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| UNDP BelarusTerms of Reference | |
| **Position/Title:** | National Consultant on the Project Midterm Review |
| **Contract Type:** | Individual Consultant (IC), Local |
| **Office/Project:** | 00090983 “Belarus: Supporting Green Urban Development in Small and Medium-Sized Cities in Belarus” |
| **Contract conditions:** | Home-based with in-country field visits in Belarus |
| **Contract duration:** | 01 December 2018 – 31 May 2019  30 working days during the above said period (including supporting the international consultant and participating in full in the 10 days mission to Belarus) |
| **Travel requirements:** | One-day missions to the Project sites in Polotsk and Novopolotsk (Vitebsk Region, Belarus), Novogrudok (Grodno Region, Belarus) as well as possible visits to other cities with whom the project is cooperating. The national consultant should be available full-time during the 10 days mission to Belarus of the international consultant. During the rest of the assignment, the national consultant is assisting the mid-term review on a part-time basis.  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. |
| **Payment conditions:** | The total lump sum contract amount will be paid in 3 installments as specified in the table below:   |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | Installment No. | Milestone No. (see Section 8 below) and timeframe | % of total contract amount | | 1 | 1 and 2 | 15 | | 2 | 3 and 4 | 40 | | 3 | 5 | 45 |   Each of the installments shall be paid within 30 business days after completion and approval of the reports as required in Section 6 ‑ “Milestones and Deliverables” below. |
| **Qualifications:** | * University degree at bachelors’ level or more in any of the following fields: urban planning and development, economics or law. Advanced degree in any of the mentioned areas will be considered as an advantage; * Practical experience in at least 1 mid-term or final performance evaluation of international and/or regional projects; * Experience or knowledge of UNDP and GEF monitoring and evaluation policy; * Experience working on at least 2 environmental projects in the Republic of Belarus in the last 7 years * Experience of cooperation with government bodies, local authorities and non-governmental organizations; * Working (at least upper intermediate) level of written and spoken English; * Fluency in written and spoken Russian and/or Belarusian. |
| **Competences:** | * Strong report writing skills and experience in writing and presenting reports to a high professional level (which includes graphs, pictures, diagrams, figures and other illustrative tools to enhance the reporting quality). |
| **Direct supervisor:** | Midterm Review of the Project (hereinafter MTR) 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).  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 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.  Throughout the assignment, the Consultant will work in close collaboration with the UNDP Country Office in Minsk and the Project Implementation Unit.  S/he will report on his/her work to Programme Analyst, UNDP Country Office in Minsk. |
| 1. **General background information on the context of the assignment**   This is the Terms of Reference (ToR) for the UNDP-GEF Midterm Review (MTR) of the full-sized project titled 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.). MTR is to be undertaken in January 2019 - May2019. The project is in its second year of implementation. 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).  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, preparing a detailed stocktaking report assessing all the outputs of the project carried out so far versus what is in the project logframe matrix, assisting with CO2 calculation from project activities, and providing clarifications on the national regulations, other issues connected to or related with the project implementation as well as providing detailed comments and inputs into the inception report and both the draft and final versions of the final evaluation report | |
| * 1. **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. | |
| * 1. **Project overview**   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 equivalent through 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. | |
| 1. **Objectives of the MTR**   The MTR will assess progress towards the achievement of the project objectives and outcomes as specified in the Project Document, and assess early signs of project success or failure with the goal of identifying the necessary changes to be made in order to set the project on-track to achieve its intended results. The MTR will also review the project’s strategy, its risks to sustainability.  A team of two independent consultants will conduct the MTR - one team leader (with experience and exposure to projects and evaluations in other regions globally) and one national expert. The consultants cannot have participated in the project preparation, formulation, and/or implementation (including the writing of the Project Document) and should not have a conflict of interest with project’s related activities. | |
| 1. **MTR APPROACH & METHODOLOGY**   The MTR must provide evidence based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The MTR team will review all relevant sources of information including documents prepared during the preparation phase (i.e. PIF, UNDP Initiation Plan, UNDP Environmental & Social Safeguard Policy, the Project Document, project reports including Annual Project Review/PIRs, project budget revisions, lesson learned reports, national strategic and legal documents, and any other materials that the team considers useful for this evidence-based review). The MTR team will review the baseline GEF focal area Tracking Tool submitted to the GEF at CEO endorsement, and the midterm GEF focal area Tracking Tool that must be completed before the MTR field mission begins.  The MTR team is expected to follow a collaborative and participatory approach[[1]](#footnote-1) ensuring close engagement with the Project Team, government counterparts (the GEF Operational Focal Point), the UNDP Country Office(s), UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Advisers, and other key stakeholders.  Engagement of stakeholders is vital to a successful MTR.[[2]](#footnote-2) Stakeholder involvement should include interviews with stakeholders who have project responsibilities, including but not limited to 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.  The national consultant is responsible for taking a lead role in organizing the 10 working days mission to Belarus including arranging for interviews and setting up meetings with key project stakeholders.  The national consultant is also responsible for providing the international consultant with a stock taking report which analyses each of the outputs carried out by the project vis-à-vis what is in the project logframe and assesses their effectiveness and relevancy.  Any additional mission to Belarus that might be deemed necessary from the international consultant should be thoroughly justified and discussed with the UNDP Belarus Country Office and the UNDP/GEF Regional Technical Advisor. If required, the costs of travel and per diem related to the second mission, if it appears to be necessary, would be paid separately from the costs of this assignment but the time would be included within the overall 27 days.  The national consultant should play a supporting role in writing the MTR report including comments and inputs to the final MTR report should describe the full MTR approach taken and the rationale for the approach making explicit the underlying assumptions, challenges, strengths and weaknesses about the methods and approach of the review. The Report length should not exceed *40* pages in total (not including annexes). | |
| 1. **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.   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. 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.  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. * Are work-planning processes results-based? If not, suggest ways to re-orientate work planning to focus on results? * Examine the use of the project’s results framework/ logframe as a management tool and review any changes made to it since project start.   Finance and co-finance:   * Consider the financial management of the project, with specific reference to the cost-effectiveness of interventions. * Review the changes to fund allocations as a result of budget revisions and assess the appropriateness and relevance of such revisions. * Does the project have the appropriate financial controls, including reporting and planning, that allow management to make informed decisions regarding the budget and allow for timely flow of funds? * Informed by the co-financing monitoring table to be filled out, provide commentary on co-financing: is co-financing being used strategically to help the objectives of the project? Is the Project Team meeting with all co-financing partners regularly in order to align financing priorities and annual work plans?   Project-level Monitoring and Evaluation Systems:   * Review the monitoring tools currently being used: Do they provide the necessary information? Do they involve key partners? Are they aligned or mainstreamed with national systems? Do they use existing information? Are they efficient? Are they cost-effective? Are additional tools required? How could they be made more participatory and inclusive? * Examine the financial management of the project monitoring and evaluation budget. Are sufficient resources being allocated to monitoring and evaluation? Are these resources being allocated effectively?   Stakeholder Engagement:   * Project management: Has the project developed and leveraged the necessary and appropriate partnerships with direct and tangential stakeholders? * Participation and country-driven processes: Do local and national government stakeholders support the objectives of the project? Do they continue to have an active role in project decision-making that supports efficient and effective project implementation? * Participation and public awareness: To what extent has stakeholder involvement and public awareness contributed to the progress towards achievement of project objectives?   Reporting:   * Assess how adaptive management changes have been reported by the project management and shared with the Project Board. * Assess how well the Project Team and partners undertake and fulfil GEF reporting requirements (i.e. how have they addressed poorly-rated PIRs, if applicable?) * Assess how lessons derived from the adaptive management process have been documented, shared with key partners and internalized by partners.   Communications:   * Review internal project communication with stakeholders: Is communication regular and effective? Are there key stakeholders left out of communication? Are there feedback mechanisms when communication is received? Does this communication with stakeholders contribute to their awareness of project outcomes and activities and investment in the sustainability of project results? * Review external project communication: Are proper means of communication established or being established to express the project progress and intended impact to the public (is there a web presence, for example? Or did the project implement appropriate outreach and public awareness campaigns?) * For reporting purposes, write one half-page paragraph that summarizes the project’s progress towards results in terms of contribution to sustainable development benefits, as well as global environmental benefits.   **iv. Sustainability**   * Validate whether the risks identified in the Project Document, Annual Project Review/PIRs and the ATLAS Risk Management Module are the most important and whether the risk ratings applied are appropriate and up to date. If not, explain why. * In addition, assess the following risks to sustainability:   Financial risks to sustainability:   * What is the likelihood of financial and economic resources not being available once the GEF assistance ends (consider potential resources can be from multiple sources, such as the public and private sectors, income generating activities, and other funding that will be adequate financial resources for sustaining project’s outcomes)?   Socio-economic risks to sustainability:   * Are there any social or political risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project outcomes? What is the risk that the level of stakeholder ownership (including ownership by governments and other key stakeholders) will be insufficient to allow for the project outcomes/benefits to be sustained? Do the various key stakeholders see that it is in their interest that the project benefits continue to flow? Is there sufficient public / stakeholder awareness in support of the long term objectives of the project? Are lessons learned being documented by the Project Team on a continual basis and shared/ transferred to appropriate parties who could learn from the project and potentially replicate and/or scale it in the future?   Institutional Framework and Governance risks to sustainability:   * Do the legal frameworks, policies, governance structures and processes pose risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project benefits? While assessing this parameter, also consider if the required systems/ mechanisms for accountability, transparency, and technical knowledge transfer are in place.   Environmental risks to sustainability:   * Are there any environmental risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project outcomes?   **Conclusions & Recommendations**  The MTR team will include a section of the report setting out the MTR’s evidence-based conclusions, in light of the findings.[[8]](#footnote-8)  Recommendations should be succinct suggestions for critical intervention that are specific, measurable, achievable, and relevant. A recommendation table should be put in the report’s executive summary. See the *Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects* for guidance on a recommendation table.  The MTR team should make no more than 15 recommendations total.  **Ratings**  The MTR team will include its ratings of the project’s results and brief descriptions of the associated achievements in a *MTR Ratings & Achievement Summary Table* in the Executive Summary of the MTR report. See Annex E for ratings scales. No rating on Project Strategy and no overall project rating is required.  Table. MTR Ratings & Achievement Summary Table for Removing Barriers to Wind Power Development in Belarus   |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | **Measure** | **MTR Rating** | **Achievement Description** | | **Project Strategy** | N/A |  | | **Progress Towards Results** | Objective Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale) |  | | 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. **Scope of Work. Duties and responsibilities**   The National Consultant will work in the team with the International Consultant for the Project Midterm Review and in cooperation with UNDP CO and the Project Implementation Unit. The Consultant should not have participated in the project preparation, formulation, and/or implementation (including the writing of the Project Document) and should not have a conflict of interest with project’s related activities.  The National Consultant will support the International Consultant in analysis of data and documentation related to implementation of the Project and will prepare a background report for the International Consultant prior to the first mission to Belarus. Particularly, the Consultant will perform the following tasks:   * Analysis of the primary data and documentation; * Participation in development of evaluation methodology; * Preparation of the midterm evaluation mission, including development of the agenda, organization and holding of meetings with the key project stakeholders; provision of interpreting services during the meetings; * Provision, if necessary, of interpreting services during meetings and translation of the primary data; * Calculation of CO2 emission reductions from project activities, as required, including review of calculations provided by the project; * Participation in preparation of the draft midterm evaluation report including drafting a stocktaking report for the international consultant based upon what has been done vis-à-vis what was supposed to be done, as outlined in the MTR; * Assistance to the International Consultant in preparing the final version of the midterm evaluation report by incorporating the comments received; * Provision of other necessary support to the International Consultant;   Other services related to the project MTR as requested by the Commissioning Unit. | |
| 1. Milestones and deliverables  * The following table defines the main milestones, as per the activities stipulated in the Section “Scope of work” above, for which formal reports are required. These reports are to be submitted to the International Consultant, the Project Implementation Unit (PIU), UNDP CO for review before the deadlines specified below. Approval of these reports by the UNDP Country Office will govern payment under the contract for this assignment. * Prior to approval of the final MTR report, a draft version shall be circulated for comments to the PIU, UNDP CO, UNDP/GEF Regional Technical Advisor and key project stakeholders. All comments and suggestions (if any) shall be addressed and the report will be considered as the final deliverable as soon it is accepted by UNDP CO. * The final version of the evaluation report should be submitted in electronic format (MS Word) to UNDP CO Programme Analyst, Mr. Igar Tchoulba (igar.tchoulba@undp.org), the Project Manager, Ms. Iryna Usava (Iryna.usava@undp.org) no later than on the 31st March 2018. * MTR timeframe is as follows:  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | | No | Milestone | Report type and size | Deadline | | 1 | Evaluation Methodology compiled, desk review and workplan completed, agenda of the mission and schedule of visits to stakeholders prepared | report of up to 15 pages | 21 January 2019 | | 2 | MTR Mission of the International Consultant to Belarus conducted: stakeholder meetings, interviews, in-country field visits held | report of up to 8 pages | 08 February 2019 | | 3 | Inputs to the draft Midterm Review report\*, developed by the International Consultant, are made, and the draft sent for comments to stakeholders | report of 40 pages in total (not including annexes). | 22 February 2019 | | 4 | Circulation and other types of feedback mechanisms for reviewing and commenting on the draft MTR report completed, and comments received | list of comments and summary of up to 8 pages | 04 March  2019 | | 5 | Finalization of the Midterm Review report (incorporating comments received on the draft report) Translation into Russian, upon UNDP CO request, with the use of interpreting services.  \*Expected date of full MTR completion- 31 March, 2019 | report of 40 pages in total (not including annexes). | 11 March 2019 |   \*The MTR report must be in English. If applicable, the Commissioning Unit may choose to arrange for a translation of the report into a language more widely shared by national stakeholders. | |
| Supervisor: Iryna Usava | |
| Supervisee: | |

**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**[[9]](#footnote-9)

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **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[[10]](#footnote-10)**

**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. The Report length should not exceed *40* pages in total (not including annexes). [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. [www.undp.org/unegcodeofconduct](http://www.undp.org/unegcodeofconduct) [↑](#footnote-ref-10)