Recommendations for future project design / strategy setting

Annex C2:

Annex C3:

1. For additional information on methods, see the [Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results](http://www.undp.org/evaluation/handbook), Chapter 7, pg. 163 [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. A useful tool for gauging progress to impact is the Review of Outcomes to Impacts (ROtI) method developed by the GEF Evaluation Office:  [ROTI Handbook 2009](http://www.thegef.org/gef/sites/thegef.org/files/documents/M2_ROtI%20Handbook.pdf) [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. The Report length should not exceed *40* pages in total (not including annexes). [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. UNDP Style Manual, Office of Communications, Partnerships Bureau, updated November 2008 [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. See Annex D for rating scales. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. For ideas on innovative and participatory Monitoring and Evaluation strategies and techniques, see [UNDP Discussion Paper: Innovations in Monitoring & Evaluating Results](http://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/librarypage/capacity-building/discussion-paper--innovations-in-monitoring---evaluating-results/), 05 Nov 2013. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
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