United Nations Development Programme

조선민주주의인민공화국주재
유엔개발계획대표부

UNDP
Empowered lives.
Resilient nations.

Terms of Reference

Mid-term Review of the projects:

"Strengthening the Resilience of Communities through Community-Based Disaster Risk Management" (CBDRM) and

"Sustainable Energy Solutions for Rural Livelihoods in DPRK" (SES)

1. INTRODUCTION

The present Terms of Reference (ToR) for the Midterm Review (MTR), to be undertaken in 2018, of the UNDP TRAC funded projects directly implemented by the UNDP:

1) **Strengthening the Resilience of Communities through Community-Based Disaster Risk Management (CBDRM)** (Award ID: 00091747; Project ID: 00096791) – See Annex G.

2) "**Sustainable Energy Solutions for Rural Livelihoods in DPRK" (SES)** (Award ID: 00090996; Project ID: 00096469) – See Annex H.

3. OBJECTIVES OF THE MTR

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

4. MTR APPROACH & 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. UNDP Environmental & Social Safeguard Policy, the Project Document, project reports including Annual Project Review (APR), project budget revisions, lesson learned reports, national strategy documents in the area of disaster prevention, relief and recovery; risk management, and any other materials that the team considers useful for this evidence-based review).

The MTR team is expected to follow a collaborative and participatory approach[1] ensuring close engagement with the UNDP Country Office, Project Team, counterparts (at the County and Ri level), and other key stakeholders.

---

[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.

Engagement of stakeholders is vital to a successful MTR.[2] Stakeholder involvement should include interviews with stakeholders who have project responsibilities, including but not limited to other bilaterals; officials at National Coordination Committee (NCC), key experts and consultants who provided services in the project implementation, members of Project Steering Committee (PSC), academia etc. Additionally, the MTR team is expected to conduct field missions to any of the CBDRM project sites i.e. 15 Ris in 3 Counties; and SES project sites i.e. 15 Ris (Including 3 Oups and 1 Dong) in 6 Counties.

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

5. DETAILED SCOPE OF THE MTR

The MTR team will assess the following four categories of project progress.

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 and United Nations Strategic Framework 2017 to 2021. Was the project concept in line with the national sector development priorities and plans of the country? Review the project results that are being mainstreamed at national level.
- Review decision-making processes: were perspectives of those who would be affected by project decisions, those who could affect the outcomes, and those who could contribute information or other resources to the process, taken into account during project design processes?
- Review the extent to which relevant gender issues were raised in the project design.
- If there are major areas of concern, recommend areas for improvement.

Results Framework/Logframe:
- Undertake a critical analysis of the project's logframe indicators and targets, assess how "SMART" the midterm and end-of-project targets are (Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Relevant, Time-bound), and suggest specific amendments/revisions to the targets and indicators as necessary.
- Are the project's objectives and outcomes or components clear, practical, and feasible within its time frame?
- Examine if progress so far has led to, or could in the future catalyse beneficial development effects (i.e. income generation, gender equality and women's empowerment, 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 colour code progress in a "traffic light system"

---

[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.

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]	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:						
	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:

- 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 project by UNDP and recommend areas for improvement.
- Review the quality of oversight support provided by the Senior Management at the Country Office, BRH 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 in-kind contribution:
- 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?

---

[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

- Informed by the co-financing monitoring table to be filled out, provide commentary on co-financing: is there a commitment from local communities and beneficiaries? Is their in-kind contribution as assessed properly?

Project-level Monitoring and Evaluation Systems:
- Review the monitoring tools currently being used: Did the project team provided all the necessary information to all stakeholders? Do they involve Ri and County committees in decision making? How could they be made more participatory and inclusive if there is a gap?
- 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 County and Ri level 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 Steering Committee (PSC).
- Assess how well the Project Team and partners undertake and fulfil UNDP reporting requirements (i.e. how have they addressed poorly-rated APRs, 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 local beneficiaries.
- For reporting purposes, write one half-page paragraph that summarizes the project's progress towards results in terms of contribution to sustainable development benefits linking SDGs, as well as global environmental benefits.

iv. Sustainability

- Validate whether the risks identified in the Project Document, Annual Project Review (APR) 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 UNDP assistance ends (consider potential resources can be from multiple sources, such as the public and income generating activities, communities' ownership in operation and maintenance and other funding that will be adequate financial resources for sustaining project's outcomes)?

Socio-economic risks to sustainability:
- Are there any social or geopolitical risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project outcomes? What is the risk that the level of stakeholder ownership (including 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 including sanctions risks to sustainability:
- Do the legal frameworks, policies and processes pose risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project benefits? What is the impact of CPD on the project? In case if there is no extension of current CPD or no new CPD is in place, what could be a suggested scenario to continue the activities that are successful and are making a difference in peoples' lives on humanitarian grounds? While assessing this parameter, also consider if the required systems/ mechanisms for accountability, transparency, and technical knowledge transfer are in place.
- What are the impact of Sanctions and suggested approach to mitigate the future risks in delivering the humanitarian assistance by the project? This includes the approach to be followed with 1718 committee.

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.[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.

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 for Project X

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)	
	Outcome 3 Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale)	

---

[8] Alternatively, MTR conclusions may be integrated into the body of the report.

Project Implementation & Adaptive Management	(rate 6 pt. scale)	
Sustainability	(rate 4 pt. scale)	

6. MIDTERM REVIEW DELIVERABLES

The total duration of the MTR shall not exceed a total of 30 days, starting 28th March 2018, and shall be completed within three months from when the consultant(s) is(are) hired.

#	Deliverable	Description	Duration	Timing	Responsibilities
1	**MTR Inception Report**	MTR team clarifies objectives and methods of Midterm Review	7 Days	No later than 2 weeks before the MTR mission	MTR team submits to the Commissioning Unit and project management
2	**In-country mission concluded by a Presentation**	Initial Findings	13 Days	End of MTR mission	MTR Team presents to project management and the Commissioning Unit
3	**Draft Final Report**	Full report (using guidelines on content outlined in Annex B) with annexes	7 Days	Within 3 weeks of the MTR mission	Sent to the Commissioning Unit, reviewed by DRR, MES, Project Manager, PA
4	**Final Report***	Revised report with audit trail detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final MTR report	3 Days	Within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft	Sent to the Commissioning Unit

*The final MTR report must be in English. If applicable, the Commissioning Unit may choose to arrange for a translation of the report into a language more widely shared by national stakeholders.

7. MTR ARRANGEMENTS

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

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

8. TEAM COMPOSITION

One independent consultant will conduct the MTR supported by National Technical Coordinator (NTC). 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 selection of consultant will be aimed at maximizing the overall qualities in the following areas:

- Recent experience with result-based management evaluation methodologies (10%);

- Experience applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios (10%);
- Competence in adaptive management, as applied to disaster risk management, and climate change mitigation (5%);
- Experience working with the UNDP evaluations (10%);
- Experience working in South East Asia (5%);
- Good understanding about delivering humanitarian assistance under sanctions, and its impact (10%);
- Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender and disaster risk management & community based approaches; energy access; experience in gender sensitive evaluation and analysis (2%).
- Excellent communication skills (5%);
- Demonstrable analytical skills (4%);
- Project evaluation/review experiences within United Nations system will be considered an asset (4%);
- A Master's degree in disaster risk management or Engineering or Management or other closely related fields (5%).

9. PAYMENT MODALITIES AND SPECIFICATIONS

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

10. APPLICATION PROCESS[9]

Recommended 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]);

c) **Brief description of approach to work/technical proposal** of why the individual considers him/herself as the most suitable for the assignment, and a proposed methodology on how they will approach and complete the assignment; (max 1 page)

d) **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.   If an applicant is employed by an organization/company/institution, and he/she expects his/her employer to charge a management fee in the process of releasing him/her to UNDP under Reimbursable Loan Agreement (RLA), the applicant must indicate at this point, and ensure that all such costs are duly incorporated in the financial proposal submitted to UNDP.

All application materials should be submitted by email to the address rbap.icroster@undp.org by 5 March 2018**.** 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.

---

[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/pso/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

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

1. UNDP Project Document
2. UNDP Environmental and Social Screening results
3. All APR's
4. Quarterly progress reports and Annual work plans
5. Audit reports (where applicable)
6. Oversight mission reports – Programme FMVs
7. All monitoring reports prepared by the project

The following documents will also be available (where applicable):
8. Project operational guidelines, manuals and systems
9. UNDP country/countries programme document(s)
10. Minutes of all the Project Steering Committee (PSC) Meetings
11. Project site location maps

ToR ANNEX B: Guidelines on Contents for the Midterm Review Report[12]

   i. Basic Report Information *(for opening page or title page)*
- Title of UNDP financed project
- UNDP Award and Project IDs#
- MTR time frame and date of MTR report
- 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

---

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

       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 risks to sustainability
- Institutional framework including sanctions 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
- In-kind contribution 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

ToR ANNEX C: Midterm Review Evaluative Matrix Template

Evaluative Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
Project Strategy: To what extent is the project strategy relevant to country priorities, country ownership, and the best route towards expected results?			
(include evaluative question(s))	(i.e. relationships established, level of coherence between project design and implementation approach, specific activities conducted, quality of risk mitigation strategies, etc.)	(i.e. project documents, national policies or strategies, websites, project staff, project partners, data collected throughout the MTR mission, etc.)	(i.e. document analysis, data analysis, interviews with project staff, interviews with stakeholders, etc.)
Progress Towards Results: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved thus far?			

Project Implementation and Adaptive Management: Has the project been implemented efficiently, cost-effectively, and been able to adapt to any changing conditions thus far? To what extent are project-level monitoring and evaluation systems, reporting, and project communications supporting the project's implementation?			
Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, socio-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?			

Evaluators/Consultants:

1. Must present information that is complete and fair in its assessment of strengths and weaknesses so that decisions or actions taken are well founded.
2. Must disclose the full set of evaluation findings along with information on their limitations and have this accessible to all affected by the evaluation with expressed legal rights to receive results.
3. Should protect the anonymity and confidentiality of individual informants. They should provide maximum notice, minimize demands on time, and respect people's right not to engage. Evaluators must respect people's right to provide information in confidence, and must ensure that sensitive information cannot be traced to its source. Evaluators are not expected to evaluate individuals, and must balance an evaluation of management functions with this general principle.
4. Sometimes uncover evidence of wrongdoing while conducting evaluations. Such cases must be reported discreetly to the appropriate investigative body. Evaluators should consult with other relevant oversight entities when there is any doubt about if and how issues should be reported.
5. Should be sensitive to beliefs, manners and customs and act with integrity and honesty in their relations with all stakeholders. In line with the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights, evaluators must be sensitive to and address issues of discrimination and gender equality. They should avoid offending the dignity and self-respect of those persons with whom they come in contact in the course of the evaluation. Knowing that evaluation might negatively affect the interests of some stakeholders, evaluators should conduct the evaluation and communicate its purpose and results in a way that clearly respects the stakeholders' dignity and self-worth.
6. Are responsible for their performance and their product(s). They are responsible for the clear, accurate and fair written and/or oral presentation of study limitations, findings and recommendations.
7. Should reflect sound accounting procedures and be prudent in using the resources of the evaluation.

MTR Consultant Agreement Form

Agreement to abide by the Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN System:

Name of Consultant: _____

Name of Consultancy Organization (where relevant): _____

I confirm that I have received and understood and will abide by the United Nations Code of Conduct for Evaluation.

Signed at _____ *(Place)*   on _____ *(Date)*

Signature: _____

ToR ANNEX E: MTR Ratings

Ratings for Progress Towards Results: (one rating for each outcome and for the objective)		
6	Highly Satisfactory (HS)	The objective/outcome is expected to achieve or exceed all its end-of-project targets, without major shortcomings. The progress towards the objective/outcome can be presented as "good practice".
5	Satisfactory (S)	The objective/outcome is expected to achieve most of its end-of-project targets, with only minor shortcomings.
4	Moderately Satisfactory (MS)	The objective/outcome is expected to achieve most of its end-of-project targets but with significant shortcomings.
3	Moderately Unsatisfactory (HU)	The objective/outcome is expected to achieve its end-of-project targets with major shortcomings.
2	Unsatisfactory (U)	The objective/outcome is expected not to achieve most of its end-of-project targets.

---

[13] www.undp.org/unegcodeofconduct

1	Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)	The objective/outcome has failed to achieve its midterm targets, and is not expected to achieve any of its end-of-project targets.

Ratings for Project Implementation & Adaptive Management: (one overall rating)		
6	Highly Satisfactory (HS)	Implementation of all seven components – management arrangements, work planning, finance and co-finance, project-level monitoring and evaluation systems, stakeholder engagement, reporting, and communications – is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management. The project can be presented as "good practice".
5	Satisfactory (S)	Implementation of most of the seven components is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management except for only few that are subject to remedial action.
4	Moderately Satisfactory (MS)	Implementation of some of the seven components is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management, with some components requiring remedial action.
3	Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)	Implementation of some of the seven components is not leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive, with most components requiring remedial action.
2	Unsatisfactory (U)	Implementation of most of the seven components is not leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management.
1	Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)	Implementation of none of the seven components is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management.

Ratings for Sustainability: (one overall rating)		
4	Likely (L)	Negligible risks to sustainability, with key outcomes on track to be achieved by the project's closure and expected to continue into the foreseeable future
3	Moderately Likely (ML)	Moderate risks, but expectations that at least some outcomes will be sustained due to the progress towards results on outcomes at the Midterm Review
2	Moderately Unlikely (MU)	Significant risk that key outcomes will not carry on after project closure, although some outputs and activities should carry on
1	Unlikely (U)	Severe risks that project outcomes as well as key outputs will not be sustained

ToR ANNEX F: MTR Report Clearance Form
(to be completed by the Commissioning Unit and Project Manager and included in the final document)

Midterm Review Report Reviewed and Cleared By:

Commissioning Unit

Name: _____

Signature: _____   Date: _____

UNDP Project Manager

Name: _____

Signature: _____   Date: _____

Annex G – Project: "Strengthening the Resilience of Communities through Community-Based Disaster Risk Management" (CBDRM)

PROJECT BACKGROUND INFORMATION

CBDRM Award ID: 00091747; Project ID: 00096791:

Project Duration	Geographic coverage
Start Date: 8 October 2015 **End Date:** 31 December 2019	**Name of project sites:** - Yonsan (3 Ris) and Singye (8 Ris) Counties, North Hwanghae Province; - Yangdok County (4 Ris), South Pyongan Province
Strategic Results	**CPD Results**
Link with UNDP Strategic Plan 2014-2017: Outcome 1: Growth and development are inclusive and sustainable, incorporating productive capacities that create employment and livelihoods for the poor and excluded; Outcome 5: Countries are able to lower the risk of natural disasters, including from climate change; Outcome 6: Early recovery and rapid return to sustainable development pathways are achieved in post-disaster settings. **UNDP Strategic Plan Output:** Preparedness system in place to effectively address the consequences of and response to natural hazards and man-made crisis at all levels of government and community.	**Expected CP Outcome(s):** CPD Outcome 5: Improved national capacities in disaster management **Expected Output(s):** • Output 1: Ri level rural communities are provided with skills and resources enabling them to implement community based disaster risk management measures. • Output 2: Mechanisms, Guidelines and Procedures for promoting CBDRM are developed and implemented at local (Ri) levels.
UNSF Outcome(s): Strategic Priority Four: Climate Change and Adaptation Outcome 2: Improved national capacities in disaster management and strategies for adaptation and mitigation to climate change; Outcome 3: Improved local and community management of natural resources.	**Implementation Modality: DIM**
Project Budget (US$)	
Total project budget: US$ 3,803,635.36	
Expenditures by CDRs / by year: USD 610.56 (2015) USD 1,714,726.47 (2016)	**Approved budget and expenditures for 2017:** USD 891,879.88 (revised AWP budget) USD 887,747.7 (actual expenditure)

Background: The occurrences of extreme weather events and seasonal variability are one of the key contributors to loss in livelihoods, increase in poverty and significant threat to human development in rural areas in Democratic People's Republic of Korea (DPRK). The causes of flood, landslides and droughts in the country are not limited to weather and climate conditions. In most of the rural areas, forest ecosystems have been converted into agricultural land in order to overcome food shortages and trees have been cut down as the primary source of household level energy. The destruction of DPRK's forests contributed significantly to

serious damage when impacted by natural hazards, especially, flooding, and landslides since deforestation weakens nature's buffering ability to store water. Currently, there is a large gap in capacities at all levels to cope with the impact of disasters and to improve communities' responsiveness and resilience. The United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) noted recent improvements in disaster preparedness and increased attention at national level to address the underlying factors that contribute to risks, against the backdrop of development priorities that focus on environmental protection and water conservation. CBDRM project will help local level communities acquire knowledge of successful practices in Community-based Disaster Risk Management (CBDRM) processes, timely and appropriate risk information and access to early warning, develop coping skills as well as access resources and services for disaster risk reduction actions that offer development benefits in near term as well as reductions in vulnerability over the long term.

Objectives: The project's objective is to enhance vulnerable communities' resilience to natural hazards. This will be achieved through CBDRM approaches, the project aims to support social resilience, whereby people can identify and anticipate risks, plan and act collectively, and can marshal their individual capabilities to overcome threats and shocks. The effects of disasters when they occur can further be lessened through preparedness and recovery efforts that can also leave communities more resilient. Such resilience is not only critical to contribute towards greater progress in human development, but also to ensure sustainable progress over time.

Strategy: UNDP's strategy for community based disaster risk management is to focus its efforts at the local (Ri) level. The CBDRM approaches will promote and support actions initially in the target areas, that range from incremental steps to the introduction of entirely new community and household-level practices that are important for reducing risks from recurring climate extremes and future climate scenarios. It is intended to enhance local capacities so that community members, including women and youth, are key important stakeholders in risk reduction and recovery.

Key Outputs:

- Output 1: Ri level rural communities are provided with skills and resources enabling them to implement community based disaster risk management measures.

- Output 2: Mechanisms, Guidelines and Procedures for promoting CBDRM are developed and implemented at local (Ri) level. Further, the project will strengthen selected communities' capacities for participatory hazard mapping and disaster reduction.

Annex H – Project "Sustainable Energy Solutions for Rural Livelihoods in DPRK" (SES) (Award ID: 00090996; Project ID: 00096469)

PROJECT BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Project Duration	Geographic coverage
• **Start Date:** 26 August 2015 • **End Date:** 31 December 2019	**Name of project sites: 15 Ris (Including 3 Oups and 1 Dong) in 6 Counties** 1. Hoechang County, South Pyongan Province 2. Singye County, North Hwanghae Province 3. Yonsan County, North Hwanghae Province 4. Unsan County, North Pyongan Province 5. Kaechon City, South Pyongan Province 6. Yangdok County, South Pyongan Province

Strategic Results	CPD Results
Link with UNDP Strategic Plan 2014-2017: Outcome 1: Growth and development are inclusive and sustainable, incorporating productive capacities that create employment and livelihoods for the poor and excluded **UNDP Strategic Plan Output:** Output 1.5: Inclusive and sustainable solutions adopted to achieve increased energy efficiency and universal modern energy access (especially off-grid sources of renewable energy)	**Expected CP Outcome(s):** CP.6: Strengthened enabling environment for use of conventional energy, and accessibility of alternative energy sources, and strategies in adaptation and mitigation to climate change **Expected Output(s):** • Output 1: Information about energy resources and feasible RE/EE solutions updated and made accessible to local beneficiaries • Output 2: Increased technical know-how of county-level personnel for energy planning and sustainable management of local renewable energy resources. • Output 3: Strengthened supply chains for the delivery of appropriate RE/EE solutions for local communities in rural areas. • Output 4: Increased energy security and self-reliance of rural population through the implementation of RE/EE solutions for local communities.

UNSF Outcome(s):	Implementation Modality: DIM
SP2-2: Strengthened human and national capacities in sustainable development; SP4-3: Improved local and community management of natural resources.	

Project Budget (US$)	
Total project budget: US$ 6,117,572	
Expenditures by CDRs / by year: USD 159.38 (2015) USD 328,233.98 (2016)	**Approved budget and expenditures for 2017:** USD 2,456,900.00 (revised AWP budget) USD 2,198,813.68 (actual expenditure)

Background: Rural areas and communities in Democratic People's Republic of Korea (DPRK) lack access to adequate and reliable energy services due to:

(i)   insufficient supply of primary energy inputs;

(ii)   inadequate infrastructure, technological and managerial know-how and competence for the sustainable exploitation of local renewable energy sources; and;

(iii)   lack of appropriate operational modalities enabling the sustainable delivery of the technologies to provide basic energy services.

The SES Project addresses this development challenge by drawing upon the lessons from the previous two UNDP projects that focused of sustainable energy i.e. Sustainable Renewable Energy Development Programme (SRED), and Small Wind Energy Development Project for Rural Areas (SWEDPRA).

The SES project focuses on the attainment of effective and sustainable local energy solutions that generate positive impact among rural beneficiaries. The SES Project will reinforce sustainability aspects and aims to strengthen energy service delivery at the local level.

Objectives: The project's objective is to provide local rural communities in targeted areas with adequate, secure and reliable access to renewable energy resources, cost-effective energy efficiency and energy conservation solutions for meeting basic energy demands under appropriate operational modalities.

This will be achieved through the implementation of local-level energy solutions in rural areas through an approach that entails: (i) the establishment of delivery models enabling the sustainable supply and operation of energy solutions in rural areas; (ii) the introduction of renewable energy technologies (RE), and solutions for more efficient energy use (EE) and energy conservation (EC); and (iii) the increase of county-level energy self-reliance by enhanced ownership and technical and managerial competencies for the sustainable use of local renewable energy resources.

Strategy: Traditionally, UNDP used to rely on Cooperative Farms as the entry point. The SES Project strategy mainly depends on the assumption that the counties play a pivotal role in the allocation of energy resources for local users and have autonomy over part of the natural resources in their territory. Engagement of the SES project therefore at the County for certain initiatives is best addressed at that level, creating more opportunities to promote energy self-reliance and address the exposure of communities to climate risks as well as to create greater impact. The SES project will focus on proven and cost-effective energy solutions that require low capital costs.

Key Outputs:

- Output 1: Information about energy resources and feasible RE/EE solutions updated and made accessible to local beneficiaries.

- Output 2: Increased technical know-how of county-level personnel for energy planning and sustainable management of local renewable energy resources.

- Output 3: Strengthened supply chains for the delivery of appropriate RE/EE solutions for local communities in rural areas.

- Output 4: Increased energy security and self-reliance of rural population through the implementation of RE/EE solutions for local communities.