

TERMS OF REFERENCE / INDIVIDUAL CONTRACT

Position title:	National Consultant for the Project Midterm Review														
Position type:	Local Consultant, IC														
Office/Project:	UNDP/GEF project: "Removing Barriers to Wind Power Development in Belarus" No. 87557														
Conditions of work:	Home-based with in-country field visits in Belarus														
Duration of contract:	6 December 2017 – 31 March 2018 30 working days (including in-country field visits in Belarus of 8 days in total)														
Requirement for travel:	One 8-day mission (in-country field visits in Belarus) Any additional mission to Belarus that might be deemed necessary should be thoroughly justified, and discussed with the UNDP Belarus Country Office and the UNDP/GEF Regional Technical Advisor. If required, the costs of travel and per diem related to the second mission, would be paid separately from the costs of this assignment but the time would be included within the overall 30 days.														
Conditions of payment:	<p>The total payment for the assignment will be a lump sum fee paid in 3 installments as specified in the table below:</p> <table><tr><th><i>Installment No.</i></th><th><i>Milestone No. (see Section 8 below) and timeframe</i></th><th><i>% of total contract amount</i></th></tr><tr><td>1</td><td>1 and 2</td><td>20</td></tr><tr><td>2</td><td>3 and 4</td><td>50</td></tr><tr><td>3</td><td>5</td><td>30</td></tr></table> <p>Each of the installments shall be paid within 20 days after completion and approval of the reports as required in Section 6 - "Milestones and Deliverables" below. Travel expenses related to the first mission shall be included in the lump sum.</p>			<i>Installment No.</i>	<i>Milestone No. (see Section 8 below) and timeframe</i>	<i>% of total contract amount</i>	1	1 and 2	20	2	3 and 4	50	3	5	30
<i>Installment No.</i>	<i>Milestone No. (see Section 8 below) and timeframe</i>	<i>% of total contract amount</i>													
1	1 and 2	20													
2	3 and 4	50													
3	5	30													
Qualifications:	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• University degree in any of the following fields: engineering, energy, environment, international relations, economics, law, or business. Advanced degree in any of the mentioned areas will be considered as an advantage;• Practical experience in mid-term or final performance evaluation of international and/or regional projects;• Experience or knowledge of UNDP and GEF monitoring and evaluation policy would be an asset;• Solid knowledge, demonstrated by at least 3 relevant publications and/or evidences in professional experience records (e.g., certifications, awards, inventions, membership of professional associations and ad-hoc panels, lecturing, training, participation in exhibitions and professional events, presentations, etc.), about principles, best international policy, best investment practice, project cycle and monitoring/auditing, applicable to energy and/or renewable energy, with preference for wind energy;• Experience of cooperation with government bodies, local authorities and non-governmental organizations;• Familiarity with relevant Belarusian regulations and standards and Belarusian policy on renewable energy is an asset;• Advanced written and spoken English;• Fluency in written and spoken Russian and/or Belarusian.														
Competencies:	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Strong report writing skills and experience in writing and presenting reports to a high professional level (which includes graphs, pictures, diagrams, figures and other illustrative tools to enhance the reporting quality).														
Direct supervisor:	<p>The principal responsibility for managing MTR resides with the Commissioning Unit, UNDP Country Office in Belarus.</p> <p>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.</p>														

Throughout the assignment, the Consultant will work in close collaboration with the UNDP Country Office in Minsk and the Project Implementation Unit. S/he will report on his/her work to Programme Analyst, UNDP Country Office in Minsk.

1. General background information on the context of the assignment

This is the Terms of Reference (ToR) for the UNDP-GEF Midterm Review (MTR) of the full-sized project titled Removing Barriers to Wind Power Development in Belarus (PIMS #4462) implemented through the Ministry of Natural Resources and Environmental Protection of Belarus (Ministry of Environment), which is to be undertaken in December 2017-March 2018. The project is in its second year of implementation (the Standard Letter of Agreement between UNDP and the Ministry of Environment to carry out activities when UNDP provides support services to the Project was signed on 30 September 2015). The MTR process must follow the guidance outlined in the document Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects.

1.1. Project background information

The United Nations Development Programme (hereinafter – UNDP) plays a key role as a partner of the Government of Belarus in the implementation of programs and policies to improve energy efficiency and introduce renewable energy sources. In particular, UNDP supports the Government of Belarus by virtue of the country's capacity building and arrangement of conditions for wind power development to achieve the goals to reduce the GDP energy intensity within the framework of the project "Removing Barriers to Wind Power Development in Belarus" financed by the GEF under the Climate Change Strategy.

This project provides for support in removing barriers to the implementation of projects in the field of wind power in the Republic of Belarus. Within the framework of this project, it is proposed to create financially viable partnership between the state and the private sector in order to promote investment activities in the Republic of Belarus through initial capital and to demonstrate practical elaborations in wind power on a market basis. By the time of the project completion it is expected to create stable incentive conditions and procedures for the assistance in the implementation of wind power projects with a total installed capacity of not less than 25 MW.

1.2. Project overview

The project aims to render assistance in removing barriers to wind power development in the Republic of Belarus. The project's contribution to the achievement of this goal will be measured by its success in the development of not less than 5 sites for the construction of wind farms, that will directly or indirectly lead to obtaining permits, financing and construction of wind mills with a capacity of at least 25 MW in Belarus. The project task is the creation and application of such a mechanism for these wind power stations, which will become a standard scheme in the future and will open up opportunities for the prospective development of wind power stations by private developer's companies. The major problem that the project seeks to address is that wind power in Belarus is not commercially attractive to private investments in the creation of wind farms due to certain barriers. In order to support the development of wind power in the Republic of Belarus, it is necessary to overcome a number of obstacles. In the course of the project, such obstacles are identified and practical measures to overcome them are developed and introduced.

2. Objectives of the MTR

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

A team of two independent consultants will conduct the MTR - one team leader (with experience and exposure to projects and evaluations in other regions globally) and one national expert. 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.

3. 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). The MTR 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 approach¹ 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 Stakeholder involvement should include interviews with stakeholders who have project responsibilities, including but not limited to UNDP Belarus, Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment protection of the Republic of Belarus, Wind Energy Support Unit (WESU), Wind Private Finance Initiative (WPFI), etc.; 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 MTR team is expected to conduct 8-days mission to Belarus, including the following project sites: a site for wind farm development near Veleshkovichi village (Liozno district, Vitebsk region); and a site for wind turbines installation near the village of Yanovich, Novogrudok district, Grodno region.

Any additional mission to Belarus that might be deemed necessary should be thoroughly justified, and discussed with the UNDP Belarus Country Office and the UNDP/GEF Regional Technical Advisor. If required, the costs of travel and per diem related to the second mission, if it is necessary, would be paid separately from the costs of this assignment but the time would be included within the overall 30 days.

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

4. 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.

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.

- Ensure broader development and gender aspects of the project are being monitored effectively. Develop and recommend SMART 'development' indicators, including sex-disaggregated indicators and indicators that capture development benefits.

ii. Progress Towards Results

Progress Towards Outcomes Analysis:

- Review the logframe indicators against progress made towards the end-of-project targets using the Progress Towards Results Matrix and following the *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	Baseline Level ⁴	Level in 1 st 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
-----------------	----------------------------------	-----------------------------------

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.

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

- Review the quality of support provided by the GEF Partner Agency (UNDP) and recommend areas for improvement.

Work Planning:

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

Finance and co-finance:

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

Project-level Monitoring and Evaluation Systems:

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

Stakeholder Engagement:

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

Reporting:

- Assess how adaptive management changes have been reported by the project management and shared with the Project Board.
- Assess how well the Project Team and partners undertake and fulfil GEF reporting requirements (i.e. how have they addressed poorly-rated 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

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 Removing Barriers to Wind Power Development in Belarus

Measure	MTR Rating	Achievement Description
Project Strategy	N/A	
Progress Towards Results	Objective Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale)	

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

	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)	

5. Scope of Work. Duties and responsibilities

The National Consultant will work in the team with the International Consultant for the Project Midterm Review and in cooperation with UNDP CO and the Project Implementation Unit. The Consultant cannot have participated in the project preparation, formulation, and/or implementation (including the writing of the Project Document) and should not have a conflict of interest with project's related activities.

The National Consultant will support the International Consultant in analysis of data and documentation related to implementation of the Project and will prepare a background report for the International Consultant prior to the first mission to Belarus. Particularly, the Consultant will perform the following tasks:

- Analysis of the primary data and documentation;
- Participation in development of evaluation methodology;
- Preparation of the midterm evaluation mission, including development of the agenda, organization and holding of meetings with the key project stakeholders; provision of interpreting services during the meetings;
- Provision, if necessary, of interpreting services during meetings and translation of the primary data;
- Participation in preparation of the draft midterm evaluation report;
- Assistance to the International Consultant in preparing the final version of the midterm evaluation report by incorporating the comments received;
- Provision of other necessary support to the International Consultant;
- Other services related to the project MTR as requested by the Commissioning Unit.

6. Milestones and deliverables

The following table defines the main milestones, as per the activities stipulated in the Section "**Scope of work**" above, for which formal reports are required. These reports are to be submitted to the International Consultant, the Project Implementation Unit (PIU), UNDP CO for review before the deadlines specified below. Approval of these reports by the UNDP Country Office will govern payment under the contract for this assignment.

Prior to approval of the final MTR report, a draft version shall be circulated for comments to the PIU, UNDP CO, UNDP/GEF Regional Technical Advisor and key project stakeholders. All comments and suggestions (if any) shall be addressed and the report will be considered as the final deliverable as soon it is accepted by UNDP CO.

The final version of the evaluation report should be submitted in electronic format (MS Word) to UNDP CO Programme Analyst, Mr. Igar Tchoulba (igar.tchoulba@undp.org), the Project Manager, Ms. Maryna Belavus (maryna.belavus@gmail.com) no later than **22 March 2018**.

The Commissioning Unit will contract the Consultant and ensure the timely provision of per diems and travel arrangements within the country for the MTR team. The Project Implementation Unit will liaise with the MTR team to provide all relevant project documents, support arrangement of stakeholder interviews and field visits.

MTR timeframe is as follows:

No	Milestone	Report type and size	Deadline
1	Evaluation Methodology compiled, desk review and workplan completed, agenda of the mission and schedule of visits to stakeholders prepared	report of up to 15 pages	1 January 2018
2	MTR Mission of the International Consultant to Belarus conducted: stakeholder meetings, interviews, in-country field visits held; interpreting services during the meetings are provided.	report of up to 8 pages	12 February 2018
3	Inputs to the draft Midterm Review report* developed by the International Consultant, are made and the draft sent for comments to stakeholders	report of 40 pages in total (not including annexes).	27 February 2018
4	Circulation and other types of feedback mechanisms for reviewing and commenting on the draft MTR report completed, and comments received	list of comments and summary of up to 8 pages	5 March 2018
5	Finalization of the Midterm Review report (incorporating comments received on the draft report) Translation into Russian, upon UNDP CO request, with the use of interpreting services; proofreading of the translated documents *Expected date of full MTR completion- 19 March 2018	report of 40 pages in total (not including annexes).	22 March 2018

*The 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.

Supervisor

Ina Klimenkova
UNDP Programme Associate

Supervisee

ToR ANNEX A: List of Documents to be reviewed by the MTR 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 Implementation Reports (PIR's)
7. Quarterly progress reports and work plans of the various implementation task teams
8. Audit reports
9. Finalized GEF CCM Tracking Tool at CEO endorsement and midterm
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/countries programme document(s)
15. Minutes of the Removing Barriers to Wind Power Development in Belarus Board Meetings and other meetings (i.e. Project Appraisal Committee meetings)
16. Project site location maps

ToR ANNEX B: Guidelines on Contents for the Midterm Review Report⁹

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

⁹ 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 MTR's findings) which highlight the strengths, weaknesses and results of the project
- 5.2 Recommendations
- Corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project
 - Actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the project
 - Proposals for future directions underlining main objectives
6. Annexes
- MTR ToR (excluding ToR annexes)
 - MTR evaluative matrix (evaluation criteria with key questions, indicators, sources of data, and methodology)
 - Example Questionnaire or Interview Guide used for data collection
 - Ratings Scales
 - MTR mission itinerary
 - List of persons interviewed
 - List of documents reviewed
 - Co-financing table (if not previously included in the body of the report)
 - Signed UNEG Code of Conduct form
 - Signed MTR final report clearance form
 - *Annexed in a separate file:* Audit trail from received comments on draft MTR report
 - *Annexed in a separate file:* Relevant midterm tracking tools (*METT, FSC, Capacity scorecard, etc.*)

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

Evaluators/Consultants:

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

MTR Consultant Agreement Form

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

Name of Consultant: _____

Name of Consultancy Organization (where relevant): _____

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

Signed at _____ (Place) on _____ (Date)

Signature: _____

¹⁰ www.undp.org/uneccodeofconduct

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

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

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

ToR ANNEX F: MTR Report Clearance Form

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

Midterm Review Report Reviewed and Cleared By:

Commissioning Unit

Name: _____

Signature: _____ Date: _____

UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Advisor

Name: _____

Signature: _____ Date: _____