UNITED NATIONS DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME
TERMS OF REFERENCE / INDIVIDUAL CONTRACT

1. Position Information

Position Title:	International Consultant/Evaluator
Type:	Individual Contract (International)
Project Title/Department:	UNDP/AF Project "Developing climate resilience of farming communities in the drought prone parts of Uzbekistan"/Sustainable Development Cluster
Duration of the service:	25 working days during the period from 3 November – 7 December 2017
Duty station:	Home-based with one mission to Tashkent, Uzbekistan, including visits to Nukus city and 5 project pilot districts (Kegeili, Kanlikul, Chimbay, Takhtakupir and Muynak) in the Republic of Karakalpakstan
Reports to:	Leader of Sustainable Development Cluster, UNDP Uzbekistan

2. Introduction

This is the Terms of Reference (ToR) for the Mid-term Evaluation (MTE) of the UNDP supported Adaptation Fund financed project titled "Developing climate resilience of farming communities in the drought prone parts of Uzbekistan" (PIMS#5002) implemented through the UNDP Uzbekistan, which is to be undertaken in 2017. The project started on the 26 May 2014 and is in its third year of implementation). This ToR sets out the expectations for this MTE.

3. Project Background Information

The frequent occurrence of drought, an overall trend of aridification and projected drying of Uzbekistan's poorest region, Karakalpakstan, place serious strains on water availability, is causing a decline in land productivity and in turn of the ability of rural poor to withstand the current and future impacts of climate change. Adaptation measures are increasing and becoming more integrated within wider policy frameworks. Integration, while it remains a challenge, streamlines the adaptation planning and decision-making process and embeds climate sensitive thinking in existing and new institutions and organizations. This can help avoid mismatches with the objectives of development planning, facilitates the blending of multiple funding streams and reduces the possibility of maladaptive actions.

The overall project **objective** is to develop climate resilience of farming and pastoral communities in the drought prone parts of Uzbekistan, specifically Karakalpakstan to address adaptation needs arise when the anticipated risks or experienced impacts of climate change require action to ensure the safety of populations and the security of assets.

With a view to achieving this objective the following interconnected **outcomes** will be achieved:

1. The institutional and technical capacity for drought management and early warning developed

2. Climate resilient farming practices established on subsistence dekhkan farms

3. Landscape level adaptation measures for soil conservation and moisture retention improves climate resilience of over 1,000,000 ha of land

4. Knowledge of climate resilient agricultural and pastoral production systems in arid lands generated and widely available

The project offices are located in Tashkent, Uzbekistan within the national partner

implementing agency, i.e. the Center of Hydrometeorological Services under the cabinet of Ministers of the Republic of Uzbekistan (Uzhydromet); and in Nukus, Karakalpakstan, as the pilot region, within the regional subdivision of Uzhydromet. Project implements its adaptation activities in the five pilot districts - Kegeili, Kanlikul, Chimbay, Takhtakupir and Muynak – as the most vulnerable to climate change impacts in Karakalpakstan.

The project helps the central, regional and local governments and vulnerable farmers and pastoralists to withstand the current and future impacts of climate change: aridification and projected drying of this region that places serious strains on water availability resulting in a decline in land productivity.

The project duration is 6 years (May 2014 – May 2020) with the total budget of USD5,190,878 (USD4,990,878 of Adaptation Fund and USD200,000 of UNDP).

4. 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.

5. MTE Approach & Methodology

The MTE must 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: Project Document, ESSP, Project Inception Report, PPRs, Finalized AF focal area Tracking Tools, Project Board meeting minutes, Financial and Administration guidelines (SOP), project budget revisions, 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 approach[1] ensuring close engagement with the Project Team, government counterparts, the UNDP Country Office, UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Advisers, and other key stakeholders.

Engagement of stakeholders is vital to a successful MTE.[2] Stakeholder involvement should include interviews with stakeholders who have project responsibilities, including but not limited to key partners at the central level (Tashkent, Uzbekistan) and at sub-national level (Nukus and 5 pilot districts in Karakalpakstan); executing agencies, senior officials and task team/component leaders, key experts and consultants in the subject area, Project Board, project stakeholders, academia, local government and CSOs, etc. Additionally, the MTE team is expected to conduct field missions to Karakalpakstan, including the project sites in Nukus and 5 project pilot districts (Kegeili, Kanlikul, Chimbay, Takhtakupir and Muynak) in the Republic of Karakalpakstan.

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.

6. 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

---

[1] For ideas on innovative and participatory Monitoring and Evaluation strategies and techniques, see UNDP Discussion Paper: Innovations in Monitoring & Evaluating Results, 05 Nov 2013.
[2] For more stakeholder engagement in the M&E process, see the UNDP Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results, Chapter 3, pg. 93.

outlined in the Project Document.
- Review the relevance of the project strategy and assess whether it provides the most effective route towards expected/intended results. Were lessons from other relevant projects properly incorporated into the project design?
- Review how the project addresses country priorities. Review country ownership. Was the project concept in line with the national sector development priorities and plans of the country (or of participating countries in the case of multi-country projects)?
- Review decision-making processes: were perspectives of those who would be affected by project decisions, those who could affect the outcomes, and those who could contribute information or other resources to the process, taken into account during project design processes?
- Review the extent to which relevant gender issues were raised in the project design.
- If there are major areas of concern, recommend areas for improvement.

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

ii. Progress Towards Results

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

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

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

---

[3] Populate with data from the Logframe and scorecards
[4] Populate with data from the Project Document
[5] If available
[6] Colour code this column only
[7] Use the 6 point Progress Towards Results Rating Scale: HS, S, MS, MU, U, HU

In addition to the progress towards outcomes analysis:

- Compare and analyse the AF Results Tracker within the 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/ 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 AF reporting requirements (i.e. how have they addressed poorly-rated PPRs, if applicable?)
- Assess how lessons derived from the adaptive management process have been documented, shared with key partners and internalized by partners.

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

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

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

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

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

Environmental risks to sustainability:

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

Conclusions & Recommendations

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

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

Rec #	Recommendation	Entity Responsible
A	*(State Outcome 1)* (Outcome 1)	
A.1	**Key recommendation:**	
A.2		
A.3		
B	*(State Outcome 2)* (Outcome 2)	
B.1	**Key recommendation:**	
B.2		
B.3		
C	*(State Outcome 3)* (Outcome 3), etc.	
C.1	**Key recommendation:**	
C.2		
C.3		
D	Project Implementation & Adaptive Management	
D.1	**Key recommendation:**	
D.2		
D.3		
E	Sustainability	
E.1	**Key recommendation:**	
E.2		
E.		

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

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 UNDP/AF project "Developing climate resilience of farming communities in the drought prone parts of Uzbekistan"

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)	

---

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

	Outcome 3 Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale)	
	Etc.	
Project Implementation & Adaptive Management	(rate 6 pt. scale)	
Sustainability	(rate 4 pt. scale)	

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

7. Timeframe

The total duration of the MTE will be approximately 5 weeks starting from 3 November 2017, and shall not exceed five months from when the consultant(s) are hired. The tentative MTR timeframe is as follows:

TIMEFRAME	ACTIVITY
24 August 2017	Application closes
29 September 2017	Select MTE Team
3 November 2017	Prep the MTE Team (handover of Project Documents)
7-9 November 2017, 3 days	Document review and preparing MTE Inception Report
14-18 November 2017, 5 days	Finalization and Validation of MTE Inception Report - latest start of MTE mission
20-28 November 2017, 9 days	MTE mission: stakeholder meetings, interviews, field visits
27 November 2017	Mission wrap-up meeting & presentation of initial findings- earliest end of MTE mission
2-5 December 2017, 4 days	Preparing draft report
13-14 December 2017, 2 days	Incorporating audit trail from feedback on draft report/Finalization of MTE report
15 December 2017	Preparation & Issue of Management Response
N/A	(optional) Concluding Stakeholder Workshop (not mandatory for MTE team)
19 December 2017	Expected date of full MTE completion

8. Mid-Term Evaluation Deliverables

#	Deliverable	Description	Timing	Responsibilities
1	MTE Inception Report	MTE team clarifies objectives and methods of Midterm Evaluation	No later than 2 weeks before the MTE mission	MTE team submits to the Commissioning Unit (Sustainable Development Cluster) and project management
2	Presentation	Initial Findings	End of MTE mission	MTE Team presents to project management and the Commissioning Unit (Sustainable Development Cluster)
3	Draft Final Report	Full report (using guidelines on content outlined in Annex B) with	Within 3 weeks of the MTE mission	Sent to the Commissioning Unit (Sustainable

				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 MTE report	Within **1 week** of receiving UNDP comments on draft	Sent to the Commissioning Unit (Sustainable Development Cluster)

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

9. MTE Arrangement

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

The Commissioning Unit (Sustainable Development Cluster) will contract the consultants, and ensure the timely provision of per diems and 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 team leader (with experience and exposure to projects and evaluations in other regions globally) and one team expert from Uzbekistan the country of the project. The consultants 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 overall "team" qualities in the following areas: *(max amount of points related to the technical evaluation)*
- Recent experience with result-based management evaluation methodologies – 10%;
- Experience applying SMART targets and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios 5%;
- Competence in adaptive management, as applied to CCA – 10%;
- Experience working with the AF evaluations – 10%;
- Experience working in Central Asia and/or CIS regions – 10%;
- Work experience in relevant technical areas for at least 10 years – 5%;
- Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender and CCA; experience in gender sensitive evaluation and analysis – 5%;
- Excellent communication skills -5%;
- Demonstrable analytical skills – 5%;
- Project evaluation/review experiences within United Nations system will be considered an asset;
- A Master's degree in climate change, environment protection, natural resources management, or other closely related field – 5%.

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[9]

Recommended Presentation of Proposal:

a) **Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability** using the template[10] provided by UNDP;

b) **CV** and a **Personal History Form** (P11 form[11]);

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

d) **Financial Proposal** that indicates the all-inclusive fixed total contract price and all other travel related costs (such as flight ticket, per diem, etc.), supported by a breakdown of costs, as per template attached to the Letter of Confirmation of Interest template. If an applicant is employed by an organization/company/institution, and he/she expects his/her employer to charge a management fee in the process of releasing him/her to UNDP under Reimbursable Loan Agreement (RLA), the applicant must indicate at this point, and ensure that all such costs are duly incorporated in the financial proposal submitted to UNDP.

Applicants are requested to apply online through the UNDP website at http://www.undp.uz. Application shall be submitted by indicated deadline. Incomplete applications or applications received after the closing date will not be given consideration. Application should contain a current and complete C.V. with indication of the e-mail and phone contact. Shortlisted candidates will be requested to submit a price offer indicating the total cost of the assignment (including daily fee, per diem and travel costs). 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.

UNDP is an equal opportunity employer. Qualified female candidates, people with disabilities, and minorities are highly encouraged to apply. UNDP Gender Balance in Management Policy promotes achievement of gender balance among its staff at all levels.

---

13. Signatures - Post Description Certification

Incumbent *(if applicable)*

Name	Signature	Date
Climate Change Specialist, SDC **Rano Baykhanova**	*Баи-*	12.10.2017
Name / Title	Signature	Date
Leader of Sustainable Development Cluster **Mr. Hurshid Rustamov**		12.10.2017
Name / Title	Signature	Date

---

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

[10] https://intranet.undp.org/unit/bom/pso/Support%20documents%20on%20IC%20Guidelines/Template%20for%20Confirmation%20of%20Interest%20and%20Submission%20of%20Financial%20Proposal.docx

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

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

1. UNDP Project Document
2. UNDP Environmental and Social Screening results
3. Project Inception Report
4. All Project Performance Reports (PPR's)
5. Quarterly progress reports and work plans of the various implementation task teams
6. Audit reports
7. Finalized AF Tracking Tools at CEO endorsement and midterm – TT for CCA
8. Oversight mission reports
9. All monitoring reports prepared by the project
10. Financial and Administration guidelines used by Project Team

The following documents will also be available:
11. Project operational guidelines, manuals and systems
12. UNDP country/countries programme document(s)
13. Minutes of the Board Meetings of UNDP/AF Project "Developing climate resilience of farming communities in the drought prone parts of Uzbekistan", and other meetings (i.e. Project Appraisal Committee meetings)
14. Project site location maps

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

i.   Basic Report Information *(for opening page or title page)*
- Title of UNDP supported AF financed project
- UNDP PIMS# and AF project ID#
- MTE time frame and date of MTE report
- Region and countries included in the project
- 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
- Project-level monitoring and evaluation systems
- Stakeholder engagement
- Reporting
- Communications

   4.4 Sustainability
- Financial risks to sustainability

---

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

- 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 (*METT, FSC, Capacity scorecard, etc.)*

ToR ANNEX C: Midterm Evaluation Evaluative Matrix Template

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

ToR ANNEX D: UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluation Consultants[13]

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]

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)

<div style="border:1px solid black; padding:10px">

Midterm Evaluation Report Reviewed and Cleared By:

Commissioning Unit

Name: _____

Signature: _____   Date:
_____

UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Advisor

Name: _____

Signature: _____   Date:
_____

</div>