**Annex 10: MTR Terms of Reference**

UNDP-GEF Midterm Review Terms of Reference

**Standard Template 1: Formatted for attachment to** [**UNDP Procurement Website**](http://procurement-notices.undp.org/)

1. **INTRODUCTION**

This is the Terms of Reference (ToR) for the UNDP-GEF Midterm Review (MTR) of the full-sized sized project titled Promoting Sustainable Rural Energy Technology for Household and Productive Uses Project (PIMS 5200) implemented through the Ministry of Water, Irrigation and Electricity, which is to be undertaken in 2018. The project started on the 10th of June 2016 and is in its second 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*

(<http://web.undp.org/evaluation/guidance.shtml#gef>).

**2. PROJECT BACKGROUND INFORMATION** Ethiopia is signatory to United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change in 1992, the Kyoto Protocol which ratified in 2005 and more recently to the 2015 Paris Agreement. With the aim of implementing these agreements, the government of Ethiopia under its CRGE initiative, GTP and SDG, is determined to take measures towards providing the community with reliable, affordable, and clean energy services that are needed to enhance the livelihood of the people and to fuel the progress of economic growth. Promoting Sustainable Rural Energy Technologies (RETs) for Households and Productive Uses Project is a full-sized national project being implemented by the Ministry of Water, Irrigation and Electricity (MoWIE) under Alternative Energy Technologies Development and Promotion Directorate (AETDPD), and the Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change (MoEFCC) under the Improved Cook Stoves Identification, Development and Promotion Directorate, Development Bank of Ethiopia, UN Capital Development fund in collaboration with UNDP through the financial support of the Global Environmental Facility (GEF), which contributes to the different initiatives of the government to provide alternative and clean energy sources to the rural communities.

The objective of the project is to promote significant use of energy efficient and renewable energy technologies for household and productive uses in rural communities in the country. The aspiration of the project is to reduce carbon emissions from deforestation and ensuring large scale adoption of clean cooking and lighting technologies through supporting the dissemination of 600,000 improved biomass stoves and 200,000 solar home systems in all over the country by the end of 2021 through a private sector driven and market based approach.

This GEF financed, UNDP and, MoWIE and MoEFCC implemented project complements the Ethiopian Energy Policy, the Ethiopian Climate Resilient Green Economy Strategy, the Initial National Communication of Ethiopia to the UNFCCC and the Sustainable Energy for All initiative. The project aims to reduce Ethiopia’s energy-related CO2 emissions by approximately 2 million tons of CO2e by promoting the use of renewable energy and low greenhouse gas (GHG)-producing technologies as a substitute for fossil fuels and non-sustainable biomass utilization in the country, with a focus on rural household appliances for cooking, lighting and heating. The activities proposed in the project are designed to remove barriers that hamper the wide-scale use of off-grid renewable energy technologies in households and productive uses in rural areas of Ethiopia, where extending the grid is simply not feasible in the short-run and where the ability to pay for larger-scale solutions is often limited.

The project consists of four components and is planned to be implemented over a period of five years. The four components are:

Component 1: Strengthening Regulatory and Legal Framework based on National Standards

Component 2: Rural Public Awareness Campaign on Renewable Energy Technologies

Component 3: Sustainable Financial Mechanism for RETs for rural households

Component 4: Business Incubator to Promote Greater Entrepreneurship for Investment in RETs

The overall goal of the project is creating enabling environment for the wide scale dissemination of quality rural energy technology products in off grid areas of the country. The project seeks to implement a more private sector-driven and market-based approach towards promoting renewable energy technologies in rural communities in Ethiopia. The four components consist of a combination of de-risking instruments (Component 1) and market-enabling activities (Component 2 and Component 4) that will combine with a financial support mechanism (Component 3) to help transform the market for off-grid renewable energy technologies in rural communities.

In line with the project components there ae four outcomes listed below:

Outcome 1: Favorable legal and regulatory environment are designed for small-scale off-grid renewable energy investments in rural areas, and modalities for stakeholder training to comply with and implement the new standards and regulations are in place by 2018.

Outcome 2: Greater awareness among rural populations about the benefits and qualities of renewable energy for household and productive uses, as well as awareness among RET enterprises about the availability of Sustainable Financial Mechanism and business support created by 2018.

Outcome 3: By 2020, replicable business model for wider scale-up across other developing countries by adopting an integrated approach to addressing demand and supply-side barriers is created.

Outcome 4: By 2016 Business incubation support programme initiated at MoWIE

At the end of its life time, the project has anticipated to save 35.5 million mega-Joules of energy using improved cook stoves and solar energy technologies through benefiting about 800,000 households from project supported access to RETs. And it also intended to reduce 2 million tons of CO2e GHGs through sale and distribution of about 300,000 RETs technologies using technology road show events. Moreover, the project has also planned to provide volume of financial investment through Sustainable Financial Mechanism for about 200 RET Enterprises and promote business incubation process in the energy sector. It also aimed to set up legal frameworks that protect and promote the effective utilization of standardized RET products through the application of standards.

The project budget consists of USD 4,091,781 of GEF grant funding, USD 500,000 from UNDP, USD 980,000 co-financing from UNCDF CleanStart global programme, USD 300,000 in-kind contribution from UNDP and co-financing from the Government of Ethiopia (MoWIE, MoFECC, FeMSEDA/EDP) of USD 35,179,954 as well as further co-financing from the Development Bank of Ethiopia with a loan of USD 20 million, HIVOS, SNV, ABPP (in-kind) USD 6,185,945 and RET Enterprises (in-kind and cash) USD 6,000,000.

The project is being implemented over the off-grid areas of the nine regional states using the regional energy bureaus as focal points for the project at region level. The project is implemented by the Ministry of Water, Irrigation and Electricity (MoWIE), Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change (MoEFCC), and Development Bank of Ethiopia (DBE) mainly responsible for the implementation of component 3 of the project in collaboration with the United Nations Capital Development Fund (UNCDF). The project has a project office in MoWIE under the Alternative Energy Technology Development and Promotion Directorate, the director being the National Project Director, with a Project Manager, Monitoring and Evaluation Officer and Project Accountant. At region level the project has focal persons assigned from the respective regional energy bureaus responsible for coordinating the project activities at region level in collaboration with the Ministries. The project also has a steering committee comprised of State Ministers’ of the MoWIE, MoEFCC, Ministry of Finance and Economic Cooperation DBE, UNCDF and UNDP. The steering committee supervises the overall implementation and puts directions on issues concerning the implementation of the project. The project office reports physical and financial performance report to the national project director and UNDP, and UNDP reports to the donor, GEF, following its reporting requirements.

**3. 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.

**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). 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 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 Ministry of Water, Irrigation and Electricity, Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change, Development Bank of Ethiopia, United Nations Capital Development Fund, Ministry of Finance and Economic Cooperation; 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 field missions to selected regions from the nine regional states, including the following project sites technology roadshow areas in Afar, Amhara, Benishanguel-Gumuz, Gambella, Somali and Tigray regional states.

In general, the approach and methodology will be

* Conduct desk review
* Collect primary data using appropriate tools in line with evaluation questions and log frame indicators
* KII with program stakeholders and FGD with communities
* Field visits to the implementation sites

Approach and methodology can be adjusted based on consultants’ experience and on the details of the information required

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 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]](#footnote-3)** | **Baseline Level[[4]](#footnote-4)** | **Level in 1st PIR (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 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]](#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.

* Lessons learned; The midterm evaluation is expected to extract lessons and successes of the program

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 (Promoting Sustainable Rural Energy Technology for Household and Productive Uses Project)**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **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 billable days will be 30 working days however the consultant will be given maximum of approximately working 60 days to conclude the MTR over a time period of 8 weeks starting on September 2018*,* and shall not exceed five months from when the consultant(s) are hired. The tentative MTR timeframe is as follows:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **TIMEFRAME** | **ACTIVITY** |
| *Sespt 01, 2018* | Application closes |
|  *Sept 24, 2018* | Select MTR Team |
| *Sept. 30, 2018* | Prep the MTR Team (handover of Project Documents) |
| *October 3-6, 2018 4 days*  | Document review and preparing MTR Inception Report |
| *October 17-20, 2018 4 days* | Finalization andValidation of MTR Inception Report- latest start of MTR mission |
| *October 24 – Novmber 15, 2018 (15 days)* | MTR mission: stakeholder meetings, interviews, field visits |
| *November 22, 2018* | Mission wrap-up meeting & presentation of initial findings- earliest end of MTR mission |
| *November 23-31, 2018 (7 days)* | Preparing draft report |
| *December 01-02, 2018 (2 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) |
| *December 08, 2018* | Preparation & Issue of Management Response |
| *NA* | (optional)Concluding Stakeholder Workshop (not mandatory for MTR team) |
| *December 14, 2018* | 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 clarifies objectives and methods of Midterm Review | No later than 2 weeks before the MTR mission: (Sep. 17, 2018) | MTR team submits to the Commissioning Unit and project management |
| **2** | **Presentation** | Initial Findings | End of MTR mission: (Oct. 22, 2018) | MTR Team presents to project management and the Commissioning Unit |
| **3** | **Draft Final Report** | Full report (using guidelines on content outlined in Annex B) with annexes | Within 3 weeks of the MTR mission: (Oct. 31, 2018) | Sent to the Commissioning Unit, reviewed by RTA, Project Coordinating Unit, GEF OFP |
| **4** | **Final Report\*** | Revised report with audit trail detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final MTR report | Within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft: (Nov. 08, 2018) | Sent to the Commissioning Unit |

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

1. **MTR ARRANGEMENTS**

The principal responsibility for managing this MTR resides with the Commissioning Unit. The Commissioning Unit for this project’s MTR is UNDP Ethiopia 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. **ToR ANNEX A: List of Documents to be reviewed by the MTR Team**
2. PIF
3. UNDP Initiation Plan
4. UNDP Project Document
5. UNDP Environmental and Social Screening results
6. Project Inception Report
7. All Project Implementation Reports (PIR’s)
8. Quarterly progress reports and work plans of the various implementation task teams
9. Audit reports
10. Finalized GEF focal area Tracking Tools at CEO endorsement and midterm (*fill in specific TTs for this project’s focal area*)
11. Oversight mission reports
12. All monitoring reports prepared by the project
13. Financial and Administration guidelines used by Project Team

The following documents will also be available:

1. Project operational guidelines, manuals and systems
2. UNDP country/countries programme document(s)
3. Minutes of the Promoting Sustainable Rural Energy Technology for Household and Productive Uses Project Board Meetings and other meetings (i.e. Project Appraisal Committee meetings)
4. Project site location maps
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-%282009%29.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)