

Terms of Reference for Midterm Evaluation

Addressing Climate Change Risks on Water Resources and Food Security in the Dry Zone of Myanmar

International Evaluation Specialist (Team Leader)

1. INTRODUCTION

This is the Terms of Reference (ToR) for the Mid-Term Evaluation (MTE) for the UNDP-supported Adaptation Fund financed project titled – “Addressing Climate Change Risks on Water Resources and Food Security in the Dry Zone of Myanmar” (PIMS 4703) implemented through the United Nations Development Programme, which is to be undertaken in October 2017. The project started in February 2015 and is in its third year of implementation. This ToR sets out the expectations for this MTE.

2. PROJECT BACKGROUND INFORMATION

UNDP Myanmar, with funding from Adaptation Fund is currently implementing a Climate Change Adaptation project - “Addressing Climate Change Risks on Water Resources and Food Security in the Dry Zone of Myanmar.” The project aims to reduce the increasing impacts of climate change on agricultural and livestock production cycles in the dry zone of Myanmar - the impacts of increasing temperature and evaporation, declining water availability, and intensifying weather events especially flash floods and cyclones.

The Dry Zone is one of the most climate sensitive and natural resource poor regions in Myanmar. The dry zone covers approximately 54,390 square kilometers and represents about 10% of the country's total land area. The present population in the Dry Zone is estimated at 18 million people. It constitutes 34% of the country's total population of about 53 million. The population density is 123 people per square kilometer, making it the third most densely populated region in Myanmar.

Across the Dry Zone, water is scarce, vegetation cover is thin, and soil is degraded due to severe erosion. The region is characterized by low annual rainfall that ranges between 508 and 1,016 mm per annum with high variability and uneven distribution. The monsoon rain is bimodal with a dry period during July when dry desiccating winds blow from the south. The undulating land, composed mainly of sandy loam with low fertility, is subjected to severe erosion under rain and strong winds. The average mean temperature in the Dry Zone is about 27° C and the temperature often rises to about 43° C in the summer period. This dry environment with its other natural limiting factors has led to conditions of growing food insecurity and severe environmental degradation.

The major economic activities in the Dry Zone are subsistence farming such as paddy, sesame and groundnut and small scale livestock rearing. Agricultural productivity is low and the farmers are heavily dependent on products from the natural forest especially fuel wood, pole, post and fodder to support their living and livestock. Many landless people are working as seasonal farm labourers, migrating to urban regions during non-planting time to find temporary employment.

The project operates in five townships in the Sagaing, Mandalay and Magway Regions – Shwebo and Moneywa townships in the Sagaing region, Myingyan and Nyaung Oo townships in the Mandalay Region, and Chauk township in the Magway Region. The townships were selected on the basis of observed temperature extremes, frequency of drought per year, and the impacts of climatic parameters on food security. An additional criterion for township selection was the potential to access ground and surface water resources – vital prerequisites for small irrigation and water management

schemes. The direct beneficiaries of the project are marginal farmers in rain-fed areas and landless workers whose access to arable land is severely threatened by erosion and land degradation. Special emphasis is placed on women and female-headed households within this vulnerable group.

The project targets approximately 50,000 households from 280 villages. The target populations are largely categorized into the following three types of beneficiaries: First group is landless farmers, who make up about 60% of target population; second group is marginal/small farmers whose landholding is less between 0.4 – 0.8 hectares and they make up about 25% of target population; and the third group is farmers who have landholding larger than 0.8 hectares.

Absence of community water infrastructure for both domestic and agricultural purposes is a critical constraint in building the resilience of these communities to future climate change impact. This project aims to deliver the following key outputs to build community resilience to climate change:

1. Enhancing water capture and storage capacities in 280 villages to augment irrigation and domestic water supply during the dry periods
2. Protecting and rehabilitating 6,141 hectares of micro-watersheds through Farmer-Managed Natural Regeneration (FMNR) to increase natural water retention and reduce erosion
3. Establishing 3,983 hectares of community-based agro-forestry plots in private and communal lands to conserve soil and water
4. Introducing drought-resilient farming methods
5. Introducing resilient post-harvest processing and storage systems
6. Introducing diversified livestock production systems targeting landless households
7. Develop climate hazard maps and risk scenarios in each township to support community-based climate risk management and preparedness planning
8. Strengthen local level climate and disaster risk management framework for timely and effective communication of climate risk and early warning information.

At the national level, the Project is supported by a Project Steering Committee (PSC). The PSC oversees and keep abreast of project progress and facilitate the implementation of the project in partnership with co-financing institutions. Implementation of the project and allocation of resources is the responsibility of UNDP - as the executing agency under the overall direction of the PSC. The PSC is chaired by the Country Director of UNDP and the Director General of Dry Zone Greening Department (DZGD). The DZGD is also the principle counterpart agency for the project. Other members of the PSC include representatives from Environmental Conservation Department, Irrigation and Water Utilization Management Department, Department of Meteorology and Hydrology, Department of Agriculture, Relief and Resettlement Department, Livestock Breeding and Veterinary Department, Watershed Management Section, Forest Department, Department of Rural Development and Foreign Economic Relations Department

To assist the Project Team on technical questions, a Technical Advisory Group (TAG) has been constituted. The TAG provides guidance and advice on technical questions related to water management, agriculture, forestry, food security and risk information/communication. The main objective of the TAG is to identify technical strengths and weaknesses of the project, take stock of available and required technical know-how under different project components, and provide technical backstopping and quality control throughout the project period. The TAG includes representatives from Dry Zone Greening Department, Environmental Conservation Department, Irrigation and Water Utilization Management Department, Department of Meteorology and Hydrology, Department of Agriculture, Relief and Resettlement Department, Livestock Breeding and

Veterinary Department, Watershed Management Section of Forest Department and Department of Rural Development.

A project team, which is housed in the Dry Zone Greening Department offices in Patheingyi and Nyaung U, comprises of the following personnel – National Project Manager, Technical Specialist (International), Soil Conservation and Water Harvesting Specialist (Nyaung U-based), Agricultural Specialist, Environmental Conservation and Forestry Specialist (Nyaung U-based), Livestock Specialist, Monitoring and Evaluation Officer, Project Assistant and a Project Driver.

The project has two locations – one main office within the Dry Zone Greening Department compound in Patheingyi, Mandalay Region and the other in Nyaung U, Mandalay region. Under the overall guidance of PSC and TAG, the Project Team is responsible for the day-to-day management and implementation, oversight, reporting and monitoring of project activities.

3. OBJECTIVES OF THE MTE

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

4. MTE APPROACH & METHODOLOGY

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

The MTE team is expected to follow a collaborative and participatory approach¹ ensuring close engagement with the Project Team, government counterparts, the UNDP Country Office, UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Adviser, and other key stakeholders. As overall reference, the MTE will use the guidance for conducting midterm reviews of UNDP-supported GEF-financed project².

Engagement of stakeholders is vital to a successful MTE.³ Stakeholder involvement should include interviews with stakeholders who have project responsibilities, including but not limited to - Dry Zone Greening Department, Environmental Conservation Department, Irrigation and Water Utilization Management Department, Department of Meteorology and Hydrology, Department of Agriculture, Relief and Resettlement Department, Livestock Breeding and Veterinary Department, Watershed Management Section of Forest Department, Department of Rural Development and Foreign Economic Relations Department; Implementing partners, key experts and consultants in the subject area, Project Steering Committee members, project stakeholders, academia, local government and CSOs, etc. Additionally, the MTE team is expected to conduct field missions to Patheingyi Mandalay,

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

² The guidance can be found here - http://web.undp.org/evaluation/documents/guidance/GEF/mid-term/Guidance_Midterm%20Review%20EN_2014.pdf

³ 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.

including the following project sites – Shwebo, Monywa under Sagaing Region, Myingyan and Nyaung U under Mandalay Region and Chauk under Magwe Region.

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

5. DETAILED SCOPE OF THE MTE

The MTE 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. 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.
- If there are major areas of concern, recommend areas for improvement.

Results Framework/Log frame:

- Are the project's objectives and outcomes or components clear, practical, and feasible within its time frame?
- Examine if progress so far has led to, or could in the future catalyse beneficial development effects (i.e. income generation, gender equality and women's empowerment, improved governance etc...) that should be included in the project results framework and monitored on an annual basis.
- Ensure broader development and gender aspects of the project are being monitored effectively.

ii. Progress Towards Results

Progress towards Outcomes Analysis:

- Review the log frame indicators against progress made towards the end-of-project targets using the Progress Towards Results Matrix; colour code progress in a "traffic light system" based on the level of progress achieved; assign a rating on progress for each outcome; make recommendations from the areas marked as "Not on target to be achieved" (red).

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

Project Strategy	Indicator ⁴	Baseline Level ⁵	Level in 1 st PPR (self-reported)	Midterm Target ⁶	End-of-project Target	Midterm Level & Assessment ⁷	Achievement Rating ⁸	Justification for Rating
Objective:	Indicator (if applicable):							
Outcome 1:	Indicator 1:							
	Indicator 2:							
Outcome 2:	Indicator 3:							
	Indicator 4:							
	Etc.							
Etc.								

Indicator Assessment Key

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

In addition to the progress towards outcomes analysis:

- Compare and analyse the Adaptation Fund (AF) Results Tracker within the Project Performance Report (PPR) 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 AF Partner Agency (UNDP) and recommend areas for improvement.

Work Planning:

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

⁴ Populate with data from the Logframe and scorecards

⁵ Populate with data from the Project Document

⁶ If available

⁷ Colour code this column only

⁸ Use the 6 point Progress Towards Results Rating Scale: HS, S, MS, MU, U, HU

Finance and co-finance:

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

Project-level Monitoring and Evaluation Systems:

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

Stakeholder Engagement:

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

Reporting:

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

Communications:

- Review internal project communication with stakeholders: Is communication regular and effective? Are there key stakeholders left out of communication? Are there feedback mechanisms when communication is received? Does this communication with stakeholders contribute to their awareness of project outcomes and activities and investment in the sustainability of project results?
- Review external project communication: Are proper means of communication established or being established to express the project progress and intended impact to the public (is there a web presence, for example? Or did the project implement appropriate outreach and public awareness campaigns?)

iv. Sustainability

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

Financial risks to sustainability:

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

Socio-economic risks to sustainability:

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

Institutional Framework and Governance risks to sustainability:

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

Environmental risks to sustainability:

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

Conclusions & Recommendations

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

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

⁹ Alternatively, MTE conclusions may be integrated into the body of the report.

B.1	Key recommendation:	
B.2		
B.3		
C	<i>(State Outcome 3) (Outcome 3), etc.</i>	
C.1	Key recommendation:	
C.2		
C.3		
D	Project Implementation & Adaptive Management	
D.1	Key recommendation:	
D.2		
D.3		
E	Sustainability	
E.1	Key recommendation:	
E.2		
E.		

Ratings

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

Table. MTE Ratings & Achievement Summary Table for *(Project Title)*

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

6. DUTY STATION

The location of the assignment will be Mnadalay and it may involve travel to the project sites in Mandalay, Sagaing and Magwe Region, as appropriate.

7. TIMEFRAME

The total duration of the MTE will be approximately one month starting 28 November 2017 – 31 January 2018. The tentative MTR timeframe is as follows:

TIMEFRAME	ACTIVITY
4 September 2017	Application closes
2 November 2017	Select MTE Team
27 November 2017	Prep the MTE Team (handover of Project Documents)
28 Nov to 1 Dec 2017 (2 days)	Document review and preparing MTE Inception Report
4 December 2017(1 Day)	Finalization and Validation of MTE Inception Report- latest start of MTE mission
5 December - 16 December 2017 (12 days)	MTE mission: stakeholder meetings, interviews, field visits
18 December 2017(1 Day)	Mission wrap-up meeting & presentation of initial findings-earliest end of MTE mission (invite all stakeholders to the meeting)
20 December 2017(1 Day)	Present findings to Stakeholder at PSC meeting
	Debriefing meeting with Project Team
25Dec 2017 to 1 Jan 2018(5 days)	Preparing draft report
2-14 January 2018	UNDP and stakeholders review draft MTE report and provide feedback
15-21 January 2018 (4days)	Incorporating audit trail from feedback on draft report/Finalization of MTE report
26 January 2018	Preparation & Issue of Management Response
5 February 2018	Expected date of full MTE completion

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

8. MIDTERM EVALUATION DELIVERABLES

#	Deliverable	Description	Timing	Responsibilities
1	MTE Inception Report	MTE team clarifies objectives and methods of Midterm Evaluation	Beginning of MTE field mission (4 Dec 2017)	MTE team submits to the Commissioning Unit and project management
2	Presentation	Initial Findings	End of MTE field mission 21 Dec 2017	MTE Team presents to project management and the Commissioning Unit
3	Draft Final Report	Full report (using guidelines on content)	Within 15 days after the MTE field	Sent to the Commissioning Unit, reviewed by RTA,

		outlined in Annex B) with annexes	mission (1 Jan 2018)	Project Coordinating Unit, GEF OFF
4	Final Report*	Revised report with audit trail detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final MTE report <i>(see Annex G for an Audit trail template)</i>	Within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft (21 January 2018)	Sent to the Commissioning Unit

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

9. MTE ARRANGEMENTS

The principal responsibility for managing this MTE resides with the Commissioning Unit. The Commissioning Unit for this project's MTE is UNDP Country Office in Myanmar.

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

10. TEAM COMPOSITION

A team of two independent consultants will conduct the MTE – one International Evaluation Specialist (Team Leader) and one National Evaluation Consultant (Team Member). Both the consultants should not 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. This TOR is for the recruitment of the International Evaluation Specialist (Team Leader).

The International Evaluation Specialist (Team Leader) is expected to possess the following skills, knowledge and expertise:

1. International Evaluation Specialist (Team Leader)

- Master's Degree in Environment, Natural Resources Management, Social Sciences or other closely related field;
- 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 Climate Change Adaptation focal area;
- Experience working with the AF or GEF evaluations;
- Experience working in South East Asia region;
- Work experience in relevant technical areas for at least 5 years;
- Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender and climate change adaptation; 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;

The Team Leader will be responsible for:

- Providing overall leadership on the independent evaluation of the Adaptation Fund Project – “Addressing Climate Change Risks on Water Resources and Food Security in the Dry Zone of Myanmar” - based on inputs and insights from the national consultant
- Conducting desk reviews of relevant documents and interview with government partners, UN/UNDP staff, donors and other partners
- Reviewing the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, value-added and impact of the AF Project;
- Identifying whether or not UNDP has achieved its intended results (based on the strategic outcomes and work plans)
- Ensuring completion of all the deliverables outlined above: evaluation inception report, draft evaluation report, and final evaluation report

11. PAYMENT MODALITIES AND SPECIFICATIONS

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

30% upon submission of the draft MTE report

60% upon finalization of the MTE report

12. APPLICATION PROCESS

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 to the address:

United Nations Development Programme
No.6, Natmauk Road, Tamwe Township, Yangon 11211, Myanmar
Attention: Ms.Nasantuya Chuluun, Operations Manager
Reference: 2017/PROC/UNDP-MMR/PN/

in a sealed envelope indicating the following reference “Consultant for Addressing Climate Change Risks on Water Resources and Food Security in the Dry Zone of Myanmar Midterm Evaluation” or by

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

email at the following address ONLY: bids.mm@undp.org by **(25 August 2017)**. Incomplete applications will be excluded from further consideration.

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

Technical Evaluation of Proposals:

All applications comprising the information/documentation provided will be evaluated to ascertain the suitability of the applicants to carry out the assignment.

Applications will be scored as per the following breakdown:

- Master's Degree in Environment, Natural Resources Management, Social Sciences or other closely related field; **(10 points)**
- Recent experience with result-based management evaluation methodologies; **(15 points)**
- Experience applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios; **(10 points)**
- Competence in adaptive management, as applied to Climate Change Adaptation focal area; **(15 points)**
- Experience working with the AF or GEF evaluations; **(10 points)**
- Experience working in South East Asia region; **(10 points)**
- Work experience in relevant technical areas for at least 5 years; **(10 points)**
- Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender and climate change adaptation; experience in gender sensitive evaluation and analysis; **(5 points)**
- Excellent communication skills; **(5 points)**
- Demonstrable analytical skills; **(5 points)**
- Project evaluation/review experiences within United Nations system will be considered an asset; **(5 points)**

Financial Evaluation of Proposals: The financial proposals of all the applicants who pass the technical evaluation will be scored.

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

1. PIF
2. UNDP Initiation Plan
3. UNDP Project Document
4. UNDP Environmental and Social Screening results
5. Project Inception Report
6. All Project Performance Reports (PPR's)
7. Quarterly progress reports and work plans
8. Audit reports (if available)
9. Finalized AF Tracking Tools at CEO endorsement and midterm (PPR's Result Tracker)
10. Oversight mission reports
11. All monitoring reports prepared by the project
12. Financial and Administration guidelines used by Project Team

The following documents will also be available:

13. Project operational guidelines, manuals and systems
14. UNDP country programme document
15. Minutes of the Project Steering Committee Meetings and other meetings (i.e. Project Appraisal Committee meetings)
16. Project site location maps

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

- i. Basic Report Information (*for opening page or title page*)
 - Title of UNDP supported GEF financed project
 - UNDP PIMS# and GEF project ID#
 - MTE time frame and date of MTE report
 - Region and countries included in the project
 - GEF Operational Focal Area/Strategic Program
 - Executing Agency/Implementing Partner and other project partners
 - MTE team members
 - Acknowledgements
- ii. Table of Contents
- iii. Acronyms and Abbreviations
1. Executive Summary (*3-5 pages*)
 - Project Information Table
 - Project Description (brief)
 - Project Progress Summary (between 200-500 words)
 - MTE Ratings & Achievement Summary Table
 - Concise summary of conclusions
 - Recommendation Summary Table
2. Introduction (*2-3 pages*)
 - Purpose of the MTE and objectives
 - Scope & Methodology: principles of design and execution of the MTE, MTE approach and data collection methods, limitations to the MTE
 - Structure of the MTE report
3. Project Description and Background Context (*3-5 pages*)
 - Development context: environmental, socio-economic, institutional, and policy factors relevant to the project objective and scope
 - Problems that the project sought to address: threats and barriers targeted
 - Project Description and Strategy: objective, outcomes and expected results, description of field sites (if any)
 - Project Implementation Arrangements: short description of the Project Board, key implementing partner arrangements, etc.
 - Project timing and milestones
 - Main stakeholders: summary list
4. Findings (*12-14 pages*)
 - 4.1 Project Strategy
 - Project Design
 - Results Framework/Logframe
 - 4.2 Progress Towards Results
 - Progress towards outcomes analysis
 - Remaining barriers to achieving the project objective
 - 4.3 Project Implementation and Adaptive Management
 - Management Arrangements
 - Work planning
 - Finance and co-finance

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

- Project-level monitoring and evaluation systems
 - Stakeholder engagement
 - Reporting
 - Communications
- 4.4 Sustainability
- Financial risks to sustainability
 - Socio-economic to sustainability
 - Institutional framework and governance risks to sustainability
 - Environmental risks to sustainability
5. Conclusions and Recommendations (4-6 pages)
- 5.1 Conclusions
- Comprehensive and balanced statements (that are evidence-based and connected to the MTE's findings) which highlight the strengths, weaknesses and results of the project
- 5.2 Recommendations
- Corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project
 - Actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the project
 - Proposals for future directions underlining main objectives
6. Annexes
- MTE ToR (excluding ToR annexes)
 - MTE evaluative matrix (evaluation criteria with key questions, indicators, sources of data, and methodology)
 - Example Questionnaire or Interview Guide used for data collection
 - Ratings Scales
 - MTE mission itinerary
 - List of persons interviewed
 - List of documents reviewed
 - Co-financing table (if not previously included in the body of the report)
 - Signed UNEG Code of Conduct form
 - Signed MTE final report clearance form
 - *Annexed in a separate file:* Audit trail from received comments on draft MTE report
 - *Annexed in a separate file:* Relevant midterm tracking tools (PPR's Result Tracker)

ToR ANNEX C: Midterm Evaluation Evaluative Matrix Template

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

Evaluators/Consultants:

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

MTE Consultant Agreement Form

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

Name of Consultant:

Name of Consultancy Organization (where relevant):

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

Signed at _____ (Place) on

_____ (Date)

Signature: _____

¹³ www.undp.org/unegcodeofconduct

ToR ANNEX E: MTE Ratings

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

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

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

ToR ANNEX F: MTE Report Clearance Form

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

Midterm Evaluation Report Reviewed and Cleared By:	
Commissioning Unit	
Name: _____	
Signature: _____	Date: _____
UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Advisor	
Name: _____	
Signature: _____	Date: _____




ToR ANNEX G: MTE Audit Trail Template

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

To the comments received on (date) from the Midterm Evaluation of (project name) (UNDP Project ID-PIMS #)

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

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

I. Signature – Post Description Certification		
Incumbent (if applicable)		
Myint Wai National Project Manager (AF Project) Supervisor		Date 21 Jul 2017
Karma Lodey Raptan Technical Specialist, AF Project		Date 31 July 2017
Thinn Hlaing Oo Programme Analyst (JRA/CCA) Lat Lat Aye (for) Team Leader, Pillar II, UNDP		Date 1 Aug 2017