

## INDIVIDUAL CONSULTANT PROCUREMENT NOTICE

05 December 2018

<b>Ref:</b>	ORKÖY/IC/2018-02
<b>Country:</b>	Turkey
<b>Description of the Assignment:</b>	MID-TERM Review Expert FOR UNDP/GEF Project: PIMS 5323: Sustainable Energy Financing Mechanism for Solar Photovoltaic Systems in Forest Villages in Turkey
<b>Project Name:</b>	<b>Sustainable Energy Financing Mechanism for Solar Photovoltaic Systems in Forest Villages in Turkey</b>
<b>Period of Assignment/Services:</b>	18 March 2019 – 16 July 2019 (25 working/days throughout the contract validity, non-consecutive)

*Proposal should be submitted by email to [tr.icproposal@undp.org](mailto:tr.icproposal@undp.org) no later than 20 December 2018, COB.*

*Any request for clarification must be sent in writing, or by standard electronic communication to the address or e-mail indicated above. UNDP will respond in writing or by standard electronic mail and will send written copies of the response, including an explanation of the query without identifying the source of inquiry, to all consultants.*

### 1. BACKGROUND

Please see Annex 1 (Terms of Reference).

### 2. SCOPE OF WORK, RESPONSIBILITIES AND DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSED ANALYTICAL WORK

Please see Annex 1 (Terms of Reference).

### 3. REQUIREMENTS FOR EXPERIENCE AND QUALIFICATIONS

Please see Annex 1 (Terms of Reference).

### 4. DOCUMENTS TO BE INCLUDED WHEN SUBMITTING THE PROPOSALS

Interested individual consultants **MUST** submit the following documents/information to demonstrate their qualifications:

1. **"Letter to UNDP Confirming Interest and Availability"** given in the attachment as Annex 3
2. Latest Personal CV including similar past experience and contact details for references

***Failure to submit either one of the above listed documents may result in automatic disqualification of a candidate.***

Interested individual consultants may also submit **"Motivation Letter and Methodology"** in addition to above listed compulsory documents.

## **5. FINANCIAL PROPOSAL**

Financial proposal shall be submitted together with the compulsory documents, in the format provided in **"Letter to UNDP Confirming Interest and Availability"**.

## **6. EVALUATION**

The evaluation will be based on cumulative analysis (i.e. technical qualifications and price proposal). The weight of the technical criteria is 70%; the weight of the financial proposal is 30%. Candidates that obtain a minimum of 49 pts out of a maximum 70 pts will be considered for the financial evaluation. Candidates that do not meet the minimum requirements will be disqualified.

Criteria	Maximum Points
<b>Technical</b>	<b>70 pts</b>
<i>General Qualifications</i>	<i>15 pts</i>
<i>General Professional Experience</i>	<i>20 pts</i>
<i>Specific Professional Experience</i>	<i>35 pts</i>
<b>Financial</b>	<b>30 pts</b>

## **7. ANNEXES**

The following annexes are an integral part of this procurement notice. In case of any conflict between the provisions of the Annex 3 and the procurement notice and/or Annex 1, Annex 2 and/or Annex 3, the provisions of Annex 3 are applicable.

- Annex 1: Terms of Reference
- Annex 2: Supporting Information to Terms of Reference
- Annex 3: General Conditions of Contract for Services of Individual Consultants
- Annex 4: Letter to UNDP Confirming Interest and Availability

## **ANNEX – I**

### **TERMS OF REFERENCE**

#### **1- BACKGROUND**

The project being implemented in collaboration with the General Directorate of Forestry, Department of Forest and Village Relations (aka ORKOY) is a 4 year long (2016-2020) GEF Full Size Project, namely Sustainable Energy Financing Mechanism for Solar Photovoltaic Systems in Forest Villages in Turkey, aka ORKOY GEF Project. The project assists Turkey with the promotion and financing of on-grid solar PV systems via village cooperatives in forest villages. The public support and involvement in the initiative will be led by the GDF, working together with other key actors in the solar PV value chain, including private sector solar PV installers, Turkish utilities, and domestic and international banks as well as other institutions that provide financing. The project objective is to support the successful launching of a sustainable energy financing mechanism within the ORKOY credit mechanism to ensure that there is at least 30 MW of installed capacity of grid-connected, cooperative solar PV in forest villages) by the end of the project; 28,750 tons CO<sub>2</sub>eq avoided emissions from the power sector (compared to the project baseline) by the end of the project; 30MWp cumulative installed capacity of grid-connected PV systems; 47,520,000 kWh/year cumulative total electricity generation from installed grid-connected PV systems and 450 created job positions for forest villagers. The project is divided in 3 components focused on;

- Developing and expanding the policy and institutional framework to promote on-grid, residential solar PV (Component 1),
- Demonstrating the technical and economic viability as well as the business model of the ORKOY sustainable energy financing mechanism for solar PV systems through 4 pilot installations (Component 2), and
- Scaling up and replication at the national level (Component 3).

The financing scheme will be divided into 4 phases. The first one will use grants only for financing of the pilot sites installation; second phase will use combination of GEF and ORKOY grants and ORKOY soft loan; third phase will introduce commercial loan together with GEF/ORKOY grants and ORKOY soft loan and the last phase will use deferred supplier payment tool in combination with ORKOY grant/soft loan and commercial line of credit.

The Expert will serve for overall Mid-Term Evaluation of all components, outputs and activities of subject project.

#### **2- SCOPE OF WORK, RESPONSIBILITIES AND DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSED ANALYTICAL WORK**

The MTR (Mid-Term Review) 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.

The mid-term review will be carried out by MTR Expert. The Expert will receive the support of UNDP Country Office and Project Management Unit, and will be assisted by a facilitator assigned by UNDP (when needed).

### 3- DUTIES & RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE INDIVIDUAL CONSULTANT (IC)

The Expert will carry out the following activities indicated in Section 5 of this Terms of Reference before producing the deliverables listed in this ToR:

The MTR Expert will be provided with support for below listed activities;

- Collection of background materials;
- Debriefings with UNDP CO and GDF representatives;
- Mission program together with the Project Management Unit, meetings with key stakeholders;
- Conducting interviews with relevant stakeholders and provide translation during the interviews when necessary;
- Debriefing with UNDP and project partners;
- Circulation of the draft MTR report among the key project stakeholders for review and comments.

### 4- INSTITUTIONAL ARRANGEMENTS

UNDP will provide the IC all relevant background documents. UNDP is not required to provide any physical facility for the work of the IC. However, depending on the availability of physical facilities (e.g. working space, computer, printer, telephone lines, internet connection etc.) and at the discretion of the UNDP in consultation with relevant stakeholders such facilities may be provided at the disposal of the IC.

The Expert will report to Natural Resources and Biodiversity Cluster Lead of UNDP. The Expert will conduct the Mid-Term Review in close collaboration with Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy Senior Technical Advisor and Monitoring & Evaluation Advisor at UNDP CO.

UNDP will assign a facilitator to set up the stakeholder interviews, arrange the field visits, coordinate with the GDF and provide translation (when necessary).

In preparation for the evaluation mission, Natural Resources and Biodiversity Cluster Lead, with assistance of UNDP CO, will arrange completion of the Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool (METT). Results of METT should be used by an international project evaluation consultant, who will provide his/her comments and track the progress in management effectiveness of project sites. Upon incorporation of the evaluator's comments the METT will be finalized and the results should be attached as a mandatory Annex to the MTR report.

These Terms of Reference follow the UNDP-GEF policies and procedures.

### 5. DELIVERABLES

The core product of the Mid-Term Review will be the Mid-Term Review Report given in Section 4 and Rating Tables given in Annex 2 of Procurement Notice.

In order to fulfill required tasks for the development of deliverables as defined and listed in the table below, the **estimated** number of days to be invested are also provided. The number of days presented as 'estimated number of man days to be invested' are **indicative**. The IC may invest less/more than the estimated number of days in each month and finalize the respective deliverable.

The payment for each deliverable will be made on the basis of the actual number of days invested for that respective deliverable; however, the overall number of days to be invested for all deliverables cannot exceed **25 days throughout the contract validity**. The amount paid shall be gross and inclusive of all associated costs such as social security, pension and income tax.

The deliverables expected from the MTR Expert are as follows:

Activities	Deliverables	TARGET DATE FOR SUBMISSION TO UNDP	Estimated Number of Working/Days to be invested*
- Detailed methodology, work plan and outline;	Inception Report: Desk review, development of methodology, updating time table, drafting mission programme. Incorporating comments received from UNDP Country Office (if necessary).	<b>25 March 2019</b>	4
- Recommendations for a strategy for future replication of the project approach for other types of the climate change and sustainable energy financing projects, for other countries in the region;	In-country field visits, interviews, preliminary mission findings briefing(s), debriefings with project partners and providing aide memoire. Delivering a presentation on aide memoire (finding(s) and recommendation(s)) to Project Partners.	<b>16 April 2019</b>	12
-Mid-term review report with findings -Lessons learned and recommendations for improvement, including recommendations for the revision of project strategy, approach, outputs and activities, if necessary;	Submission of Draft MTR report	<b>15 May 2019</b>	7
- Description of best practices, and an “action list” in a certain area of particular importance for the project.	Finalization of the MTR Report in line with the comments received from the relevant stakeholders regarding the Draft MTR Report.	<b>17 June 2019</b>	2
<b>Estimated Total Number of days</b>			<b>25</b>

### Reporting Line

The MTR Expert will be responsible to the UNDP Natural Resources and Biodiversity Cluster Lead for the completion of the tasks and duties assigned in Section3 of this ToR. All of the reports are subject to approval from UNDP Natural Resources and Biodiversity Cluster Lead in order to realize the payments to the MTR Expert. He/she will work in close collaboration with Project Management Unit, GDF, and other project partners.

### Reporting Language

The reporting language should be in English.

### Title Rights

The title rights, copyrights and all other rights whatsoever nature in any material produced under the provisions of this TORs will be vested exclusively in UNDP.

## 6- MINIMUM QUALIFICATION REQUIREMENTS

The candidates who participated in project preparation, formulation, and/or implementation (including the writing of the Project Document) are not eligible for this consultancy. The candidates should not have a conflict of interest in terms of project activities.

The required qualifications of the MTR Expert are as follows:

	Minimum Requirements	Assets
<b>General Qualifications (15 points)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bachelor's Degree in Energy, Natural Resources, Environmental Economics, Engineering, Business Administration, Economics or other related areas (8 points)</li> <li>Fluency in English both written and spoken. (2 points)</li> <li>Full computer literacy. (2 points)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Masters or Higher Degree in Energy, Natural Resources, Renewable Energy, Solar Energy, Environmental Economics, Engineering, Business Administration, Economics, Forestry (3 points)</li> </ul>
<b>Professional Experience (20 points)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proven knowledge and experience on renewable energy and/or climate change (8 points)</li> <li>Minimum ten (10) years of relevant professional experience (3 points)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>More than fifteen (15) years of relevant professional experience. (2 points)</li> <li>Experience working in one or more environmental or renewable energy project(s) in the Europe &amp; CIS region (3 points)</li> <li>Experience working in one or more environmental or renewable energy project(s) in Turkey in the past 7 years (4 points)</li> </ul>
<b>Specific Experience (35 points)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>5 years of professional experience in providing management or consultancy services to environment and/or renewable energy projects (8 points)</li> <li>Experience in monitoring and evaluation of environment and/or renewable energy projects for UN or other international development agencies (at least in one project) (7 points)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Solid knowledge in results-based management (especially results-oriented monitoring and evaluation) (5 points).</li> <li>More than 8 years of relevant professional experience in providing management or consultancy services to environment and/or forestry projects (2 points) .</li> <li>Knowledge of GEF M&amp;E guidelines and procedures (3 points).</li> <li>Experience in having worked on solar energy projects anywhere in the world as an advisor, consultant,</li> </ul>

	Minimum Requirements	Assets
		<p>developer, evaluator and/or investor in the past 7 years (5 points).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Experience in having worked on solar energy projects in Turkey as an advisor, consultant, developer, evaluator, and/or investor in the past 7 years (5 points).</li> </ul>
<p><b>Notes:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Internships (paid/unpaid) are not considered professional experience.</li> <li>• Obligatory military service is not considered professional experience.</li> <li>• Professional experience gained in an international setting is considered international experience.</li> </ul>		

Female candidates are encouraged to apply.

## 7. TIMING AND DURATION

The work will be undertaken during a period of 25 man/day throughout the time-frame below;

- Estimated Contract Start Date: 18 March 2019
- Estimated Date for Submission of Last Deliverable: 17 June 2019
- Estimated Contract End Date: 16 July 2019

## 8. PLACE OF WORK

Place of work (duty station) for the assignment is home-based. There will be *missions to Ankara and selected project sites*. The mission shall be a minimum of 10 working days in Turkey, although this may be broken into two shorter missions with the mutual agreement of the consultant and UNDP Turkey, provided that the total number of days spent in Turkey is not less than 10 working days. The mission to Turkey will cover days spent in Ankara, as well as days spent to visit project sites and also possibly a day or days in Istanbul for relevant meetings. All travel related costs (cost items indicated below) of these missions out of the duty station (economy class flight ticket and accommodation in 3 or 4-star hotel) will be borne by UNDP. Approval of UNDP is needed prior to the missions is needed. The costs of these missions may either be;

- Arranged and covered by UNDP CO from the respective project budget without making any reimbursements to the consultant or
- Reimbursed to the consultant upon the submission of the receipts/invoices of the expenses by the consultant and approval of the UNDP. The reimbursement of each cost item subject to following constraints/conditions provided in below table;
- covered by the combination of both options

<b>Cost item</b>	<b>Constraints</b>	<b>Conditions of Reimbursement</b>
Travel (intercity transportation)	full-fare economy class tickets	1- Approval by UNDP of the cost items before the initiation of travel 2- Submission of the invoices/receipts, etc. by the consultant with the UNDP's F-10 Form 3- Acceptance and Approval by UNDP of the invoices and F-10 Form.
Accommodation	Up to 50% of the effective DSA rate of UNDP for the respective location	
Breakfast	Up to 6% of the effective DSA rate of UNDP for the respective location	
Lunch	Up to 12% of the effective DSA rate of UNDP for the respective location	
Dinner	Up to 12% of the effective DSA rate of UNDP for the respective location	
Other Expenses (intra city transportations, transfer cost from /to terminals, etc.)	Up to 20% of effective DSA rate of UNDP for the respective location	

## 9. PAYMENTS

Payments will be made within 30 days upon acceptance and approval of the corresponding deliverable by UNDP on the basis of actual number of days invested in that respective deliverable and the pertaining Certification of Payment document signed by the MTR Expert and approved by the responsible UNDP Natural Resources and Biodiversity Cluster Lead. The total amount of payment to be affected to the MTR Expert within the scope of this contract cannot exceed 25 days.

The MTR Expert shall be paid in US\$ if he/she resides in a country different than Turkey. If he/she resides in Turkey, the payment shall be realized in TL through conversion of the US\$ amount by the official UN exchange rate valid on the date of money transfer.

If the deliverables are not produced and delivered by the MTR Expert to the satisfaction of UNDP as approved by the responsible Cluster Lead, no payment will be made even if the consultant has invested man/days to produce and deliver such deliverables.

Expected delivery dates of the reports will be finalized by UNDP during the Briefing Meeting that will be conducted upon contract signature.

The amount paid to the MTR Expert shall be gross and inclusive of all associated costs such as social security, pension and income tax etc.

**Tax Obligations:** The IC is solely responsible for all taxation or other assessments on any income derived from UNDP. UNDP will not make any withholding from payments for the purposes of income tax. UNDP is exempt from any liabilities regarding taxation and will not reimburse any such taxation to the IC.



## **10. ATTACHMENTS**

**Attachment A:** GEF Terminology and Project Review Criteria

**Attachment B:** Project Ratings

**Attachment C:** Evaluator Code of Conduct

## ATTACHMENT A. GEF TERMINOLOGY AND PROJECT REVIEW CRITERIA

**Implementation Approach** includes an analysis of the project's logical framework, adaptation to changing conditions (adaptive management), partnerships in implementation arrangements, changes in project design, and overall project management.

Some elements of an effective implementation approach may include:

- The logical framework used during implementation as a management and M&E tool
- Effective partnerships arrangements established for implementation of the project with relevant stakeholders involved in the country/region
- Lessons from other relevant projects (e.g., same focal area) incorporated into project implementation
- Feedback from M&E activities used for adaptive management.

**Country Ownership/Driveness** is the relevance of the project to national development and environmental agendas, recipient country commitment, and regional and international agreements where applicable. Project Concept has its origin within the national sectoral and development plans

Some elements of effective country ownership/driveness may include:

- Project Concept has its origin within the national sectoral and development plans
- Outcomes (or potential outcomes) from the project have been incorporated into the national sectoral and development plans
- Relevant country representatives (e.g., governmental official, civil society, etc.) are actively involved in project identification, planning and/or implementation
- The recipient government has maintained financial commitment to the project
- The government has approved policies and/or modified regulatory frameworks in line with the project's objectives

For projects whose main focus and actors are in the private-sector rather than public-sector (e.g., IFC projects), elements of effective country ownership/driveness that demonstrate the interest and commitment of the local private sector to the project may include:

- The number of companies that participated in the project by: receiving technical assistance, applying for financing, attending dissemination events, adopting environmental standards promoted by the project, etc.
- Amount contributed by participating companies to achieve the environmental benefits promoted by the project, including: equity invested, guarantees provided, co-funding of project activities, in-kind contributions, etc.
- Project's collaboration with industry associations

**Stakeholder Participation/Public Involvement** consists of three related and often overlapping processes: information dissemination, consultation, and "stakeholder" participation. Stakeholders are the individuals, groups, institutions, or other bodies that have an interest or stake in the outcome of the GEF-financed project. The term also applies to those potentially adversely affected by a project.

Examples of effective public involvement include:

### Information dissemination

- Implementation of appropriate outreach/public awareness campaigns

### Consultation and stakeholder participation

- Consulting and making use of the skills, experiences and knowledge of NGOs, community and local groups, the private and public sectors, and academic institutions in the design, implementation, and evaluation of project activities

#### Stakeholder participation

- Project institutional networks well placed within the overall national or community organizational structures, for example, by building on the local decision making structures, incorporating local knowledge, and devolving project management responsibilities to the local organizations or communities as the project approaches closure
- Building partnerships among different project stakeholders
- Fulfillment of commitments to local stakeholders and stakeholders considered to be adequately involved.

**Sustainability** measures the extent to which benefits continue, within or outside the project domain, from a particular project or program after GEF assistance/external assistance has come to an end. Relevant factors to improve the sustainability of project outcomes include:

- Development and implementation of a sustainability strategy.
- Establishment of the financial and economic instruments and mechanisms to ensure the ongoing flow of benefits once the GEF assistance ends (from the public and private sectors, income generating activities, and market transformations to promote the project's objectives).
- Development of suitable organizational arrangements by public and/or private sector.
- Development of policy and regulatory frameworks that further the project objectives.
- Incorporation of environmental and ecological factors affecting future flow of benefits.
- Development of appropriate institutional capacity (systems, structures, staff, expertise, etc.) .
- Identification and involvement of champions (i.e. individuals in government and civil society who can promote sustainability of project outcomes).
- Achieving social sustainability, for example, by mainstreaming project activities into the economy or community production activities.
- Achieving stakeholder's consensus regarding courses of action on project activities.

**Replication approach**, in the context of GEF projects, is defined as lessons and experiences coming out of the project that are replicated or scaled up in the design and implementation of other projects. Replication can have two aspects, replication proper (lessons and experiences are replicated in different geographic area) or scaling up (lessons and experiences are replicated within the same geographic area but funded by other sources). Examples of replication approaches include:

- Knowledge transfer (i.e., dissemination of lessons through project result documents, training workshops, information exchange, a national and regional forum, etc).
- Expansion of demonstration projects.
- Capacity building and training of individuals, and institutions to expand the project's achievements in the country or other regions.
- Use of project-trained individuals, institutions or companies to replicate the project's outcomes in other regions.

**Financial Planning** includes actual project cost by activity, financial management (including disbursement issues), and co-financing. If a financial audit has been conducted the major findings should be presented in the TE.

Effective financial plans include:

- Identification of potential sources of co-financing as well as leveraged and associated financing<sup>1</sup>.
- Strong financial controls, including reporting, and planning that allow the project management to make informed decisions regarding the budget at any time, allows for a proper and timely flow of funds, and for the payment of satisfactory project deliverables
- Due diligence due diligence in the management of funds and financial audits.

*Co-financing includes:* grants, loans/concessional (compared to market rate), credits, equity investments, in-kind support, other contributions mobilized for the project from other multilateral agencies, bilateral development cooperation agencies, NGOs, the private sector and beneficiaries. Please refer to Council documents on co-financing for definitions, such as GEF/C.20/6.

*Leveraged resources* are additional resources—beyond those committed to the project itself at the time of approval—that are mobilized later as a direct result of the project. Leveraged resources can be financial or in-kind and they may be from other donors, NGO's, foundations, governments, communities or the private sector. Please briefly describe the resources the project has leveraged since inception and indicate how these resources are contributing to the project's ultimate objective.

**Cost-effectiveness** assesses the achievement of the environmental and developmental objectives as well as the project's outputs in relation to the inputs, costs, and implementing time. It also examines the project's compliance with the application of the incremental cost concept. Cost-effective factors include:

- Compliance with the incremental cost criteria (e.g. GEF funds are used to finance a component of a project that would not have taken place without GEF funding.) and securing co-funding and associated funding.
- The project completed the planned activities and met or exceeded the expected outcomes in terms of achievement of Global Environmental and Development Objectives according to schedule, and as cost-effective as initially planned.
- The project used either a benchmark approach or a comparison approach (did not exceed the costs levels of similar projects in similar contexts)

**Monitoring & Evaluation.** Monitoring is the periodic oversight of a process, or the implementation of an activity, which seeks to establish the extent to which inputs, work schedules, other required actions and outputs are proceeding according to plan, so that timely action can be taken to correct the deficiencies detected. Evaluation is a process by which program inputs, activities and results are analyzed and judged explicitly against benchmarks or baseline conditions using performance indicators. This will allow project managers and planners to make decisions based on the evidence of information on the project implementation stage, performance indicators, level of funding still available, etc, building on the project's logical framework.

Monitoring and Evaluation includes activities to measure the project's achievements such as identification of performance indicators, measurement procedures, and determination of baseline conditions. Projects are required to implement plans for monitoring and evaluation with adequate funding and appropriate staff and include activities such as description of data sources and methods for data collection, collection of baseline data, and

---

<sup>1</sup> Please refer to Council documents on co-financing for definitions, such as GEF/C.20/6. The following page presents a table to be used for reporting co-financing.

stakeholder participation. Given the long-term nature of many GEF projects, projects are also encouraged to include long-term monitoring plans that are sustainable after project completion

## ATTACHMENT B: PROJECT RATINGS

PROJECT COMPONENT OR OBJECTIVE	RATING SCALE						RATING
	HU	U	MU	MS	S	HS	
<b>PROJECT FORMULATION</b>							
Conceptualization/Design							
Stakeholder participation							
<b>PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION</b>							
<b>Implementation Approach</b>							
The use of the logical framework							
Adaptive management							
Use/establishment of information technologies							
Operational relationships between the institutions involved							
Technical capacities							
<b>Monitoring and evaluation</b>							
<b>Stakeholder participation</b>							
Production and dissemination of information							

Local resource users and NGOs participation							
Establishment of partnerships							
Involvement and support of governmental institutions							
<b>PROJECT RESULTS</b>							
<b>Attainment of Outcomes/ Achievement of objectives</b>							
Achievement of objective							
Outcome 1							
Outcome 2							
Outcome .....							
<b>OVERALL PROJECT ACHIEVEMENT &amp; IMPACT</b>							

## ATTACHMENT C: EVALUATION CONSULTANT CODE OF CONDUCT AGREEMENT FORM

Evaluators:

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.

### Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form<sup>2</sup>

**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 \_\_\_\_\_

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_

## ANNEX 2

### SUPPORTING INFORMATION TO TERMS OF REFERENCE

#### 1. INTRODUCTION

##### 1.1 Project Background

<sup>2</sup> [www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct](http://www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct)



The project being implemented in collaboration with the General Directorate of Forestry, Department of Forest and Village Relations (aka ORKOY) is a 4 year long (2016-2020) GEF Full Size Project, namely Sustainable Energy Financing Mechanism for Solar Photovoltaic Systems in Forest Villages in Turkey, aka ORKOY GEF Project. The project assists Turkey with the promotion and financing of on-grid solar PV systems via village cooperatives in forest villages. The public support and involvement in the initiative will be led by the GDF, working together with other key actors in the solar PV value chain, including private sector solar PV installers, Turkish utilities, and domestic and international banks as well as other institutions that provide financing. The project objective is to support the successful launching of a sustainable energy financing mechanism within the ORKOY credit mechanism to ensure that there is at least 30 MW of installed capacity of grid-connected, cooperative solar PV in forest villages) by the end of the project; 28,750 tons CO<sub>2</sub>eq avoided emissions from the power sector (compared to the project baseline) by the end of the project; 30MWp cumulative installed capacity of grid-connected PV systems; 47,520,000 kWh/year cumulative total electricity generation from installed grid-connected PV systems and 450 created job positions for forest villagers. The project is divided in 3 components focused on;

- Developing and expanding the policy and institutional framework to promote on-grid, residential solar PV (Component 1),
- Demonstrating the technical and economic viability as well as the business model of the ORKOY sustainable energy financing mechanism for solar PV systems through 4 pilot installations (Component 2), and
- Scaling up and replication at the national level (Component 3).

The financing scheme will be divided on 4 phases. The first one will use grants only for financing of the pilot sites installation; second phase will use combination of GEF and ORKOY grants and ORKOY soft loan; third phase will introduce commercial loan together with GEF/ORKOY grants and ORKOY soft loan and the last phase will use deferred supplier payment tool in combination with ORKOY grant/soft loan and commercial line of credit.

## **1.2 Standard UNDP/GEF M&E requirements**

This Mid Term Review (MTR) is initiated by the UNDP Turkey as the Implementation Agency for this project and it aims to provide managers (at the Project Implementation Unit, UNDP Turkey Country Office and UNDP-GEF levels) with strategy and policy options for more effectively and efficiently achieving the project's expected results and for replicating the results. It also provides the basis for learning and accountability for managers and stakeholders.

The Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) policy at the project level in UNDP/GEF has four objectives:

- to monitor and evaluate results and impacts;
- to provide a basis for decision making on necessary amendments and improvements;
- to promote accountability for resource use; and
- to document, provide feedback on, and disseminate lessons learned.

A mix of tools is used to ensure effective project M&E. These might be applied continuously throughout the lifetime of the project – e.g. periodic monitoring of indicators -, or as specific time-bound exercises such as mid-term reviews, audit reports and independent evaluations.

In accordance with UNDP/GEF M&E policies and procedures, all projects with long implementation periods are strongly encouraged to conduct mid-term evaluations. In addition to providing an independent in-depth review of implementation progress, this type of evaluation is responsive to GEF Council decisions on transparency and better access of information during implementation.

The MTR is intended to identify potential project design problems, assess progress towards the achievement of objective, identify and document lessons learned (including lessons that might improve design and implementation of other UNDP-GEF projects), and to make recommendations regarding specific actions that might be taken to improve the project. It is expected to serve as a tool of validating or filling the gaps in the initial assessment of relevance, effectiveness and efficiency obtained from monitoring. The MTR provides the opportunity to assess early signs of project success or failure and prompt necessary adjustments.

## **DETAILED SCOPE OF THE MTR**

The MTR expert 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).

### 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 expert will include a section of the report setting out the MTR's evidence-based conclusions, in light of the findings.<sup>3</sup>

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 expert should make no more than 15 recommendations total.

## Ratings

The MTR expert 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 the Project**

Measure	MTR Rating	Achievement Description
Project Strategy	N/A	
	Objective Achievement	

---

<sup>3</sup> Alternatively, MTR conclusions may be integrated into the body of the report.

<b>Progress Towards Results</b>	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.	
<b>Project Implementation &amp; Adaptive Management</b>	(rate 6 pt. scale)	
<b>Sustainability</b>	(rate 4 pt. scale)	

### 3. TEAM COMPOSITION

An Independent International Consultant will conduct the MTR in collaboration with Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy Senior Technical Advisor and Monitoring & Evaluation Advisor at UNDP CO. 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.

#### List of Documents to be reviewed by the MTR Expert

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. Audit reports
8. Knowledge products and visibility materials including reports, training materials, etc. produced under the project
9. Finalized GEF focal area Tracking Tools at CEO endorsement and midterm (*fill in specific TTs for this project's focal area*)
10. All monitoring reports prepared by the project

11. Financial and Administration guidelines used by Project Team

The following documents will also be available:

- 12. UNDP country/countries programme document(s)
- 13. Minutes of the Project Steering Committee Meetings and other meetings (if any)
- 14. Project site location maps

**Guidelines on Contents for the Midterm Review Report<sup>4</sup>**

- i. Basic Report Information (*for opening page or title page*)
  - Title of UNDP / UNIDO supported GEF financed project
  - UNDP PIMS#, UNIDO SAP# 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 Expert
  - 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

---

<sup>4</sup> The Report length should not exceed 40 pages in total (not including annexes).



### 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
- 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.*)

### Midterm Review Evaluative Matrix Template

This Midterm Review Evaluative Matrix must be fully completed/amended by the consultant and included in the MTR inception report and as an Annex to the MTR report.

Evaluative Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
<b>Project Strategy: To what extent is the project strategy relevant to country priorities, country ownership, and the best route towards expected results?</b>			
(include evaluative question(s))	(i.e. relationships established, level of coherence between project design and implementation approach, specific activities conducted, quality of risk	(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.)

	mitigation strategies, etc.)		
<b>Progress Towards Results: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved thus far?</b>			
<b>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?</b>			
<b>Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, socio-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?</b>			

## UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluators/Midterm Review Consultants<sup>5</sup>

### 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: \_\_\_\_\_

## MTR Ratings

---

<sup>5</sup> [www.undp.org/uneqcodeofconduct](http://www.undp.org/uneqcodeofconduct)

<b>Ratings for Progress Towards Results: (one rating for each outcome and for the objective)</b>		
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.

<b>Ratings for Project Implementation &amp; Adaptive Management: (one overall rating)</b>		
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.

<b>Ratings for Sustainability: (one overall rating)</b>
---

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

### **MTR Report Clearance Form**

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

<p><b>Midterm Review Report Reviewed and Cleared By:</b></p> <p><b>Commissioning Unit</b></p> <p>Name: _____</p> <p>Signature: _____ Date: _____</p> <p><b>UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Advisor</b></p> <p>Name: _____</p> <p>Signature: _____ Date: _____</p>	
---	--

## Audit Trail Template

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

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

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

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

## 2. EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

The project progress and achievements will be tested against following GEF evaluation criteria:

- Relevance – the extent to which the activity is suited to local and national development priorities and organizational policies, including changes over time.
- Effectiveness – the extent to which an objective has been achieved or how likely it is to be achieved.
- Efficiency – the extent to which results have been delivered with the least costly resources possible.
- Results/impacts – the positive and negative, and foreseen and unforeseen, changes to and effects produced by a development intervention. In GEF terms, results include direct project outputs, short-to medium term outcomes, and longer-term impact including global environmental benefits, replication effects and other, local effects.

- Sustainability – the likely ability of an intervention to continue to deliver benefits for an extended period of time after completion. Projects need to be environmentally as well as financially and socially sustainable.

The Project will be rated against individual criterion of *relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and impact/results based* on the following scale:

- Highly Satisfactory (HS): The project has no shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives.
- Satisfactory (S): The project has minor shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives.
- Moderately Satisfactory (MS): The project has moderate shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives.
- Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): The project has significant shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives.
- Unsatisfactory (U) The project has major shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives.
- Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): The project has severe shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives.

As for *sustainability criteria* the evaluator should at the minimum evaluate the “likelihood of sustainability of outcomes at project termination, and provide a rating for this.

The following four dimensions or aspects of sustainability should be addressed:

*Financial resources:*

- a. Are there any financial risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project outcomes?
- b. What is the likelihood of financial and economic resources not being available once the GEF assistance ends (resources can be from multiple sources, such as the public and private sectors, income generating activities, and trends that may indicate that it is likely that in future there will be adequate financial resources for sustaining project’s outcomes)?

*Socio-political:*

- a. Are there any social or political risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project outcomes?
- b. 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?
- c. Do the various key stakeholders see that it is in their interest that the project benefits continue to flow?
- d. Is there sufficient public / stakeholder awareness in support of the long term objectives of the project?

*Institutional framework and governance:*

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



*Environmental:*

- a. Are there any environmental risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project outcomes? The evaluation should assess whether certain activities will pose a threat to the sustainability of the project outcomes. For example, construction of dam in a protected area could inundate a sizable area and thereby neutralizing the biodiversity related gains made by the project.

On each of the dimensions of sustainability of the project outcomes will be rated as follows:

- Likely (L): There are no or negligible risks that affect this dimension of sustainability.
- Moderately Likely (ML): There are moderate risks that affect this dimension of sustainability.
- Moderately Unlikely (MU): There are significant risks that affect this dimension of sustainability
- Unlikely (U): There are severe risks that affect this dimension of sustainability.

All the risk dimensions of sustainability are critical. Therefore, overall rating for sustainability will not be higher than the rating of the dimension with lowest ratings. For example, if a project has an ‘Unlikely’ rating in either of the dimensions then its overall rating cannot be higher than ‘Unlikely’.

The evaluator should develop detailed methodology and work plan for MTR during the preparatory phase of the MTR. The MTR tools and techniques may include, but not limited to:

- Desk review;
- Interviews with Project Management Unit and key stakeholders, including UNDP Country Office in Turkey, General Directorate of Forestry (GDF) of the Ministry of Forestry and Water Affairs and any other stakeholders as deemed necessary.
- Questionnaires.
- Participatory techniques and other approaches for gathering and analysis of data.

An indicative outline of the Mid-term Evaluation Report is presented below.

### **3. INDICATIVE OUTLINE OF THE MID-TERM EVALUATION REPORT**

#### **Title and opening page**

- Provide the following information:
- Name of the UNDP/GEF project
- UNDP and GEF project ID#s.
- Evaluation time frame and date of evaluation report
- Region and countries included in the project
- GEF Operational Program/Strategic Program
- Executing Agency and project partners
- Evaluation team members
- Acknowledgements

## **Executive Summary**

- 2 -3 pages that:
- Briefly describe the project evaluated
- Explain the purpose and objectives of the evaluation, including the audience
- Describes key aspects of the evaluation approach and methods
- Summarizes principle conclusions, recommendations and lessons

(See: UNDP Editorial Manual<sup>6</sup>)

## **Introduction**

- Purpose of the evaluation
- Briefly explain why the mid-term evaluation was conducted (the purpose), why the project is being evaluated at this point in time, why the evaluation addressed the questions it did, and the primary intended audience.
- Key issues addressed
- Providing an overview of the evaluation questions raised
- Methodology of the evaluation
- Clear explanation of the evaluation's scope, primary objectives and main questions. The Evaluation ToR may also elaborate additional objectives that are specific to the project focal area and national circumstances, and which may address the project's integration with other UNDP strategic interventions in the project area
- Stakeholders' engagement in the evaluation, including how the level of stakeholder involvement contributes to the credibility of the evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendations.
- Structure of the evaluation
- Acquaint the reader with the structure and contents of the report and how the information contained in the report will meet the purposes of the evaluation and satisfy the information needs of the report's intended users

## **Evaluation Team**

- Briefly describing the composition of the evaluation team, background and skills and the appropriateness of the technical skill mix, gender balance and geographical representation.

## **Ethics**

- The evaluator should note the steps taken to protect the rights and confidentiality of persons interviewed (see UNEG 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluators' for more information).<sup>7</sup> Attached to this report should be a signed 'Code of Conduct' form from the evaluator.

## **Project Description and development context**

- Project start and duration
- Problems that the project seeks to address
- Immediate and development objectives of the project

---

<sup>6</sup> UNDP Style Manual, Office of Communications, Partnerships Bureau, updated November 2008

<sup>7</sup> UNEG, '[Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation](#)', June 2008.

- Main stakeholders

## **Findings**

- (In addition to a descriptive assessment, all criteria marked with (\*) should be rated<sup>8</sup>)

## **Project Formulation**

- Analysis of LFA (Project logic /strategy; Indicators)
- Assumptions and Risks
- Lessons from other relevant projects (e.g., same focal area) incorporated into project implementation
- Stakeholder participation
- Replication approach
- UNDP comparative advantage
- Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector, including management arrangements

## **Project Implementation**

- The logical framework used during implementation as a management and M&E tool
- Effective partnerships arrangements established for implementation of the project with relevant stakeholders involved in the country/region
- Feedback from M&E activities used for adaptive management

Financial Planning

Monitoring and evaluation: design and implementation (\*)

UNDP and Executing Agency execution (\*) coordination, and operational issues

## **Project Results**

- Overall results (attainment of objectives) (\*)
- Relevance, Effectiveness, & Efficiency (\*)
- Country ownership
- Mainstreaming
- Sustainability (\*)
- Catalytic Role & Impact
- Conclusions, recommendations & lessons
- 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
- Best and worst practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance and success
- Annexes.
- TOR
- Itinerary
- List of persons interviewed

---

<sup>8</sup> Using a six-point rating scale: 6: Highly Satisfactory, 5: Satisfactory, 4: Marginally Satisfactory, 3: Marginally Unsatisfactory, 2: Unsatisfactory and 1: Highly Unsatisfactory, see section 3.5, page 37 for ratings explanations.

- Summary of field visits
- List of documents reviewed
- Questionnaire used and summary of results
- Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form

**The length of the MTR Report shall not exceed 30 pages in total (not including annexes).**