

Adaptation Fund Midterm Evaluation

Terms of Reference

1. INTRODUCTION

This is the Terms of Reference (ToR) for the Mid-Term Evaluation (MTE) for the UNDP-supported Adaptation Fund financed project titled “*Climate change resilient production landscapes and socio-economic networks advanced in Guatemala*” (PIMS 4386) implemented through the *Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources (MARN)*, which is to be undertaken in 2017. The project started on the *July 2 of 2015* and is in its *second year of implementation*.). This ToR sets out the expectations for this MTE.

2. PROJECT BACKGROUND INFORMATION

The objective of the Project “ *Climate change resilient production landscapes and socio-economic networks advanced in Guatemala* ” is to increase the resilience to the climate of productive landscapes and socioeconomic systems in twelve municipalities of the departments of Sololá (Santa Catarina Ixtahuacán, Nahualá , Santa Lucia Utatlán, San Clara La Laguna, Santa Maria Visitation, San Juan La Laguna, Santiago La Laguna) and Suchitepéquez (Santo Tomás La Unión, San Pablo Jocopilas, San Antonio Suchitepéquez, Chicacao, Santa Bárbara) with jurisdiction within the basin Of the Nahualate River, threatened by the impacts of climate change and climate variability, in particular the hydrometeorological phenomena that have increased in frequency and intensity. The direct beneficiaries of the specific actions to be implemented will be community organizations located within the 19 selected sub-basins based on their vulnerability. The sub-basins are: Alto Nahualate, Uguaxucube, Tzozomá, Paximbal, Igualcox, Masá, Ixtacapa, Yatzá, Panán, Mixpiyá, Nicá, Mocá, Paquiacamiyá, Tarro, Bravo, San Francisco, Chunajá, Siguacán y Coralito. The total population prioritized for these sub-basins is 139,545 people, of which 85,341 (61%) are rural and 69,918 (50%) are women. At least 50 community organizations and not less than 7,500 inhabitants will benefit directly from the Project.

This objective is intended to be achieved through compliance with the following key results:

Project objective: to increase climate resilience in production landscapes and socio-economic systems in target municipalities, threatened by climate change and climatic variability impacts, in particular hydrometeorological events that are increasing in frequency and intensity.

Outcome 1: *Local and national capacities and tools enable decision makers and communities to reduce vulnerabilities and strengthen adaptive responses.* The Project strengthens the capacities of local and national authorities and decision makers through climate information useful for the planning and public investment processes specific to the intervention area, with the objective of improving the analysis capacity to record the Information at local and national level, while strengthening communication mechanisms for adaptation to climate change.

Outcome 2: *Production landscape resilience increased through application of traditional and ancestral practices and other production activities, as well as targeted investments.* The Project identifies, consensuses and is put into practice, the local strategies of adaptation (catalog previously elaborated) to increase the resilience and ecological capacity of the productive landscapes of the

area of intervention. These strategies are identified, prioritized and implemented in a participatory manner with organizations, community leaders and local governments, seeking an adaptation approach based on the needs of each community.

Outcome 3: *Socio-economic adaptive capacity of communities improved.* The project promotes basic infrastructure and value chains as strategies to increase the resilience and ecological capacity of productive landscapes in the intervention area. These strategies are identified, prioritized and implemented in a participatory manner with organizations, community leaders and local governments, seeking an adaptation approach based on the needs of each community.

Output 4: *Effective knowledge management results in informed decision-making at all levels through an integrated information system.* This activity is designed so that the results and lessons learned from the implementation of adaptation strategies feedback the process of capacity building at local and national level, while contributing to the creation of standards and technical manuals and to the establishment of a program Information system on adaptation to climate change.

In order to improve the adaptability to climate change of the communities in the Project area, gender, multiculturalism and food security issues are comprehensively addressed.

During the implementation of the Project, MARN and UNDP coordinate actions with other government entities, accompanying the implementation process, among which are mentioned: Secretary of Planning and Programming of the Presidency (SEGEPLAN), Ministry of Agriculture (MAGA), National Council of Protected Areas (CONAP), National Institute of Seismology, Volcanology, Meteorology and Hydrology (INSIVUMEH), National Forestry Institute (INAB), Secretariat of Food and Nutrition Security (SESAN), Institute of Agricultural Sciences and Technology (ICTA), Faculty of Agronomy of the University of San Carlos de Guatemala (USAC), municipalities, community organizations, non-governmental organizations (NGOs), among other actors.

The Project was designed to be executed in 4 years, with a financial allocation of the AF for USD 5,000,000.00, with no co-financing provided.

3. OBJECTIVES OF THE MTE

The MTE will assess progress towards the achievement of the project objectives and outcomes as specified in the Project Document, and assess early signs of project success or failure with the goal of identifying the necessary changes to be made in order to set the project on-track to achieve its intended results. The MTE will also review the project's strategy, its risks to sustainability.

Mid-term evaluation should assess at a minimum:

- Initial outputs and results of the project;
- Quality of implementation, including financial management;
- Assumptions made during the preparation stage, particularly objectives and agreed upon indicators, against current conditions;
- Factors affecting the achievement of objectives; Context. The current context is especially crucial, as a change in socio-economic conditions can make the initial diagnosis that was the starting point for the implemented intervention, and

- M&E systems and their implementation.

The results of this evaluation may contribute to certain modifications in the implementation of an intervention and to updating the adopted assumptions.

4. MTE APPROACH & METHODOLOGY

The MTE must provide evidence based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The MTE consultant will review all relevant sources of information including documents prepared during the preparation phase (i.e. AF Concept, AF Proposal, UNDP Initiation Plan, UNDP Environmental & Social Safeguard Policy, the Project Document, project reports including Project Performance Reports/PPRs, project budget revisions, lesson learned reports, national strategic and legal documents, and any other materials that the consultant considers useful for this evidence-based review).

The MTE consultant is expected to follow a collaborative and participatory approach¹ ensuring close engagement with the Project Team, government counterparts, the UNDP Country Office(s), UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Advisers, and other key stakeholders such as civil society organizations.

Engagement of stakeholders is vital to a successful MTE.² Stakeholder involvement should include interviews with stakeholders who have project responsibilities, including but not limited to *Director of the Project, Vice-Minister of Natural Resources and Climate Change of MARN, Chief of Adaptation to Climate Change of MARN, Project Coordinator, Energy and Environment Officer of the UNDP Country Office, UNDP Regional Technical Adaptation Advisor*; 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. The MTE consultant is expected to conduct field missions to some or all the municipalities and project sites. The field mission sites to visit will be part of the consultant methodology proposal. Project sites: *seven municipalities of the departments of Sololá: Santa Catarina Ixtahuacán, Nahualá, Santa Lucía Utatlán, San Clara La Laguna, Santa María Visitation, San Juan La Laguna, Santiago La Laguna and five municipalities of Suchitepéquez: Santo Tomás La Unión, San Pablo Jocopilas, San Antonio Suchitepéquez, Chicacao, Santa Bárbara*; including the following: agricultural plots of local producers, including home gardens; areas of reforestation or forest conservation; construction of structures for rainwater harvesting, municipal offices; offices of local organizations, among others.

The final MTE report should describe the full MTE approach taken and the rationale for the approach making explicit the underlying assumptions, challenges, strengths and weaknesses about the methods and approach of the review.

5. DETAILED SCOPE OF THE MTE

The MTE consultant will assess the following four categories of project progress.

¹ For ideas on innovative and participatory Monitoring and Evaluation strategies and techniques, see [UNDP Discussion Paper: Innovations in Monitoring & Evaluating Results](#), 05 Nov 2013.

² For more stakeholder engagement in the M&E process, see the [UNDP Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results](#), Chapter 3, pg. 93.

i. Project Strategy

Project design:

- Review the problem addressed by the project and the underlying assumptions. Review the effect of any incorrect assumptions or changes to the context to achieving the project results as outlined in the Project Document.
- Review the relevance of the project strategy and assess whether it provides the most effective route towards expected/intended results. Were lessons from other relevant projects properly incorporated into the project design?
- Review how the project addresses country priorities. Review country ownership. Was the project concept in line with the national sector development priorities and plans of the country (or of participating countries in the case of multi-country projects)?
- Review decision-making processes: were perspectives of those who would be affected by project decisions, those who could affect the outcomes, and those who could contribute information or other resources to the process, 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:

- 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.

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; colour code progress in a "traffic light system" based on the level of progress achieved; assign a rating on progress for each outcome; make recommendations from the areas marked as "Not on target to be achieved" (red).

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

| Project Strategy | Indicator ³ | Baseline Level ⁴ | Level in 1 st PIR (self-reported) | Midterm Target ⁵ | End-of-project Target | Midterm Level & Assessment ⁶ | Achievement Rating ⁷ | Justification for Rating |
|-------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------------|--|-----------------------------|-----------------------|---|---------------------------------|--------------------------|
| Objective: | Indicator (if applicable): | | | | | | | |
| Outcome 1: | Indicator 1: | | | | | | | |

³ Populate with data from the Logframe and scorecards

⁴ Populate with data from the Project Document

⁵ If available

⁶ Colour code this column only

⁷ Use the 6 point Progress Towards Results Rating Scale: HS, S, MS, MU, U, HU

| Project Strategy | Indicator ³ | Baseline Level ⁴ | Level in 1 st PIR (self-reported) | Midterm Target ⁵ | End-of-project Target | Midterm Level & Assessment ⁶ | Achievement Rating ⁷ | Justification for Rating |
|------------------|------------------------|-----------------------------|--|-----------------------------|-----------------------|---|---------------------------------|--------------------------|
| | 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 AF Results Tracker within the Project Performance Report (PPR) at the Baseline with the one completed right before the Midterm Evaluation.
- 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 AF 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:

- a) 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?
- b) 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.

iv. 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?

Conclusions & Recommendations

The MTE consultant will include a section of the report setting out the MTE's evidence-based conclusions, in light of the findings.⁸

Recommendations should be succinct suggestions for critical intervention that are specific, measurable, achievable, and relevant. A recommendation table should be put in the report's executive summary.

| Rec # | Recommendation | Entity Responsible |
|-------|-------------------------------|--------------------|
| A | (State Outcome 1) (Outcome 1) | |
| A.1 | Key recommendation: | |
| A.2 | | |
| A.3 | | |
| B | (State Outcome 2) (Outcome 2) | |
| B.1 | Key recommendation: | |

⁸ Alternatively, MTE conclusions may be integrated into the body of the report.

| Rec # | Recommendation | Entity Responsible |
|-------|--|--------------------|
| B.2 | | |
| B.3 | | |
| C | <i>(State Outcome 3) (Outcome 3), etc.</i> | |
| C.1 | Key recommendation: | |
| C.2 | | |
| C.3 | | |
| D | Project Implementation & Adaptive Management | |
| D.1 | Key recommendation: | |
| D.2 | | |
| D.3 | | |
| E | Sustainability | |
| E.1 | Key recommendation: | |
| E.2 | | |
| E. | | |

The MTE consultant should make no more than 15 recommendations total.

Ratings

The MTE consultant 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 “Climate change resilient production landscapes and socio-economic networks advanced in Guatemala” (PIMS 4386)

| 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) | |

6. TIMEFRAME

The total duration of the MTE will be approximately *90 days of work, in a period of 5 months*, and shall not exceed five months from when the consultant is hired. The tentative MTR timeframe is as follows:

| TIMEFRAME | ACTIVITY |
|---|---|
| 2 days after signing of the contract | Prep the MTE consultant (handover of Project Documents) |
| 4 days after first meeting (skype or similar) | Document review and preparing MTE Inception Report |
| 5 days after the report submission | Finalization and Validation of MTE Inception Report- latest start of MTE mission |
| 20 days | MTE mission: stakeholder meetings, interviews, field visits |
| Last day of mission | Mission wrap-up meeting & presentation of initial findings- earliest end of MTE mission |
| 3 weeks after wrap-up meeting | Preparing draft report |
| 7 days after comments submission | Incorporating audit trail from feedback on draft report/Finalization of MTE report |
| 7 days after comments submission | Preparation & Issue of Management Response |
| | Expected date of full MTE completion |

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

7. MIDTERM EVALUATION DELIVERABLES

| # | Deliverable | Description | Timing | Responsibilities |
|---|--|--|---|---|
| 1 | MTE Inception Report. Document is expected in Spanish. | MTE consultant clarifies objectives and methods of Midterm Evaluation | 15 days after signing of the contract | MTE consultant submits to the Commissioning Unit and project management |
| 2 | Draft Final Report Draft report is expected in Spanish. | Full report (using guidelines on content outlined in Annex B) with annexes | 21 days after signing of the contract | Sent to the Commissioning Unit, reviewed by RTA, Project Coordinating Unit, GEF OFP |
| 3 | Final Report* Draft report t is expected in Spanish and English. | Revised report with audit trail detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final MTE report | Final report, Spanish version is expected to be submitted 10 days after receiving UNDP comments on draft. | Sent to the Commissioning Unit |

| # | Deliverable | Description | Timing | Responsibilities |
|---|-------------|-------------|---|------------------|
| | | | Final report, English version is expected to be submitted 14 days after receiving UNDP approval of Spanish version. | |

*The final MTE report must be in English and Spanish.

8. MTE ARRANGEMENTS

The principal responsibility for managing this MTE resides with the Commissioning Unit. The Commissioning Unit for this project's MTE is *the UNDP Country Office*. The commissioning unit will contract the consultant.

The payment for the consultancy is a lump sum, including airfare tickets, local travel costs for the mission in Guatemala, accommodations and daily subsistence allowances. The consultant will be responsible to make the necessary travel arrangements for the MTE. The consultant will cover the travel cost and per diem.

The Project Team will be responsible for liaising with the MTE consultant to provide all relevant documents, set up stakeholder interviews, and arrange field visits.

9. PROFILE OF THE CONSULTANT

The consultant cannot have participated in the project preparation, formulation, and/or implementation (including the writing of the Project Document) and should not have a conflict of interest with project's related activities.

The consultant is expected to have the following qualifications:

- a) Academic background:
 - ✓ Master's degree in Climate change, sustainable agriculture, biological or environmental sciences, or other closely related field.
 - ✓ University degree in biology, agricultural engineer or related discipline.
- b) General Experience:
 - ✓ 7 years of experience on project evaluation/review.
 - ✓ 7 years of experience in the design and/or implementation of projects related to climate change, resilience/adaptation and/or sustainable development projects.
 - ✓ 5 years of experience working in Latin America.
- c) Specific experiences:
 - ✓ Two specific experiences that demonstrate the application of result-based management evaluation methodologies that include the application of SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios.

- ✓ Two specific experiences that demonstrate to have the knowledge of project cycle of vertical funds such as the Adaptation Fund, Global Environmental Facility, Green Climate Fund, other.
- d) Competencies and corporate values:
- ✓ Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender; experience in gender sensitive evaluation and analysis.
 - ✓ Leadership and team work.
 - ✓ Excellent communication skills.
 - ✓ Demonstrable analytical skills.
 - ✓ Ability to develop and motivate his/her peers/colleagues/team members
 - ✓ Respect for a diverse working environment
 - ✓ Ability to produce written outputs/reports clearly and concisely
 - ✓ Excellent written and verbal communication skills in Spanish and in English.

10. PAYMENT MODALITIES AND SPECIFICATIONS

10% of payment upon approval of the final MTE Inception Report
40% upon submission of the draft MTE report
50% upon finalization of the MTE report

11. APPLICATION PROCESS⁹

Presentation of Proposal:

- a) **Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability** using the [template](#)¹⁰ provided by UNDP.
- b) **CV** and a **Personal History Form (P11 form**¹¹**)** duly signed.
- c) **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 he/she will approach and complete the assignment, **written in Spanish and in English;**
- d) **Work schedule** that specified the activities, dates and time frame.
- e) **Financial Proposal** that indicates the all-inclusive fixed total contract price and all other travel related costs (such as flight ticket, per diem, etc), supported by a breakdown of costs, as per template attached to the Letter of Confirmation of Interest template.
- f) **Terms of reference**, duly signed.
- g) Copy of **personal identification**.
- h) Copy of **academic credential**, such as University Degrees diplomas.
- i) Minimum of three letters of professional references, contracts, settlements or receipt in full documents.

⁹ Engagement of the consultants should be done in line with guidelines for hiring consultants in the POPP: <https://info.undp.org/global/popp/Pages/default.aspx>

¹⁰

<https://intranet.undp.org/unit/bom/ps/Support%20documents%20on%20IC%20Guidelines/Template%20for%20Confirmation%20of%20Interest%20and%20Submission%20of%20Financial%20Proposal.docx>

¹¹ http://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/corporate/Careers/P11_Personal_history_form.doc

All application should be submitted in a sealed envelope indicating the following reference:
“Consultant for *Climate change resilient production landscapes and socio-economic networks advanced in Guatemala*” (PIMS 4386), Midterm Evaluation”.

All application materials should be submitted to the following address:
5ª Avenida 5-55 Zona 14, Torre IV, Nivel 10
Edificio Euro Plaza World Business Center
Ciudad de Guatemala, Guatemala 01014

or by email at the following address
procurement.gt@undp.org by (29 November 2017

Incomplete applications will be excluded from further consideration.

Criteria for Evaluation of Proposal: Only those applications which are responsive and compliant will be evaluated. Offers will be evaluated according to the Combined Scoring method – where the educational background and experience on similar assignments will be weighted at 70% and the price proposal will weigh as 30% of the total scoring. The applicant receiving the Highest Combined Score that has also accepted UNDP’s General Terms and Conditions will be awarded the contract.

| Criteria | | Scores | |
|---------------------|---|--------|-----------|
| | | Rnaks | Max score |
| Academic background | Master’s degree in Climate change, sustainable agriculture, biological or environmental sciences, or other closely related field. | 10 | 15 |
| | University degree in biology, agricultural engineer or related discipline. | 5 | |
| General Experience | 7 years of experience on project evaluation/review. | 10 | 40 |
| | 7 years of experience in the design and/or implementation of projects related to climate change, resilience/adaptation and/or sustainable development projects. | 10 | |
| | 5 years of experience working in Latin America | 10 | |
| | Two specific experiences that demonstrate the application of result-based management evaluation methodologies that include the application of SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios. | 5 | |
| | Two specific experiences that demonstrate to have the knowledge of project cycle of vertical funds such as the Adaptation Fund, Global Environmental Facility, Green Climate Fund, other | 5 | |

| | | | |
|--------------------------------------|--|------------|------------|
| Technical Methodological Proposal | Fully harmonized with Terms of Reference and with solid technical level. It presents methodological proposal that demonstrates solid knowledge and correct application of the technique in the reach of results. | 35 | 35 |
| | Harmonic with Terms of Reference and technically acceptable. It presents a methodological proposal that demonstrates knowledge and application of the technique in a manner acceptable for the achievement of results. | 30 | |
| | Harmonic with Terms of Reference, but technically weak. Weak methodological proposal that demonstrates weak application of the technique in the reach of results. | 20 | |
| | Not harmonic with Terms of Reference. Methodological proposal and application of weak technique and out of context with respect to ToR. | 0 | |
| Work Plan and Schedule | It includes a Schedule and a descriptive work plan adjusted to the reality of the Project, considering the activities to be carried out in an integrated and coherent manner | 10 | 10 |
| | Includes Schedule and work plan with weak description of the activities, does not present the activities in an integrated and coherent way. | 7 | |
| | Includes only Schedule | 1 | |
| Sub – Total | Sub – Total for Curricular evaluation and thechnical proposal | 100 | 70% |
| Financial proposal | (Lowest proposal/evaluated proposal) * 30% | 30% | |
| Total results of the proposal | | | |

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

1. Project Document
2. Environmental and Social Screening
3. Project Inception Report
4. All Project Performance Reports (PPR's)
5. Quarterly progress reports and work plans of the various implementation task teams
6. Audit reports
7. Finalized AF Tracking Tools: "Result Tracer"
8. Oversight mission reports
9. All monitoring reports prepared by the project
10. Financial and Administration guidelines used by Project Team

The following documents will also be available:

11. Project operational guidelines, manuals and systems
12. UNDP country/countries programme document(s)
13. Minutes of the "Climate change resilient production landscapes and socio-economic networks advanced in Guatemala" (PIMS 4386) Board Meetings and other meetings (i.e. Project Appraisal Committee meetings)
14. Project site location maps

ToR ANNEX B: Guidelines on Contents for the Midterm Evaluation Report¹²

- 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 consultant
 - 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

¹² The Report length should not exceed 40 pages in total (not including annexes).

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 Results Tracker.

ToR ANNEX C: Midterm Evaluation Evaluative Matrix Template

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

ToR ANNEX D: UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluation Consultants¹³

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: _____

¹³ www.unep.org/unepcodeofconduct

ToR ANNEX E: 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 Evaluation |
| 2 | Moderately Unlikely (MU) | Significant risk that key outcomes will not carry on after project closure, although some outputs and activities should carry on |
| 1 | Unlikely (U) | Severe risks that project outcomes as well as key outputs will not be sustained |



ToR ANNEX F: MTE Report Clearance Form

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

Midterm Evaluation Report Reviewed and Cleared By:

Commissioning Unit

Name: _____

Signature: _____ Date: _____

UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Advisor

Name: _____

Signature: _____ Date: _____