

**TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR MID-TERM REVIEW OF THE UNDP/GEF PROJECT:**

“**Generate global environmental benefits through environmental education and raising awareness of stakeholders**”

Contents

[1. INTRODUCTION 2](#_Toc492632841)

[2. PROJECT BACKGROUND INFORMATION 2](#_Toc492632842)

[3. OBJECTIVES OF THE MTR 3](#_Toc492632843)

[4. MTR APPROACH & METHODOLOGY 3](#_Toc492632844)

[5. DETAILED SCOPE OF THE MTR 3](#_Toc492632845)

[6. TIMEFRAME 9](#_Toc492632846)

[7. DELIVERABLES 9](#_Toc492632847)

[8. ARRANGEMENTS 10](#_Toc492632848)

[9. TEAM COMPOSITION 10](#_Toc492632849)

[10. PAYMENT MODALITIES AND SPECIFICATIONS 11](#_Toc492632850)

[11. APPLICATION PROCESS 11](#_Toc492632851)

[ANNEX A: List of Documents to be reviewed by the MTR Consultant 13](#_Toc492632852)

[ANNEX B: Guidelines on Contents for the Midterm Review Report 14](#_Toc492632853)

[ANNEX C: Midterm Review Evaluative Matrix Template 16](#_Toc492632854)

[ANNEX D:. Project Results Framework 18](#_Toc492632855)

[ANNEX E: UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluators/Midterm Review Consultants 26](#_Toc492632856)

[ANNEX F: MTR Ratings 27](#_Toc492632857)

[ANNEX G: MTR Report Clearance Form 28](#_Toc492632858)

# INTRODUCTION

This is the Terms of Reference (ToR) for the UNDP-GEF Midterm Review (MTR) of the medium-sized project titled “**Generate global environmental benefits through environmental education and raising awareness of stakeholders**’’ (PIMS 5309) implemented through the UNDP/Ministry of Nature Protection of the Republic of Armenia (RoA), to be undertaken in 2017. The project started on November 03, 2015 and is in its second year of implementation.. This ToR sets out the expectations for this MTR. The MTR process must follow the guidance outlined in the document *Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects* [[1]](#footnote-1).

# PROJECT BACKGROUND INFORMATION

The goal of this project is to expand the capacity of Armenia to generate global environmental benefits through environmental education and raising awareness of stakeholders to implement Rio Convention strategies. The objective of the project is to strengthen the capacity to use environmental education and awareness raising as tools to address natural resource management issues. The achievement of this objective will strengthen the capacity of staff in the public sector, raise the public awareness about global environmental issues and the related international conventions, strengthen the links between sectors, including the mainstreaming of environmental concerns in development policies and projects, and finally contribute to an ecologically safe and sound environment.

The project objective will be achieved through three components (outcomes): i) enhance legal, policy, institutional and strategic frameworks to strengthen environmental education and raise awareness of stakeholders as natural resource management tools; ii) improve the capacity of relevant educational entities and organizations, offering environmental education to integrate environmental education and awareness raising into programmes and projects as tools for natural resource management; iii) develop capacity of community-based organizations (CBOs) to use environmental education and awareness raising as tools for natural resource management.

These activities will contribute to UNDP Strategic Plan Output 2.5 “Legal and regulatory frameworks, policies and institutions enabled to ensure the conservation, sustainable use, and access and benefit sharing of natural resources, biodiversity and ecosystems, in line with international conventions and national legislation”.

The project activities commenced in middle 2016 with conclusion planned for late 2018.

The project runs on principal allocations of 750,000 USD from GEF and additional input of 30,000 USD from UNDP and planned co-financing of 693,735 USD as in-kind contributions from Government of RoA, UNDP and NGOs.

The Project Board provides consensus-based decisions, in particular when guidance is required by the Project Coordinator (PC) and has final authority on matters requiring official review and approval, including annual work plans, budgets, and key hires. The Project Board actively seeks and takes account of the input of the Technical Advisory Committee that meets annually, with periodic consultation as needed throughout the year.

UNDP acts as the GEF Agency for this project. The project is implemented by the Ministry of Nature Protection (MNP) following UNDP’s National Implementation Modality (NIM). The Ministry of Education and Science based on the mandate in addressing educational policy in the country, including environmental education is the primary beneficiary of the project.

# 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.

# MTR APPROACH & METHODOLOGY

The MTR must provide evidence based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The MTR consultant 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 Report (APR)/, 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 consultant 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 consultant is expected to follow a collaborative and participatory approach[[2]](#footnote-2) 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.[[3]](#footnote-3) Stakeholder involvement should include interviews with stakeholders who have project responsibilities, including but not limited to; 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 CBOs, etc.

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.

# DETAILED SCOPE OF THE MTR

The MTR consultant 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?
* 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 (Annex D) 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[[4]](#footnote-4)** | **Baseline Level[[5]](#footnote-5)** | **Level in 1st APR self- reported)** | **Midterm Target[[6]](#footnote-6)** | **End-of-project Target** | **Midterm Level & Assessment[[7]](#footnote-7)** | **Achievement Rating[[8]](#footnote-8)** | **Justification for Rating** |
| **Objective:** | Indicators 1-4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Outcome 1:** | Indicator 5-7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Outcome 2:** | Indicators 8-11 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Outcome 3:** | Indicators 12-15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**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 Capacity Development (CD) scorecards 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, 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, 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 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 consultant will include a section of the report setting out the MTR’s evidence-based conclusions, in light of the findings.[[9]](#footnote-9)

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 consultant should make no more than 15 recommendations total.

**Ratings**

The MTR consultant 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 “Generate global environmental benefits through environmental education and raising awareness of stakeholders’’ (0091047/00081939)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **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) |  |

# TIMEFRAME

The total duration of the MTR will be up to *15 days* over a time period of *8 weeks* starting *from the first day of the mission,* and shall not exceed five months from when the consultant is hired. The tentative MTR timeframe is as follows:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **TIMEFRAME** | **ACTIVITY** |
| *October 10, 2017* | Application closes |
| *October 31, 2017* | Select MTR consultant |
| *November 1-3, 2017* | Prep the MTR consultant (handover of Project Documents) |
| *November 6-10, 3 days* | Document review and preparing MTR Inception Report |
| *November 15, 1 day* | Finalization and Validation of MTR Inception Report - latest start of MTR mission |
| *November 27- December 1, 5 days* | MTR mission: stakeholder meetings, interviews, wrap-up workshop |
| *December 4 – 15, 6 days* | Preparing draft report |
| *January 8-12, 1 days* | Incorporating audit trail from feedback on draft report/Finalization of MTR report |
| *Up to 2 weeks after receiving the draft report* | Preparation & Issue of Management Response |
| *1 week after receiving the Management Response* | Expected date of full MTR completion |

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

# DELIVERABLES

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **#** | **Deliverable** | **Description** | **Timing** | **Responsibilities** |
| **1** | **MTR Inception Report** | MTR consultants clarifies objectives and methods of Midterm Review | No later than 1 week before the MTR mission  November 10, 2017 | MTR consultant submits to the Commissioning Unit and project management |
| **2** | **Presentation** | Initial Findings | End of MTR mission  December 1, 2017 | MTR consultant presents to project management and the Commissioning Unit |
| **3** | **Draft Final Report** | Full report (using guidelines on content outlined in Annex B) with annexes | Within 3 weeks of the MTR mission  December 15, 2017 | Sent to the Commissioning Unit, reviewed by RTA, Project Coordinating Unit, GEF OFP |
| **4** | **Final Report\*** | Revised report with audit trail detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final MTR report | Within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft  February 9, 2018 | 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.

# ARRANGEMENTS

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

The commissioning unit will contract the consultant and ensure all necessary support throughout the process, including with travel arrangements within the country for the MTR consultant. The Project Team will be responsible for liaising with the MTR consultant to provide all relevant documents, set up stakeholder interviews, and arrange field visits.

# TEAM COMPOSITION

The independent international consultant (with experience and exposure to projects and evaluations in other regions globally) will conduct the MTR with support of local expert group and administrative team of the project. 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 consultants will be aimed at maximizing the qualifications in the below areas. 70% of points will be awarded for the technical qualifications and 30% for the financial bid.

* Recent experience with result-based management evaluation methodologies;
* Experience applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios;
* Competence in adaptive management, as applied to MFA-  Cross-cutting capacity development areas;
* Experience working with the GEF or GEF-evaluations;
* Experience working in CIS countries and in the Caucasus countries;
* Work experience in projects evaluation for at least 10 years;
* Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender equality and CCCD; experience in gender sensitive evaluation and analysis.
* Excellent communication skills;
* Demonstrable analytical skills;
* Project evaluation/review experiences within United Nations system will be considered an asset;
* A Master’s degree in Environment, or other closely related field.

# PAYMENT MODALITIES AND SPECIFICATIONS

10% of payment upon approval of the final MTR Inception Report

30% upon submission of the draft MTR report

60% upon finalization of the MTR report

Or, as otherwise agreed between the Commissioning Unit and the MTR team.

# APPLICATION PROCESS[[10]](#footnote-10)

**Recommended Presentation of Proposal:**

1. **Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability** using the [template](https://intranet.undp.org/unit/bom/pso/Support%20documents%20on%20IC%20Guidelines/Template%20for%20Confirmation%20of%20Interest%20and%20Submission%20of%20Financial%20Proposal.docx)[[11]](#footnote-11) provided by UNDP;
2. **CV** and a **Personal History Form** ([P11 form](http://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/corporate/Careers/P11_Personal_history_form.doc)[[12]](#footnote-12));
3. **Brief description of approach to work/technical proposal** of why the individual considers him/herself as the most suitable for the assignment, and a proposed methodology on how they will approach and complete the assignment; (max 1 page)
4. **Financial Proposal** that indicates the all-inclusive fixed total contract price 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](http://procurement-notices.undp.org/view_file.cfm?doc_id=29916). 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.

**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

**ANNEX A: List of Documents to be reviewed by the MTR Consultant**

1. PIF
2. UNDP Initiation Plan
3. UNDP Project Document
4. UNDP Country Programme Document 2016-2020
5. UN Development Assistance Framework 2016-2020
6. UNDP Environmental and Social Screening results
7. Project Inception Report
8. Annual Project Report (APR)
9. Semi-annual and Annual progress reports and work plans
10. Capacidy development scorecards
11. All monitoring reports prepared by the project
12. Minutes of the Project Outcome Board Meetings and other meetings (i.e. Project Technical Advisory Committee meetings)

ANNEX B: Guidelines on Contents for the Midterm Review Report[[13]](#footnote-13)

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **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 * Country of the project * GEF Operational Focal Area/Strategic Program * Executing Agency/Implementing Partner and other project partners * MTR 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) * 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 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?** | | | |
| How well does the project align with evolving GEF CCCD focal area priorities through GEF 5 and GEF 6? | Extent to which CCCD and related GEF priorities and areas of work incorporated | Project documents  National policies and strategies  Project partners  Project beneficiaries |  |
| Are project outcomes contributing to national development priorities and plans? | Degree to which the project supports objectives of Government. |  |
| Have implementation strategies been appropriate (is the logframe logical and complete)? | Adequacy of project design and implementation to national realities and existing capacities |  |
| Did the project address the needs of target beneficiaries and other stakeholders? Are beneficiaries and other stakeholders effectively engaged in implementation? | Degree to which the project meets stakeholder expectations |  |
| **Progress Towards Results: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved thus far?** | | | |
| How well has the project performed against its expected objectives and outcomes, and its indicators and targets? | Extent to which milestones and targets are achieved at mid-term, as laid out in the logframe and monitoring plan | Project reports  Minutes of Project Board and Advisory Committee Meetings  Local partners Capacity Development Scorecards |  |
| Which have been key factors contributing to project success/underachievement? | Evidence of adaptive management and/or early application of lessons learned | Project work plans and reports  Interviews with local partners  Tracking tools |  |
| How has the project contributed to raising capacity of local stakeholders to address aims of the project or of Government? | Extent of support from local stakeholders |  |
| What are the views of stakeholders on the implementation and activities of the project? | Extent to which stakeholders are actively participating in the  implementation and monitoring of the project |  |
| **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?** | | | |
| Implementation efficiency (including monitoring):   * Was the project management effective? * Were there any particular challenges with the management process? * Has project implementation been responsive to issues arising (e.g. from monitoring or from interactions with stakeholders)? * Were progress reports produced accurately and timely, and did they respond to reporting requirements including adaptive management changes? * Did the project management Board provide the anticipated input and support to project management? * Has internal and external communication been effective and efficient? * How efficiently have resources and back-up been provided by donors, including quality assurance by UNDP? | Extent to which project activities were conducted on time  Extent to which project delivery matched the expectation of the ProDoc and the expectations of partners  Level of satisfaction expressed by partners in the responsiveness (adaptive management) of the project | Project work plans and reports  Local partners  Tracking tools |  |
| Financial efficiency:   * Are the accounting and financial systems in place adequate for project management and producing accurate and timely financial information? * Have funds been available and transferred efficiently (from donor to project to contractors) to address the project purpose, outputs and planned activities? * Are funds being used correctly? * Are financial resources being utilized efficiently (converted into outcomes)? Could financial resources be used more efficiently? * Was project implementation as cost effective as originally proposed (planned vs. actual) | Extent to which funds have been converted into outcomes as per the expectations of the ProDoc  Level of transparency in the use of funds  Level of satisfaction of partners and beneficiaries in the use of funds  Timely delivery of funds, mitigation of bottlenecks | Project financial records  Project audit reports  Project work plans and reports |  |
| Efficiency of partnership arrangements for the project   * To what extent were partnerships/linkages between institutions/organizations realized as planned? * Which partnerships/linkages were facilitated? Which ones can be considered sustainable?   What was the level of efficiency of cooperation and collaboration arrangements? | * Extent to which project partners committed time and resources to the project * Extent of commitment of partners to take over project activities | Project work plans and reports  Interviews with local partners |  |
| Is the project responsive to threats and opportunities emerging during the course of the project? | Level of adaptive management related to emerging trends | Project work plans and reports |  |
| How well were risks, assumptions and impact drivers managed? What was the quality of risk mitigation strategies developed? Were these sufficient? Are there clear strategies for risk mitigation related to long-term sustainability of the project? | Extent to which project has responded to identified and emerging risks  Level of attention paid to up-dating risks log | Risks log |  |
| Is a communications strategy in place? How well is it implemented and how successful has it been in reaching intended audiences? | Extent to which project information has been disseminated  Level of awareness of beneficiaries and the general public | Communications documents  Press articles |  |
| **Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, socio-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?** | | | |
| Is the social, legal and political environment conducive to sustainability? | Extent of supportive policies | Policy documents  Project board and Advisory Committee minutes  Local partners and beneficiaries |  |
| Are there early signs of activities being taken up by project partners, and plans being developed to sustain them? | Extent to which partners are considering post-project actions |  |  |
| Have partners and stakeholders successfully enhanced their capacities and do they have the required resources to make use of these capacities? | Extent to which partners and stakeholders are applying new ideas outside of the immediate project context |  |  |

ANNEX D:. Project Results Framework

|  |
| --- |
| **Intended Outcome as stated in the UNDAF/Country Programme Results and Resource Framework:**  Outcome 7. By 2020, sustainable development principles and good practices for environmental sustainability resilience building, climate change adaptation and mitigation, and green economy are introduced and applied |
| **Outcome indicators as stated in the Country Programme, including baseline and targets:**  7.1 Number of innovative tools/approaches in­troduced to promote environmental sustain­ability and resilience principles |
| **Output indicators as stated in the Country Programme, including baseline and targets:**  4.3.1. Number of innovative tools and practices developed, approved and applied. Natural resources used or returned to sustainable management mode |
| **Applicable Output(s) from UNDP Strategic Plan:**  Output 4.1. Regulatory framework of social, environmental and economic sectors is updated to better address environmental sustainability and resilience principles |
| **Applicable GEF Strategic Focal Area Objectives:**  CD-2: to generate, access and use information and knowledge; and  CD-4: to strengthen capacities for management and implementation on convention guidelines. |
| **Applicable GEF Outcome Indicators:**  CD-2: Institutions and stakeholders trained how to use different tools available to manage information; Stakeholders are better informed via workshops and trainings about global challenges and local actions required; Knowledge platform established to share lessons learned among CBOs and CSOs across SGP participating countries (Number); Public awareness raised through workshops and other activities (Number)  CD-4: Institutional capacities for management of environment strengthened (Number); Standards developed and adopted; Management capacities for implementation of convention guidelines and Reporting enhanced countries (Number); Capacities of CSOs and CBOs as SGP partners, strengthened**.** |

| Objectives and Outcomes | Indicator | Baseline | Targets  End of Project | Source of verification | Risks and Assumptions |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Objective: to strengthen the institutional and individuals capacities to use environmental education EE and environmental public awareness EPA as tools for addressing natural resource management issues. | 1. Usage of EE and environmental awareness tools to address NRM | * EE/EPA are not systematically used for NRM | * Diverse and high quality EE and EPA programmes are available to address NRM | * Progress reports / PIRs * Programmes integrating these programmes and techniques * Surveys | *Risk*:   * Due to election, political changes or other events, changes in governmental priorities might happen and the GOA might not remain committed to EE as a tool for NRM   *Assumption*:   * The GOA continues to be committed to institutionalize (Systematize environmental learning through key institutions i.e. public service academy and crises learning academy, schools, etc.). This will enable EE and public awareness to be a tool for NRM. |
| 1. Citizens involve­ment in decision-making to address NRM issues | * Few opportunities and deficient practice for stakeholder involvement in NRM decisions at national or community levels | * Stakeholders in selected areas are involved in decision-making to address NRM issues | * Documentation of consultation processes * Surveys/interviews * Documented feedback by the decision-making authorities | *Risk*:   * The project does not create any interest among the targeted stakeholders   *Assumption*:   * Project introductory workshops will be held with targeted beneficiaries to present the project objective and strategy as well as the planned activities to create an interest and demand for these activities. |
| Decision-makers able to use to use EE as tools to improve NRM | * Few government departments, formal education including teachers and other key development stakeholders have capacities to use environmental knowledge, skills and capacities to address NRM issues | * Decision-makers and teachers using environmental knowledge and ecological awareness to improve NRM | * Progress reports / PIRs * Training evaluation forms * Survey |
| 1. Capacity development scorecard rating | Capacity for:   * Engagement: 5 of 9 * Generate, access and use information and knowledge: 7 of 15 * Policy and legislation development: 6 of 9 * Management and implementation: 3 of 6 * Monitor and evaluate: 3 of 6   (Total score: 24/45) | Capacity for:   * Engagement: 7 of 9 * Generate, access and use information and know-ledge: 11 of 15 * Policy and legislation development: 7 of 9 * Management and implementation: 4 of 6 * Monitor and evaluate: 4 of 6   (Total targeted score: 33/45) | * Mid-term review and final evaluation reports, including an updated CD scorecard * Annual PIRs * Capacity assessment reports | *Risk*:   * Project activities and resources do not translate in increasing the national capacity of using EE and EPA as tools to improve decision-making concerning NRM.   *Assumption*:   * The project is effective in developing the national capacity in the area of environmental education. |
| OUTCOME 1: Enhanced legal, policy, institutional and strategic frameworks to strengthen environmental education and raising awareness of stakeholder as natural resource management tools. | | | | | |
| Output 1.1: Adequate legislation and policy frameworks are in place to implement obligations from the Rio and Aarhus Conventions related to environmental education (EE) and environmental public awareness (EPA).  Output 1.2: Relevant institutions have the necessary mandates to use environmental education and public awareness as tools for environmental management. | 1. Adequate policies for EE and EPA enabling action to integrate Rio and Aarhus Conventions’ obligations | * Current policies and regulations concerning EE and EPA raising are poorly known, weakly implemented and not effective for enabling decision makers to address NRM issues | * Key policies for EE and EPA in place integrating Rio and Aarhus Conventions’ obligations and providing conducive enabling environment for the development of EE in Armenia | * Revised/new policies * National evaluation reports | *Risk*:   * The government does not fulfill its international obligations; including those from the Aarhus and the 3 Rio Conventions related to EE and EPA   *Assumption*:   * The government continues to fulfill its international commitments including the need to have an EE capacity for NRM. |
| 1. Adequate legislation for EE | * Current laws and policies related to EE are not conducive as tools for NRM | * EE as a tool for NRM is supported by conducive legislation (regulatory) framework. | * Laws, including amendments, and other regulations adopted or submitted to the relevant authorities. | *Risk*:   * New legislation proposed by the project is not adopted by the Government and/or the Parliament   *Assumption*:   * The government continues to be committed to improve its legislation framework for environmental management, including EE and EPA. The project team will closely monitor the development |
| 1. Adequate institutional set-up with clear mandates in EE | * Weak institutional mandates, weak national coordination and unclear responsibilities for EE | * Institutions with clear mandates and assigned responsibilities to implement EE programmes | * Institutions mandated by the government to implement EE. * Prospective development programs of relevant institutions * Job descriptions | *Risk*:   * No institutional changes occur   *Assumption*:   * The government pursues its policies to improve EE in Armenia; including the clarification of institutional mandates. The project will closely monitor the situation, involve all relevant agencies in project work to ensure their buy-in and support to proposed institutional changes |
| OUTCOME 2: Improved capacity of relevant government and educational entities to integrate environmental education and awareness raising into programmes and projects as tools for natural resource management. | | | | | |
| Output 2.1: Institutional capacity enhanced of key government and educational entities to integrate EE and EPA into national programmes and projects in support of integration of RIO and Aarhus obligations.  Output 2.2: Integrated EE /EPA training programmes developed and delivered through training centers for civil servants; training centers for teachers and other existing relevant training mechanisms. | 1. Strategies and programmes integrating EE and EPA as tools to improve NRM | * Current strategies and programmes do not include EE and EPA as tools to support NRM decision-making | * Strategies and programmes include the use of EE and EPA as tools to address NRM issues | * Revised/new strategies and programmes * Enhanced national progress reports | *Risk*:   * Key agencies and managers in ministries give a low priority to integrate EE as a tool for NRM   *Assumption*:   * The government pursues its policies to implement the Rio and Aarhus Conventions obligations; including the obligation to develop EE /EPA as a tool for NRM. Project team will involve all relevant agencies into project activities to ensure their buy-in and support to develop EE programmes.   *Risk*:   * Institutional risks associated with poor coordination among institutional stakeholders at the national level   *Assumption*:   * While an inherent risk in any initiative involving multiple institutional stakeholders and international organizations, this risk is substantially mitigated by the existence of established coordination mechanisms already operating. Establishment of the Project Board and an Advisory Committee will ensure a coordinated approach.   *Risk*:   * Lack or absence of faculty with proper knowledge, experience and teaching skills to implement education activities.   *Assumption*:   * An extended register will be created to include professionals available at different agencies who have relevant experience and skills which will allow the selection of faculties on a competitive basis. In the initial phase, there will be brief workshops organized to create interest and disseminate information materials on the project and its strategy.   *Risk*:   * The training centers for public servants and teachers might not be interested in integrating into their training catalogue the training curricula developed with the support of the project   *Assumption*:   * The related in-service training institution(s) will be contacted early on to establish a partnership with the project and involved them in designing and delivering courses |
| 1. Number of diverse organizations conducting EE and number of individuals (M, F) trained to deliver EE and EPA programmes | * Few stakeholders are engaged in development and delivery of EE programmes in Armenia | * 50 leading stakeholders in different governmental and non-state organizations are trained to deliver EE/EPA programmes -minimum 40% women | * Progress reports / PIRs * List of participants * Training evaluation forms |
| 1. EE/EPA materials and delivery mechanisms scoped | * EE /EPA training materials and training delivery mechanisms for decision makers are limited and ad hoc * EE training methodology and training delivery mechanisms for decision makers does not correspond to the actual needs * Existing programmes to re-train teachers in the EE field are limited and unevenly delivered | * EE/EPA programmes and EE/EPA education delivery mechanisms systematically available to decision makers and teachers | * EE /EPA programmes * Progress reports / PIRs * Copy of materials |
| 1. Number of decision makers (men and women) trained in EE | * Limited training in the field of environmental protection and NRM currently offered | * 1,000 people trained (civil servants, com­munity servants, staff of SNCOs and teachers) with a minimum of 40% women | * Progress reports / PIRs * List of participants * Training evaluation forms |
| OUTCOME 3: Developed capacity of community based organizations (CBOs) to use environmental education and awareness raising as tools for natural resource management. | | | | | |
| Output 3.1:  Capacity enhanced of CBOs to implement EE and EPA campaigns.  Output 3.2:  EE materials developed and delivery mechanisms are identified.  Output 3.3:  Communication Campaign developed and delivered through community based activities and national media. | 1. Number of CBOs conducting EE/EPA and CBO members (M, F) trained to deliver EE and EPA programmes to address NRM at local level | * CBOs have limited capacity to deliver EE and EPA | * CBOs using EE/EPA as a tool for the public and local communities to be actively involved in NRM decision-making processes. | * Documents from CBOs * Field visits * Surveys | *Risk*:   * Local governments do not have the mandate to involve stakeholders in decision-making for NRM * The decentralization of NRM responsibilities at the local level is not supported nationally i.e. in order for the EIA processes to work effectively, the public and local level government staff need to be ecologically knowledgeable and encouraged to be involved.   *Assumption*:   * Project will closely monitor the situation and advocate for decentralization of NRM responsibilities highlighting the benefits for sustainable economic development of the country   *Risk*:   * For non-environmental professionals the program objective and strategy are not easily understood and do not create any interest.   *Assumption*:   * The project will produce and disseminate information products such as leaflets, booklets and other print materials to inform stakeholders about the project objective, strategy and the planned activities, in order to create an interest and a demand for participating to project activities   *Risk*:   * Key stakeholders do not adopt the campaign.   *Assumption*:   * The campaign will be developed with a strong participation of stakeholders in order to keep the ownership of this campaign as much as possible with the stakeholders and facilitate its final adoption   *Risk*:   * Journalists are not interested in EE /EPA programmes   *Assumption*:   * Project introductory workshops will be held with targeted journalists/media outlets to present the project objective and strategy as well as the planned activities to create an interest and demand for these activities. |
|  | 1. EE and EPA content, educational materials and delivery mechanisms scoped and developed | * CBOs have developed materials for EE and EPA but there is no synergy and systematic approach for its delivery at the local level. | * EE/EPA programmes at a local level scoped and systematically delivered through identified delivery mechanism | * EE and EPA materials and programmes delivered through CBOs * Field visits * Surveys |  |
| 1. A communication campaign developed and delivered | * Skills and knowledge to develop EE/EPA campaign is limited | * A communication campaign covering global environ­mental issues and solutions delivered | * Campaign documents * Media coverage (videos etc.) * Evaluation report |
| 1. Number of journalists (men and women) and diversity of media outlets trained to deliver EE /EPA programmes | * Journalists/media outlets have limited capacity for NRM issues coverage, including global environmental issues and solutions | * 100 journalists with a minimum of 40% women from diverse media outlets trained on environ­mental topics, including global environmental issues and solutions | * Progress reports / PIRs * List of participants * Training evaluation forms (pre- and post-training tests etc.) * Surveys |

ANNEX E: UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluators/Midterm Review Consultants**[[14]](#footnote-14)**

**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 F: 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 G: 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: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

1. <http://web.undp.org/evaluation/documents/guidance/GEF/mid-term/Guidance_Midterm%20Review%20_EN_2014.pdf> [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. 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-2)
3. For more stakeholder engagement in the M&E process, see the [UNDP Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results](http://www.undg.org/docs/11653/UNDP-PME-Handbook-(2009).pdf), Chapter 3, pg. 93. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. Populate with data from the Logframe and scorecards [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. Populate with data from the Project Document [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. If available [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. Colour code this column only [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. Use the 6 point Progress Towards Results Rating Scale: HS, S, MS, MU, U, HU [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. Alternatively, MTR conclusions may be integrated into the body of the report. [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. 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> [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
11. <https://intranet.undp.org/unit/bom/pso/Support%20documents%20on%20IC%20Guidelines/Template%20for%20Confirmation%20of%20Interest%20and%20Submission%20of%20Financial%20Proposal.docx> [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
12. <http://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/corporate/Careers/P11_Personal_history_form.doc> [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
13. The Report length should not exceed 40 pages in total (not including annexes). [↑](#footnote-ref-13)
14. [www.undp.org/unegcodeofconduct](http://www.undp.org/unegcodeofconduct) [↑](#footnote-ref-14)