Annex 1 – MTR ToRs

1. **INTRODUCTION**

This is the Terms of Reference (ToR) for the UNDP-GEF Midterm Review(MTR) of the *full* -sized project titled *Mainstreaming Incentives for Biodiversity Conservation in CRGE* (PIMS4644)implemented through the *Ministry of Environment Forest and Climate Change*, which is to be undertaken in *2018*. The project started on the *October 2015*andis in its *third*year of implementation. In line with the UNDP-GEF Guidance on MTRs, this MTR process was initiated before the submission of the second Project Implementation Report (PIR). 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*.

**2. PROJECT BACKGROUND INFORMATION**

The project was designed to: *To Ensure that Biodiversity of Ethiopia is better protected from current and future threats, by ensuring development and investment decisions do not impact negatively on Biodiversity”. Under the general objective the project has two major outcomes;*

* *The enabling policy framework for mainstreaming biodiversity conservation into the Climate Resilient Green Growth is strengthened and*
* *At least 20,000 ha of highly threatened Afromontane eco-region are under Payment for Ecosystem Services resulting in improved stewardship by community land managers and reduced pressure on Bio-Diversity*

*The project is currently supporting communities and local governments in their effort to intensively rehabilitating highly threatened ecosystem in 04 areas of Ethiopia in 04 regional states namely; Choke mountain ecosystem in Amhara regional state where significant number of tributary rivers to the blue Nile starts, Diga-Arjo forest in Oromia regional state which has also high importance for Dedhesa sub-basin in the west, Kulfo forest in South Nations, Nationalities and Peoples’ regional state which is also a critical catchment for Omo watershed to the south and Hadew(Karamara) range area in Ethio-Somali regional state where promising & significant number of medicinal threes & shrubs exist..*

**3. OBJECTIVES OF THE MTR**

The MTR willassess 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 and its risks to sustainability.

**4. MTR APPROACH & METHODOLOGY**

The MTR must provide evidence based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The MTR team will review all relevant sources of information including documents prepared during the preparation phase (i.e. PIF, UNDP Initiation Plan, UNDP Environmental & Social Safeguard Policy, the Project Document, project reports including Annual Project Review/PIRs, 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). TheMTR team 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 team is expected to follow a collaborative and participatory approach[[1]](#footnote-1) 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.[[2]](#footnote-2) Stakeholder involvement should include interviews with stakeholders who have project responsibilities, including but not limited to *The State Minister of Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change (MEFCC), GEF Focal Person, Environmental work organs of Amhara, Oromia, SNNP and Ethio-Somali Regional States, the Project Manager at PMU in MEFCC and his staff, The inclusive Growth and Sustainable Development Unit TL at UNDP, The Country Director at UNDP, The GEF Program Analyst at UNDP, The Regional Technical Advisor, Project Site Officers at four project sites, Project Steering Committee at national and local levels* . Additionally, the MTR team is expected to conduct field missions to the following project sites *Choke Mountain, East Gojjam Zone (Amhara Region), Arjo-Digo Forest (Oromiya Region),Kulfo Forest, Arba-Minch (SNNP Region), Hadew Kebele, Jijiga Zone (Somali Region)*.

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

**5. DETAILED SCOPE OF THE MTR**

The MTR team will assess the following four categories of project progress. 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 (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.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 against progress made towards theend-of-project targetsusing 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[[3]](#footnote-3)** | **Baseline Level[[4]](#footnote-4)** | **Level in 1stPIR (self- reported)** | **Midterm Target[[5]](#footnote-5)** | **End-of-project Target** | **Midterm Level & Assessment[[6]](#footnote-6)** | **Achievement Rating[[7]](#footnote-7)** | **Justification for Rating** |
| **Objective:** | Indicator (if applicable): |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Outcome 1:** | Indicator 1: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Indicator 2: |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Outcome 2:** | Indicator 3: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Indicator 4: |  |  |  |  |  |
| Etc. |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Etc.** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**Indicator Assessment Key**

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

In addition to the progress towards outcomes analysis:

* Compare and analyse the GEF Tracking Tool 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 theProject Teammeeting 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 managementand 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 PIRs, 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, Annual Project Review/PIRs 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 team will include a section of the report setting out the MTR’s evidence-based conclusions, in light of the findings.[[8]](#footnote-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. See the*Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects*for guidance on a recommendation table.

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

**Ratings**

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

Table. MTR Ratings & Achievement Summary Table for (Mainstreaming Incentives for Biodiversity Conservation in CRGE)

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

1. **TIMEFRAME**

The total duration of the MTR will be approximately *60 working days* over a time period of *(three months)* starting *June 15, 2018 ,* and shall not exceed five months from when the consultant(s) are hired. The tentative MTR timeframe is as follows:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **TIMEFRAME** | **ACTIVITY** |
| *June 10, 2018* | Application closes |
| *June 15, 2018* | Select MTR Team |
| *June 20, 2018* | Prep the MTR Team (handover of Project Documents) |
| *June 25, 2018* | Document review and preparing MTR Inception Report |
| *June 30, 2018* | Finalization andValidation of MTR Inception Report- latest start of MTR mission |
| *July 13, 2018 (10 days)* | MTR mission: stakeholder meetings, interviews, field visits |
| *July 17, 2018 (2 days)* | Mission wrap-up meeting & presentation of initial findings- earliest end of MTR mission |
| *July 26, 2018 (8 days)* | Preparing draft report |
| *August 2, 2018 (5 days)* | Incorporating audit trail from feedback on draft report/Finalization of MTR report (note: accommodate time delay in dates for circulation and review of the draft report) |
| *August 6, 2018 (2 days)* | Preparation & Issue of Management Response |
| *August 23, 2018 (12 days)* | Expected date of full MTR completion |

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

1. **MIDTERM REVIEW DELIVERABLES**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **#** | **Deliverable** | **Description** | **Timing** | **Responsibilities** |
| **1** | **MTR Inception Report** | MTR team clarifiesobjectives and methods of Midterm Review | No later than 2 weeks before the MTR mission | MTR team submits to the IGSD Unit /UNDP CO and Ministry of Environment and Forest |
| **2** | **Presentation** | Initial Findings | End of MTR mission | MTR Team presents to IGSD unit/UNDP Co and Ministry of Environment and Forest |
| **3** | **Draft Final Report** | Full report (using guidelines on content outlined in Annex B) with annexes | Within 3 weeks of the MTR mission | Sent to the IGSD 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 10days of receiving UNDP comments on draft | Sent to the IGSD 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.

1. **MTR ARRANGEMENTS**

The principal responsibility for managing this MTR resides with the IGSD Unit. The IGSD Unit for this project’s MTR is*(In the case of single-country projects, the Commissioning Unit is the UNDP Country Office. In the case of regional projects and jointly-implemented projects, typically the principal responsibility for managing this MTR resides with the country or agency or regional coordination body – please confirm with the UNDP-GEF team in the region – that is receiving the larger proportion of GEF financing. For global projects,the Commissioning Unit can be the UNDP-GEF Directorate or the lead UNDP Country Office).*

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

1. **TEAM COMPOSITION**

A team of two independent consultants (one international and one national) will conduct the MTR - one team leader – the international consultant (with experience and exposure to projects and evaluations in other regions globally) and one team expert – the national consultant. 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:*(give a weight to all these qualifications so applicants know what is the max amount of points they can earn for the technical evaluation)*

* 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 GEF Climate Change adaptation projects;
* Experience working with the GEF or GEF-evaluations;
* Experience working in GEF Africa Region
* Work experience in relevant technical areas for at least 10 years;
* Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender and *GEF Climate Change Adaptation Projects*; 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 *Climate Change Adaptation, Environmental Science, Natural Resource Management*, or other closely related field.

| Criteria | | Weight | Max. Point |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Technical Competence (based on CV, Proposal and interview (if required)) | | 70% | 100 |
| * Criteria a. Educational relevance: close fit to post | |  | 10 |
| * Criteria b. Understanding the scope of work and organization of the proposal | |  | 50 |
| * Criteria c. Experience of similar assignment | |  | 30 |
| * Criteria d. Previous work experience in Africa/ Ethiopia | |  | 10 |
| Financial (Lower Offer/Offer\*100) | | 30% | 30 |
| Total Score | Technical Score \* 70% + Financial Score \* 30% | | |

1. **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.

1. **APPLICATION PROCESS[[9]](#footnote-9)**

**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)[[10]](#footnote-10) 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)[[11]](#footnote-11));
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 priceand 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.

All application materials should be submitted to the address UNDP, Procurement Office, North Wing, 6th Floor, ECA Compound, P.O.Box 5580, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia; in a sealed envelope indicating the following reference “Consultant for *Mainstreaming Incentives for Biodiversity Conservation in CRGE*  Midterm Review” or by email at the following address ONLY: [Mekdelawit.hailu@undp.org](mailto:Mekdelawit.hailu@undp.org)This email address is being protected from spam bots, you need Javascript enabled to view it by ***(Midnight Addis Time on May 10, 2018).*** Incomplete applications will be excluded from further consideration.

**Criteria for Evaluation of Proposal:** Only those applications which are responsive and compliant will beevaluated. 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 2 – Interview guide used for data collection

Below is the interview guide that was used as support for the discussionswith project implementers, partners and beneficiaries. Face-to-face interviews and Focus Group Discussions were organised around the four main themes underlined in the table: i) satisfaction; ii) collaboration and partnering; iii) knowledge management and capacity building; and iv) future direction. The review team used open discussion oriented around these four themes and the related questions to collect qualitative and quantitative data relevant to the MTR.

Table 1. Survey guide for project management, partners and beneficiaries

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **1** | **Satisfaction** | |
|  | 1.1 | What have been the key achievements thus far; i.e. what would not have happened, or happened as quickly without the project? |
|  | 1.2 | To what extent is the project’s work aligned with key priorities of your organisation? |
|  | 1.3 | What are areas in which the project could do better in terms of quality of interactions, processes that the project uses, technical work or knowledge sharing? Please give examples. |
|  | 1.4 | Please comment on how well the project is addressing or incorporating into its work emerging priorities, such as the renewed emphasis on gender equality, sustainability or country ownership? |
| **2** | **Collaboration and partnering** | |
|  | 2.1 | Is the project doing enough to partner with other relevant organisations, including local organisations? In what ways are they working well? Are any important connections not being made, and if this is the case, how can they improve? |
| **3** | **Knowledge management and capacity building** | |
|  | 3.1 | How are the project’s products shared among partners and among relevant organisations? Are lessons learned captured, compiled and shared? Are project results shared and used to facilitate replication of best practices? How could this process be improved? |
|  | 3.2 | Is the project addressing capacity building needs of the beneficiary community organisations (e.g. CBOs and cooperatives, relevant line ministries, PES legal experts) and local governmental institutions? Please elaborate. |
| **4** | **Future direction** | |
|  | 4.1 | What are the strengths and weaknesses of this project and what would you like to see changed in future project designs? |
|  | 4.2 | What are the technical gaps or emerging priorities that need to be addressed, either in the remainder of this project, or in a follow-on one? |

Annex 3 – Ratings scales

Progress towards results were rated according to the scale presented in the table below.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Ratings for Progress Towards Results** | | |
| 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 (MU) | 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. |

As per the ToRs of the MTR, sustainability on the following four-point scale: Likely (L), Moderately Likely (ML), Moderately Unlikely (ML) and Unlikely (U).

1. 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-1)
2. 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-2)
3. Populate with data from the Logframe and scorecards [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. Populate with data from the Project Document [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. If available [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. Colour code this column only [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. Use the 6 point Progress Towards Results Rating Scale: HS, S, MS, MU, U, HU [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. Alternatively, MTR conclusions may be integrated into the body of the report. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
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> [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. <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-10)
11. <http://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/corporate/Careers/P11_Personal_history_form.doc> [↑](#footnote-ref-11)