

GTALCC Project Midterm Review

Detailed Terms of Reference with Annexes

1. INTRODUCTION

This is the Detailed Terms of Reference (ToR) for the UNDP-GEF Midterm Review (MTR) of the full-sized project titled Green Technology Application for the Development of Low Carbon Cities (PIMS#4283) implemented through the Ministry of Energy, Science Technology, Environment & Climate Change (MESTECC), which is to be undertaken in April 2019. The project started on June 2016 and is in its third year of implementation. 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/documents/guidance/GEF/midterm/Guidance_Midterm%20Review%20EN_2014.pdf).

2. PROJECT BACKGROUND INFORMATION

The objective of the project is to facilitate the implementation of low carbon initiatives in at least five Malaysian cities and showcase a clear and integrated approach to low carbon development. The objective will be achieved by removing barriers to integrated low carbon urban planning and development through 3 components: 1) policy support for the promotion of integrated low carbon urban development, which will enable cities to implement and adopt integrated low carbon urban development plans and programmes; 2) awareness and institutional capacity development, which will expedite appraisal, approval and the implementation of strategic urban development, and ensure cities are aware of planning and implementing low carbon technology applications, and; 3) low carbon technology investments in cities, where there is an increase in investment in low carbon technologies with more low carbon projects implemented. The project is implemented over 5 years in Cyberjaya, Iskandar Malaysia, Melaka, Petaling Jaya, and Putrajaya. It is expected to generate direct GHG emission reductions of 346,442 tCO₂eq by End of Project and 2,152,032 tonnes CO₂eq over the lifetime of project investment.

The total budget for the project is 4.35 Million USD from the Global Environment Facility. The Implementing Partner of the project is the Ministry of Energy, Science Technology, Environment & Climate Change (MESTECC), with the Sustainable Energy Development Authority (SEDA) as the executing agency.

The project document and other relevant GEF documents can be downloaded at:

<https://www.thegef.org/project/green-technology-application-development-low-carbon-cities-gtalcc>

Information on the UNDP evaluation process and experience from other countries can be referred to at the Evaluation Resource center at the following link: <https://erc.undp.org/>

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 and its risks to sustainability.

4. MTR APPROACH & METHODOLOGY

The MTR must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The MTR team will review all relevant sources of information including documents prepared during the preparation phase (i.e. PIF, UNDP Initiation Plan, UNDP Environmental & Social Safeguard Policy, the Project Document, project reports including Annual Project Review/PIRs, project budget revisions, lesson learned reports, national strategic and legal documents, and any other materials that the team considers useful for this evidence-based review). The MTR team will review the baseline GEF focal area Tracking Tool submitted to the GEF at CEO endorsement, and the midterm GEF focal area Tracking Tool that must be completed before the MTR field mission begins.

The MTR team is expected to follow a collaborative and participatory approach¹ ensuring close engagement with the Project Team, government counterparts (the GEF Operational Focal Point), the UNDP Country Office(s), UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Advisers, and other key stakeholders.

Engagement of stakeholders is vital to a successful MTR.² Stakeholder involvement should include interviews with stakeholders who have project responsibilities, including but not limited to the UNDP GEF Technical Advisor, UNDP Country Office, Implementing Partner and Executing Agency, project team, consultants and key experts in low carbon cities, project stakeholders, local government, Project Board, academia, CSOs and other project partners relevant to the outcome of the Project. Additionally, the MTR team is expected to conduct a field mission to Putrajaya, including project sites in Putrajaya and the Greater Kuala Lumpur region.

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

5. DETAILED SCOPE OF THE MTR

The MTR team will assess the following four categories of project progress. See the *Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects* for extended descriptions.

i. Project Strategy

Project design:

- Review the problem addressed by the project and the underlying assumptions. Review the effect of any incorrect assumptions or changes to the context to achieving the project results as outlined in the Project Document.
- Review the relevance of the project strategy and assess whether it provides the most effective route towards expected/intended results. Were lessons from other relevant projects properly incorporated into the project design?
- Review how the project addresses country priorities. Review country ownership. Was the project concept in line with the national sector development priorities and plans of the country (or of participating countries in the case of multi-country projects)?
- Review decision-making processes: were perspectives of those who would be affected by project decisions, those who could affect the outcomes, and those who could contribute information or other resources to the process, taken into account during project design processes?
- Review the extent to which relevant gender issues were raised in the project design. See Annex 9 of *Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects* for further guidelines.

¹ For ideas on innovative and participatory Monitoring and Evaluation strategies and techniques, see [UNDP Discussion Paper: Innovations in Monitoring & Evaluating Results](#), 05 Nov 2013.

² For more stakeholder engagement in the M&E process, see the [UNDP Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results](#), Chapter 3, pg. 93.

- 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	Baseline Level ⁴	Level in 1 st PIR (self-reported)	Midterm Target ⁵	End-of-project Target	Midterm Level & Assessment ⁶	Achievement Rating ⁷	Justification for Rating
Objective:	Indicator (if applicable):							
Outcome 1:	Indicator 1:							
	Indicator 2:							
Outcome 2:	Indicator 3:							
	Indicator 4:							
	Etc.							
Etc.								

Indicator Assessment Key

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

In addition to the progress towards outcomes analysis:

- Compare and analyse the GEF Tracking Tool at the Baseline with the one completed right before the Midterm Review.
- Identify remaining barriers to achieving the project objective in the remainder of the project.

³ Populate with data from the Logframe and scorecards

⁴ Populate with data from the Project Document

⁵ If available

⁶ Colour code this column only

⁷ Use the 6 point Progress Towards Results Rating Scale: HS, S, MS, MU, U, HU

- 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? How is the project engaging with the private sector?
- 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 and social risks to sustainability:

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

Conclusions & Recommendations

The MTR team will include a section of the report setting out the MTR’s evidence-based conclusions, in light of the findings.⁸

Recommendations should be succinct suggestions for critical intervention that are specific, measurable, achievable, and relevant. A recommendation table should be put in the report’s executive summary. See the *Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects* for guidance on a recommendation table.

The MTR team should make no more than 15 major recommendations in 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 GTALCC 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)	

6. TIMEFRAME

The total duration of the MTR will be approximately 20 working days over a time period of 10 weeks. The tentative MTR timeframe is as follows:

ACTIVITY	NUMBER OF WORKING DAYS	APPROXIMATE COMPLETION DATE
Document review and preparing MTR Inception Report (MTR Inception Report due no later than 2 weeks before the MTR mission)	4 days	15 March 2019
MTR mission: stakeholder meetings, interviews, field visits (3-11 April 2019)	7 days	11 April 2019

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

Presentation of initial findings- last day of the MTR mission	1 day	12 April 2019
Preparing draft report (due within 3 weeks of the MTR mission)	5 days	3 May 2019
Finalization of MTR report/ Incorporating audit trail (see Annex G) from feedback on draft report (due within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on the draft)	3 days	31 May 2019

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

7. 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	MTR team submits to the Commissioning Unit and project management
2	Presentation	Initial Findings	End of MTR mission	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	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	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.

8. MTR ARRANGEMENTS

The principal responsibility for managing this MTR resides with the Commissioning Unit. The Commissioning Unit for this project's MTR is UNDP Malaysia.

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.

9. TEAM COMPOSITION

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

consultants cannot have participated in the project preparation, formulation, and/or implementation (including the writing of the Project Document) and should not have a conflict of interest with project's related activities.

The team members must present the following qualifications:

International Consultant

Competencies

- Competence in adaptive management, as applied to climate change mitigation;
- Demonstrable analytical skills.

Education

- Master's degree in environmental science, environmental engineering, town planning, engineering, climate change or other closely related field

Experience

- More than 10 years working experience in climate change mitigation projects with good knowledge of state-of-the-art approaches and best practices of similar projects;
- Recent experience working with result-based management evaluation methodologies
- Experience in evaluating UNDP/GEF evaluations for climate change mitigation is preferred;
- Experience applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios;
- Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender and climate change; experience in gender sensitive evaluation and analysis;
- Excellent writing and communication skills in English.

National Consultant

Competencies

- Competence in adaptive management, as applied to climate change mitigation;
- Demonstrable analytical skills.

Education

- Master's degree in environmental science, environmental engineering, town planning, engineering, climate change or other closely related field

Experience

- More than 5 years working experience in climate change mitigation projects;
- Experience in implementing projects with the Government of Malaysia;
- Have strong linkages with national stakeholders related to climate change mitigation;

- Experience in project evaluation especially on UNDP/GEF climate change mitigation projects are preferred;
- Excellent writing and communication skills in English and Malay.

10. PAYMENT MODALITIES AND SPECIFICATIONS

10% of payment upon approval of the final MTR Inception Report

30% upon submission and approval of the 1st draft MTR report

60% upon submission and approval (UNDP Malaysia and UNDP RTA) of the final MTR report

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

1. Project Initial Form (PIF)
2. UNDP/ GEF GTALCC Project Document
3. Project Inception Report
4. Output reports and documents produced under GTALCC
5. All Project Implementation Reports (PIRs)
6. Quarterly progress reports and work plans of the various implementation task teams
7. Audit reports
8. Finalized GEF focal area Tracking Tools at CEO endorsement and midterm *for climate change mitigation*
9. Oversight mission reports
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. Project operational guidelines, manuals and systems
13. UNDP Country Programme Action Plan (CPAP) and Country Programme Document (CPD)
14. Minutes of the GTALCC National Steering Committee and Project Technical Committee Meetings
15. Project site location maps

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

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

⁹ The Report length should not exceed 40 pages in total (not including annexes).

- 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 (*Climate Change Mitigation*)

ToR ANNEX C: 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
Project Strategy: To what extent is the project strategy relevant to country priorities, country ownership, and the best route towards expected results?			
Relevance: How does the project relate to the main objectives of the GEF focal area, and to the environment and development priorities at the local, regional and national levels?			
a) How does the project relate to the main objectives of the GEF focal area, and to the environment and development priorities at the local, regional and national levels?			
b) How does the project support the environment and sustainable development objectives of the Government of Malaysia?			
c) What was the level of stakeholder participation and ownership in project design and implementation?			
d) How does the project support the needs of relevant stakeholders and has the implementation of the project been inclusive of all relevant stakeholders?			
e) Were local beneficiaries and stakeholders adequately involved in project design and implementation?			
f) Are there logical linkages between expected results of the project (log frame) and the project design in terms of project components, choice of partners, structure, delivery mechanism, scope, budget, use of resources etc?			
g) Is the length of the project sufficient to achieve project outcomes?			
h) Does the GEF funding support activities and objectives not addressed by other donors? How do GEF-funds help fill gaps (or give additional stimulus) that are necessary but are not covered by other donors?			
Progress Towards Results: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved thus far?			
a) Has the project been effective in achieving its expected outcomes? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outcome 1.1- Major cities implemented and adopted integrated low carbon urban development plans and/or programmes 			

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outcome 2.1- Expedient appraisal, approval and implementation of strategic urban development plans/ program and projects • Outcome 2.1- Major cities are aware of, and are planning and implementing low carbon technology applications for integrated urban development • Outcome 3.1- Increased investment in low carbon technology applications in cities • Outcome 3.2- More low carbon projects implemented in Malaysian cities 			
b) What lessons have been learned from the project regarding the achievement of outcomes?			
c) What changes could have been made (if any) to the design of the project in order to improve the achievement of the project's expected results?			
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?			
a) Did the project logical framework and work plans and any changes made to them use as management tools during implementation?			
b) Were the accounting and financial systems in place adequate for project management and producing accurate and timely financial information?			
c) Were progress reports produced accurately, timely and responded to reporting requirements?			
d) Was project implementation as cost effective as originally proposed (planned vs actual)?			
e) Did leveraging of funds (co-financing) happen as planned? Were financial resources utilized effectively? Could financial resources have been used more efficiently?			
f) Was procurement carried out in a manner making efficient use of project resources?			
g) To what extent has partnerships/ linkages between			

institutions/ organizations were encouraged and supported?			
h) What was the level of efficiency of cooperation and collaboration arrangements?			
i) Was an appropriate balance struck between the utilization of international expertise as well as local capacity?			
j) Did the project take into account local capacity in the design and implementation of the project?			
Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, socio-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?			
a) How well are risks, assumptions and impact drivers for financial, institutions, social and economic being managed?			
b) What was the quality of risk mitigation strategies developed? Were these sufficient?			
c) Are there clear strategies for risk mitigation related with the long-term sustainability of the project?			
d) Has the experience of the project provided relevant lessons for other future projects targeted at similar objectives?			
e) What lessons can be learnt from the project regarding efficiency?			
f) How could the project implementation have been more efficiently carried out (in terms of management structures and procedures, partnership arrangements etc)			
g) What changes could have been made (if any) to the project in order to improve its efficiency?			
Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward, reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status?			
a) Does the project adequately take into account the national realities, both in terms of institutional and policy framework towards reducing environmental stress and enhanced energy security in the country in its design and its implementation?			
b) Are there any indications that the project has helped to facilitate the implementation of low carbon initiatives in at least 5 Malaysian cities and showcase a clear and integrated approach to low carbon development?			

Evaluators/Consultants:

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

MTR Consultant Agreement Form

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

Name of Consultant: _____

Name of Consultancy Organization (where relevant): _____

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

Signed at _____ (*Place*) on _____ (*Date*)

Signature: _____

¹⁰ <http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/100>

ToR ANNEX E: MTR Ratings

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

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

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

ToR ANNEX F: MTR Report Clearance Form

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

Midterm Review Report Reviewed and Cleared By:

Commissioning Unit

Name: _____

Signature: _____ Date: _____

UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Advisor

Name: _____

Signature: _____ Date: _____

ToR ANNEX G: Audit Trail Template

Note: The following is a template for the MTR Team 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 team response and actions taken