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## UNDP-GEF Midterm Review

## Terms of Reference

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Post title: | International Consultant for the Midterm Review (MTR) of UNDP-GEF Project “Belarus: Supporting Green Urban Development in Small and Medium-Sized Cities in Belarus” |
| Type of contract: | Individual Consultant, International |
| Country / Duty Station: | Home Based with one mission of at least 10 working days (not including travel and weekend days) to the Republic of Belarus |
| Expected places of travel (if applicable): | Minsk, Belarus, one-day field visits to the Project’s sites in Polotsk and Novopolotsk (Vitebsk Region, Belarus), to Novogrudok (Grodno Region, Belarus), other cities in Belarus as according to the mission schedule to be agreed before the mission start date.  Any additional travel that might be deemed necessary should be thoroughly justified and discussed with the UNDP Country Office and the UNDP/GEF Regional Technical Advisor. If required, the travel costs and per diem related to the additional missions, will be paid separately, in addition to the contract amount but the time spent on such missions would be included in the overall 27 days of the assignment. |
| Languages required | English |
| Expected start date of the assignment: | 2nd January 2019 |
| Duration of Contract: | 1st December 2018 – 31st May 2019 |
| Duration of Assignment: | 27 working days during a 3 months period from the 2nd January 2019 until the 31st March 2019 |
| Payment conditions: | The total lump-sum contract amount will be paid in three installments (payments linked to satisfactory performance and delivery of results) in the following way:  15% of the approved contract amount will be paid following contract signing and upon completion, submission and acceptance of MTR Inception Report;  40% of the total contract amount will be paid following MTR mission to the Republic of Belarus and upon submission and approval of the draft MTR report;  40% of the total contract amount will be paid upon submission and approval by UNDP Belarus and UNDP Regional Technical Adviser of the MTR report.  Each of the installments shall be paid within 30 business days after completion and approval of the reports as required in Section 7 “Midterm Review Deliverables” below. |
| Administrative arrangements: | The principal responsibility for managing MTR resides with the Commissioning Unit - UNDP Country Office in Belarus.  The Commissioning Unit will contract the consultants and ensure the timely provision of payments according to the above said schedule 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. |
| Evaluation method: | Desk Review and Interviews of Short-Listed Candidates |
| Direct Supervisor: | Midterm Review of the Project will be conducted by a team of two independent consultants – one team leader (an international consultant with experience and exposure to projects and evaluation in other regions globally) and one team expert (from the country of the project). |

1. **INTRODUCTION**

This is the Terms of Reference (ToR) for the Individual Consultant who will act as a leader of the team conducting UNDP-GEF Midterm Review (MTR) of the full-sized project titled Belarus: Supporting Green Urban Development in Small and Medium-Sized Cities in Belarus (PIMS #4981) implemented through the Ministry of Natural Resources and Environmental Protection of Belarus (Ministry of Environment), which is to be undertaken in January 2019 - March 2019. The project officially registered in the Republic of Belarus on 27 October 2016 and is in its second year of implementation. In line with the UNDP-GEF Guidance on MTRs, this MTR process was initiated before the submission of the second Project Implementation Report (PIR). This ToR sets out the expectations for this MTR. The MTR process must follow the guidance outlined in the document [Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects](http://web.undp.org/evaluation/documents/guidance/GEF/mid-term/Guidance_Midterm%20Review%20_EN_2014.pdf) (<http://web.undp.org/evaluation/documents/guidance/GEF/mid-term/Guidance_Midterm%20Review%20_EN_2014.pdf>).

The MTR team will consist of two members: International Consultant who will act as a team leader and a Local Consultant who will assist the International Consultant in collecting data, scheduling the visits and meetings with the involved parties, providing clarifications on the national regulations, other issues connected to or related with the project implementation.

**2. PROJECT BACKGROUND INFORMATION**

Belarus is a highly urbanized country with the majority of population living in the cities. The strongest economic sectors are service industries and manufacturing. The Government of Belarus is an Annex I Party to the UNFCCC since the year 2000 and is a Party to the Kyoto Protocol since 2005. The Government of Belarus also signed up to the Copenhagen Accord (2009) and pledged to reduce GHG emissions to 12% below 1990 levels by the year 2020 as according to Doha Amendment to the Protocol.

The current challenge for Belarus is being able to design and implement a comprehensive set of sustainable actions towards green city status by saving energy, reducing GHG emissions, as well as other measures that are beneficial to the economies and environments of these cities. In Belarus, there are no cities which currently meet this definition of a green city. There are only cities which aspire to this status but are impeded in realizing this goal by a lack of knowledge, experience and planning capacity related to green urban development.

The project aims to remove barriers to support further investment in green urban development by cities in Belarus, with a particular emphasis on energy-efficiency in street and public buildings lighting and sustainable transport initiatives.

The process of spatial and urban planning in Belarus is well entrenched with three levels of government from a national level to regional levels (oblasts or a number of districts within an oblast) to a local level (spanning a whole district or a part of a district or settlement). This process and the methodologies for planning, however, do not fully reflect the best international practices that address holistic approaches to planning. The root cause of the absence of green urban development in Belarus is the lack of focus on GHG mitigation in the current planning urban practices in Belarus and using sustainable mobility as one of the mitigation options. Moreover, there is a paucity of examples in Belarus on implementing the concept of linking green urban development to GHG emissions reduction. City planners generally plan urban development consistent with old practices with no link towards green urban planning and its principles of sustainability. In particular, three cities involved in this Project, which are Polotsk, Novopolotsk and Novogrudok, have made expressions of their interest to strengthen their ties to green urban development planning as a strategy to assist them with low emissions development. To accelerate this process towards green urban development, these cities have signed up to the EU Covenant of Mayors.

The objective of the Project is the growth of development of green urban development plans and pilot green urban development initiatives related to energy efficiency and sustainable transport in small and medium cities in Belarus. This objective is to be achieved through 4 components: i) Development and adoption of green urban development plans; ii) Development of pilots on sustainable urban transport in Novopolotsk and Polotsk; iii) Development of pilots on energy efficiency in Novogrudok; and iv) Replication mechanisms for green urban development in Belarus.

The Project is expected to generate lifetime direct GHG emission reductions of 77.8 ktonnes of CO2 equivalentthrough improved urban transport efficiencies in the cities of Polotsk and Novopolotsk and 13.3 ktonnes of CO2 equivalent through energy efficiency pilots in Novogrudok municipality. Indirect emission reductions (top-down and bottom-up) will range from 25.2 to 231 ktonnes of CO2 equivalent.

**3. OBJECTIVES OF THE MTR**

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

**4. MTR APPROACH & METHODOLOGY**

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

MTR Evaluation team is expected to follow a collaborative and participatory approach[[1]](#footnote-1) ensuring close engagement with the Project Team, government counterparts (the GEF Operational Focal Point), the UNDP Country Office(s), UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Advisers, and other key stakeholders.

Engagement of stakeholders is vital to a successful MTR.[[2]](#footnote-2) Stakeholder involvement should include interviews with stakeholders who have project responsibilities, including but not limited to the following organizations and officials: UNDP Belarus Country Office, Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment Protection of the Republic of Belarus, Organizations - Members of the Project Board: *Ministry of Architecture and Construction of the Republic of Belarus, Ministry of Economy of the Republic of Belarus, Ministry of Transport and Communications of the Republic of Belarus, Ministry of Finance of the Republic of Belarus, Department of Energy Efficiency under the State Committee for Standardization, Novogrudok District Executive Committee, Novopolotsk City Executive Committee, Polotsk Regional Executive Committee, Institute of Regional and Urban Planning “BelNIIPGradostroitelstva”, Republican Public Association “The Belarusian Union of Transport Workers”,* Project Manager and members of the Project Implementation Unit, selected vendors and individual consultants.

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 (<http://web.undp.org/evaluation/documents/guidance/GEF/mid-term/Guidance_Midterm%20Review%20_EN_2014.pdf>).

1. **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 and 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.

1. **Progress Towards Results**

Progress Towards Outcomes Analysis:

* Review the logframe indicators against progress made towards the end-of-project targets using the Progress Towards Results Matrix and following the *Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects*; colour code progress in a “traffic light system” based on the level of progress achieved; assign a rating on progress for each outcome; make recommendations from the areas marked as “Not on target to be achieved” (red).

Table. Progress Towards Results Matrix (Achievement of outcomes against End-of-project Targets)

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

**Indicator Assessment Key**

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

In addition to the progress towards outcomes analysis:

* Compare and analyse the GEF Tracking Tool at the Baseline with the one completed right before the Midterm Review.
* Identify remaining barriers to achieving the project objective in the remainder of the project.
* By reviewing the aspects of the project that have already been successful, identify ways in which the project can further expand these benefits.

**iii. Project Implementation and Adaptive Management**

Management Arrangements:

* Review overall effectiveness of project management as outlined in the Project Document. Have changes been made and are they effective? Are responsibilities and reporting lines clear? Is decision-making transparent and undertaken in a timely manner? Recommend areas for improvement.
* Review the quality of execution of the Executing Agency/Implementing Partner(s) and recommend areas for improvement.
* Review the quality of support provided by the GEF Partner Agency (UNDP) and recommend areas for improvement.

Work Planning:

* Review any delays in project start-up and implementation, identify the causes and examine if they have been resolved.
* Has the work planning been carried out in a manner which is consistent with the project document and with the project workplan or are there significant deviations?
* 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 Evaluation team will include a section of the report setting out the MTR’s evidence-based conclusions, in light of the findings.[[8]](#footnote-8)

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

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

**Ratings**

The MTR Evaluation 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 the Project “Belarus: Supporting Green Urban Development in Small and Medium-Sized Cities in Belarus”

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Measure** | **MTR Rating** | **Achievement Description** |
| **Project Strategy** | N/A |  |
| **Progress Towards Results** | Objective Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale) |  |
| Outcome 1 Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale) |  |
| Outcome 2 Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale) |  |
| Outcome 3 Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale) |  |
| Etc. |  |
| **Project Implementation & Adaptive Management** | (rate 6 pt. scale) |  |
| **Sustainability** | (rate 4 pt. scale) |  |

1. **TIMEFRAME**

The Terms of Reference comprise three components: 1) start-up, a period of up to 5 days during which the International and National Consultants, working from their home base, will familiarize themselves with background materials and prepare MTR inception report; 2) field mission to Belarus for conducting consultations with stakeholder and project implementation team, visits to project sites, report drafting and in-country presentation; and 3) finalization of the MTR Report.

The total duration of the MTR will be approximately 27 working days (15 home-based, 10 on mission to Belarus, 2 travel days) over a time period of (3 months) starting January 04, 2019*,* and shall not exceed five months from when the consultant(s) are hired. The tentative MTR timeframe is as follows:

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

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **TIMEFRAME\*** | **Number of working days spent on the assignment** | **ACTIVITY** | **RESPONSIBLE PARTY** |
| *2 November 2018-* | - | Public advertisement of the post vacancy | UNDP Belarus |
| *19 November 2018* | - | Application closes | UNDP Belarus |
| *7 December 2018* | - | Select MTR Evaluation Team/contracting the successful applicant(s) | UNDP Belarus |
| *04 January 2018* | - | Prep the MTR Evaluation Team (handover of the Project related documents) | Green Cities Project |
| *11 January 2019 -* | 5 | Documents review and preparing draft MTR Inception Report | MTR Team |
| *21 January 2019 -* | 2 | Finalization andValidation of MTR Inception Report | MTR Team |
| *28 January 2019 –*  *8 February 2019* | 10 | MTR mission: stakeholder meetings, interviews, field visits | MTR Team |
| *22 February 2019* | 5 | Preparing draft MTR report | MTR Team |
| *04 March 2019* | - | Reviewing and commenting on the draft MTR report | UNDP Belarus |
| *11 March, 2019* | 3 | Finalization of the MTR report (incorporating comments received on the draft report) | MTR Team |
| *25 March 2019* | - | Preparation & Issue of Management Response | UNDP Belarus |
| *29 March 2019* | - | Expected date of full MTR completion | MTR Evaluation Team |

\* Dates said in this column are preliminary scheduled milestones. Actual dates will be agreed with the contracted Individual Consultant upon awarding the contract.

1. **MIDTERM REVIEW DELIVERABLES**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **#** | **Deliverable** | **Description** | **Timing** | **Responsibilities** |
| **1** | **MTR Inception Report** | Leader of MTR Evaluation Team (International Consultant) clarifies objectives and methods of Midterm Review | No later than 1 week before the MTR mission: 21 January 2019 | Leader of MTR Evaluation team (International Consultant) submits to the Commissioning Unit and project management |
| **2** | **Presentation** | Initial Findings | End of MTR mission: 8 February 2019 | MTR Evaluation 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 2 weeks after the MTR mission: 22 February 2019 | 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 after receiving UNDP comments on draft: 11 March 2019 | Sent to the Commissioning Unit |

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

1. **MTR ARRANGEMENTS**

The principal responsibility for managing this MTR resides with the Commissioning Unit. The Commissioning Unit for this project’s MTR is UNDP Country Office in Belarus.

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

1. **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, International Consultant) and one team expert from Belarus (National Consultant). The International Consultant is designated as the team leader and will be responsible for the entire midterm review and respective MTR deliverables mentioned above in line with this ToR, with inputs from the project. The National Consultant will provide assistance to the International Consultant in line with a separate ToR focusing on preparation of the baseline data, organizing and participation in the midterm review mission to Belarus, incorporation of detailed comments received into the MTR report.

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

The selection of consultants will be aimed at maximizing the overall “team” qualities.

**Qualifications for Team Leader:**

* Advanced university degree (at least the Master level) in environmental studies, urban planning and development, economics or law; or university degree (at least Master level) in other sciences with not less than 10 years of practical experience in one of the said professional fields;
* Minimum seven years of relevant professional experience;
* Previous experience with results‐based monitoring and evaluation methodologies demonstrated by an example of evaluation of at least one other UNDP project funded by GEF in the past five years;
* Experience or knowledge of UNDP and GEF monitoring and evaluation policy demonstrated by performance evaluation of at least one other UNDP-GEF project will be considered as an asset;
* Technical knowledge in the targeted focal area(s) such as urban development and planning, climate change, sustainable urban mobility, energy efficiency and etc. demonstrated by at least 5 relevant publications and/or evidences in professional experience records (e.g., certifications, lecturing, training, participation in exhibitions and professional events, presentations, etc.);
* Excellent written and spoken English is a must;
* Working knowledge of written and spoken Belarusian or Russian is an advantage;
* Strong report writing skills and experience in writing and presenting reports to a high professional level (an example of reports and presentations that include graphs, pictures, diagrams, figures and other illustrative tools to enhance the reporting quality shall be provided).

1. **PAYMENT MODALITIES AND SPECIFICATIONS**

The total amount of the lump sum contract for the assignment of MTR Team Leader will be paid in 3 installments as specified in the table below:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Installment No. | MTR Deliverables (section 7 above) | % of total contract amount |
| 1 | Following contract signing and upon completion, submission and acceptance of MTR Inception Report (deliverable 1) | 15% |
| 2 | Following MTR mission to the Republic of Belarus and upon submission and approval of the draft MTR report (deliverables 2 and 3) | 40% |
| 3 | Following submission and approval (by UNDP-CO and UNDP RTA) of the MTR report, which takes into account and addresses all the comments that have been provided by both the Government stakeholders, UNDP Project Manager, UNDP Belarus, and UNDP IRH (deliverable 4) | 45% |

Each of the installments shall be paid within 30 days after completion and approval of the reports as required in Section 7 ‑ “MTR Deliverables” above. **Travel expenses shall be included in the lump sum.**

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

**Recommended Presentation of Proposal:**

1. **Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability** using the [template](https://intranet.undp.org/unit/bom/pso/Support%20documents%20on%20IC%20Guidelines/Template%20for%20Confirmation%20of%20Interest%20and%20Submission%20of%20Financial%20Proposal.docx) provided by UNDP;
2. **CV** and/or a **Personal History Form** ([P11 form](http://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/corporate/Careers/P11_Personal_history_form.doc));
3. **Brief description of approach to work/technical proposal** of why the individual considers him/herself as the most suitable for the assignment, and a proposed methodology on how they will approach and complete the assignment; (max 1 page)
4. **Financial Proposal** that indicates the all-inclusive fixed total contract price and all other travel related costs (such as flight ticket, per diem, etc), supported by a breakdown of costs, as per template attached to the Letter of Confirmation of Interest template. If an applicant is employed by an organization/company/institution, and he/she expects his/her employer to charge a management fee in the process of releasing him/her to UNDP under Reimbursable Loan Agreement (RLA), the applicant must indicate at this point, and ensure that all such costs are duly incorporated in the financial proposal submitted to UNDP.

All application materials should be submitted to the address UNDP, Kirava Street 17, 6th floor, 220050 Minsk, Belarusin a sealed envelope indicating the following reference **“Belarus: Supporting Green Urban Development in Small and Medium-Sized Cities in Belarus Midterm Review”** or by email at the following address ONLY: [tenders.by@undp.org](mailto:tenders.by@undp.org) by **23:59 on November 19, 2018 (Minsk time).**This email address is being protected from spam bots, you need Javascript enabled to view it. Incomplete applications will be excluded from further consideration.

**Criteria for Evaluation of the Proposal**: Only those applications which are responsive and complaint will be evaluated. Offers will be evaluated according to the Combined Scoring method – where the educational background and experience on similar assignments will be weighted at 70% and the price proposal will weigh as 30% of the total scoring. The applicant receiving the Highest Combined Score that has also accepted UNDP’s General Terms and Conditions will be awarded the contract.

**Technical Scoring for Team Leader:**

The following criteria will be rated as indicated below:

1. Academic Qualifications, Professional Experience and Knowledge (to be evaluated on the basis of desk review):

* Advanced university degree (at least the Master level) in environmental studies, urban planning and development, economics or law; or university degree (at least Master level) in other sciences with not less than 10 years of practical experience in one of the said professional fields=3 points, + 2 points if Doctor Degree in relevant field (**Max 5 points**);
* Minimum seven years of relevant professional experience: 15 points for 7 years of experience and 1 point for every additional year of experience but not more than 2 additional points in total (**Max 20 points**);
* Previous experience with results‐based monitoring and evaluation methodologies demonstrated by an example of evaluation of at least one other UNDP project funded by GEF in the past five years: 10 points for one project and 1 point for any number of additional projects (**Max 15 points**);
* Experience or knowledge of UNDP and GEF monitoring and evaluation policy demonstrated by performance evaluation of at least one other UNDP-GEF project (**Max 3 points, if any)**;
* Technical knowledge in the targeted focal area(s) such as urban development and planning, climate change, sustainable urban mobility, energy efficiency and etc. demonstrated by at least 5 relevant publications and/or evidences in professional experience records (e.g., certifications, lecturing, training, participation in exhibitions and professional events, presentations, etc.): 10 points for 5 evidences and 1 point for every additional evidence but not more than 5 additional evidences in total (**Max 12 points)**;

1. Personal Skills, Competencies (to be evaluated using the applied scoring system below on the basis of desk review and personal interview)\*

* Proposed approach to fulfillment of the assignment =**25 points max\*;**
* Excellent written and spoken English = **5 points max\***;
* Working knowledge of written and spoken Belarusian or Russian =3 points for knowledge of one of the languages, **5 points** for both languages **(max)\*;**
* Strong report writing skills and experience in writing and presenting reports to a high professional level = **10 points** **max\***.

Applied scoring system for the evaluation criteria marked with ‘\*’:

| **Degree of compliance** | **Supporting Evidence** | **Scoring scale (% from maximum available score for the given sub-criteria)** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Excellent | Excellent evidence of ability to exceed contract requirements | 100% |
| Good | Good evidence of ability to exceed contract requirements | 80% |
| Satisfactory | Satisfactory evidence of ability to support contract requirements | 60% |
| Poor | Marginally acceptable or weak evidence of ability to comply with contract requirements | 40% |
| Very poor | Lack of evidence to demonstrate ability to comply with contract requirements | 10% |
| No submission | Information has not been submitted or is unacceptable | 0% |

MAXIMUM: **70 points.**

Candidates who score (70%) meaning 49/70 points, will undergo financial evaluation.

**Financial Scoring for Team Leader:**

Financial scoring will be computed as a ratio of the total price of the offer under evaluation to the lowest price among the received technically complaint offers according to the below formula:

Financial score = (Lowest Priced Offer / Price of the Offer Being Reviewed) x 30.

MAXIMUM: **30 points.**

The total score equals to technical score + financial score.

The highest scoring candidate will proceed to the validation interview with the interview panel.

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

1. UNDP Project Document
2. Project Inception Report
3. All Project Implementation Reports (PIR’s)
4. Annual Working Plans and Annual Project Progress reports
5. All monitoring reports prepared by the project
6. Minutes of the Project Board Meetings
7. CDRs
8. Logs (Monitoring Logs, Offline Risk Logs, Lessons Learned Logs and Offline Issues Logs)

Other relevant documents:

1. Project Technical Reports by project experts
2. Project’s Events Proceedings (including agenda and presentations/publications of conferences, workshops, trainings, etc.)
3. Relevant printed documentation (brochures, flyers, booklets, briefs, publications, press releases, etc.) or visual materials (photo, video) in support of the Project’s achievements and results.

*and other documents requested by MTR Evaluation Team.*

**ToR ANNEX B: Guidelines on Contents for the Midterm Review Report**[[10]](#footnote-10)

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **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 Evaluation team members * Acknowledgements | | |
| **ii.** | Table of Contents | | |
| **iii.** | Acronyms and Abbreviations | | |
| **1.** | Executive Summary *(3-5 pages)*   * Project Information Table * Project Description (brief) * Project Progress Summary (between 200-500 words) * MTR Ratings & Achievement Summary Table * Concise summary of conclusions * Recommendation Summary Table | | |
| **2.** | Introduction *(2-3 pages)*   * Purpose of the MTR and objectives * Scope & Methodology: principles of design and execution of the MTR, MTR approach and data collection methods, limitations to the MTR * Structure of the MTR report | | |
| **3.** | Project Description and Background Context *(3-5 pages)*   * Development context: environmental, socio-economic, institutional, and policy factors relevant to the project objective and scope * Problems that the project sought to address: threats and barriers targeted * Project Description and Strategy: objective, outcomes and expected results, description of field sites (if any) * Project Implementation Arrangements: short description of the Project Board, key implementing partner arrangements, etc. * Project timing and milestones * Main stakeholders: summary list | | |
| **4.** | Findings *(12-14 pages)* | | |
| **4.1** | Project Strategy   * Project Design * Results Framework/Logframe | |
| **4.2** | Progress Towards Results   * Progress towards outcomes analysis * Remaining barriers to achieving the project objective | |
| **4.3** | Project Implementation and Adaptive Management   * Management Arrangements * Work planning * Finance and co-finance * Project-level monitoring and evaluation systems * Stakeholder engagement * Reporting * Communications | |
| **4.4** | Sustainability   * Financial risks to sustainability * 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.)* | | |

**ToR ANNEX C: Midterm Review Evaluative Matrix Template**

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

**ToR ANNEX D: UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluators/Midterm Review Consultants[[11]](#footnote-11)**

**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: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**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: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

1. For ideas on innovative and participatory Monitoring and Evaluation strategies and techniques, see [UNDP Discussion Paper: Innovations in Monitoring & Evaluating Results](http://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/librarypage/capacity-building/discussion-paper--innovations-in-monitoring---evaluating-results/), 05 Nov 2013. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. For more stakeholder engagement in the M&E process, see the [UNDP Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results](http://www.undg.org/docs/11653/UNDP-PME-Handbook-(2009).pdf), Chapter 3, pg. 93. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Populate with data from the Logframe and scorecards [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. Populate with data from the Project Document [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. If available [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. Colour code this column only [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. Use the 6 point Progress Towards Results Rating Scale: HS, S, MS, MU, U, HU [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. Alternatively, MTR conclusions may be integrated into the body of the report. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. Engagement of the consultants should be done in line with guidelines for hiring consultants in the POPP: <https://info.undp.org/global/popp/Pages/default.aspx> [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. The Report length should not exceed *40* pages in total (not including annexes). [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
11. [www.undp.org/unegcodeofconduct](http://www.undp.org/unegcodeofconduct) [↑](#footnote-ref-11)