UNDP-GEF Midterm Review
Terms of Reference for International Consultant

Project title: Reducing Releases of Polybromodiphenyl Ethers (PBDE) and Unintentional Persistent Organic Pollutants (UPOPs) Originating from Unsound Waste Management and Recycling Practices and the Manufacturing of Plastics in Indonesia

Category of consultant: C – Senior Specialist

1. INTRODUCTION

This is the Terms of Reference (ToR) for the UNDP-GEF Midterm Review (MTR) of the *full*-sized project titled Reducing Releases of Polybromodiphenyl Ethers (PBDE) and Unintentional Persistent Organic Pollutants (UPOPs) Originating from Unsound Waste Management and Recycling Practices and the Manufacturing of Plastics in Indonesia (or PBDEs-UPOPs for short) (PIMS# 5073) implemented through the Ministry of Industry (MoI), which is to be undertaken in *2019.* The project started on the 16 *March* 2016 and is in its *third* year of implementation. In line with the UNDP-GEF Guidance on MTR, 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).

2. PROJECT BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Project period:	48 months
Allocated resources from GEF:	US$3,990,000
Co-financing:	
• UNDP:	US$40,000
• Ministry of Industry:	US$5,000,000
• APHINDO:	US$12,000,000
• Perum Jasa Tirta:	US$1,525,188
• Konsorsium Lingkungan Hidup:	US$166,406

Indonesia is committed to addressing the threats posed by Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs) to human health and the environment. The country ratified the Stockholm Convention in 2009 by publishing Law No. 19/2009. Indonesia purpose urgent actions to reduce the impact of Polybromodiphenyl Ethers (PBDE), a flame retardant, and UPOP emissions that are harmful to the environment and human health, by reducing the use of PBDE in the plastic manufactures, as well as to improve the recycling and disposal technique to be better and safe.

Project of reducing releases of Polybromodiphenyl Ethers (PBDE) and Unintentional Persistent Organic Pollutants (UPOPs) originating from unsound waste management and recycling practices and the manufacturing of plastics in Indonesia is a collaboration project between the Indonesia Ministry of Industry and the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), funded by the Global Environment Facility (GEF). The project aims to reduce releases of PBDEs and UPOPs by improving overall life-cycle management of plastics and PBDEs-containing plastics through the introduction of alternatives to PBDEs in plastics manufacturing processes and the application of BAT/BEP in plastics recycling and disposal practices.

The project supports Indonesia's plastics industry and recyclers in ensuring that no banned PBDEs are used or recycled into new manufactured articles. In addition, environmentally safe and sound operations of municipal and community waste management will be supported in order to reduce harmful releases of PBDEs and UPOPs. While the core objective of the project is reducing releases of harmful chemicals, it brings additional benefits in terms of socio-economic and climate change, as it has two activity areas that are inherently climate beneficial i.e. increased recycling and material efficiency and better waste management. The project is structured in the following outputs:

Project Outcome: To reduce releases of PBDEs and UPOPs by improving overall life-cycle management of plastics and PBDEs-containing plastics through the introduction of alternatives to PBDEs in plastics manufacturing processes and the application of BAT/BEP in plastics recycling and disposal practices.

Output 1: Strengthening the national policy and regulatory framework to reduce UPOPs and PBDE releases from plastics manufacturing, recycling and disposal practices

Activity Results 1.1: Reduced PBDEs and UPOPs releases resulting from unsound waste management practices through the adoption and implementation of standards/measures, policies, plans and regulations.

Output 2: Reducing or eliminating the importation and use of PBDEs in plastics manufacturing

Activity Result 2.1: Sufficient national technical expertise built to meet challenges with PDBEs in manufacturing and plastic raw material recycling

Activity Result 2.2: PDBE releases to the environment from the manufacturing sector reduced through phase out and introduction of PBDE avoiding quality control of raw material and awareness raising

Output 3: Reducing of UPOPs and PDBEs from unsound plastics recycling

Activity Result 3.1 Reduced releases of PBDEs as a result of improved handling, storage, recycling and disposal of PBDEs containing wastes and products through the introduction of BAT/BAP in the plasticss recycling sector.

Activity Result 3.2 Reduced releases of UPOPs as a result of improved raw material (recycled plastics) supply chains as well as the introduction of environmentally sound disposal practices at recycling entities.

Output 4: Reducing releases of UPOPs and PBDEs from unsound plastic disposal practices

Activity Result 4.1: PBDEs and UPOPs releases to the environment reduced through the implementation of appropriate disposal options for hazardous and unrecyclable plastic waste fractions from both formal and informal recyclers and waste collectors.

Output 5: Monitoring, learning, adaptive feedback, outreach, and evaluation

Activity Result 5.1: Monitoring and Evaluation and adaptive management applied in response to needs, mid-term evaluation findings with lessons learned extracted.

3. OBJECTIVES OF THE MTR

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

4. MTR APPROACH & METHODOLOGY

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

The MTR team is expected to follow a collaborative and participatory approach[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] Stakeholder involvement should include interviews with stakeholders who have project responsibilities, including but not limited to Ministry of Industry, Ministry of Forestry and Environment, Manufacturer Association, Recycling Association; executing agencies, senior officials and task team/ component leaders, key experts and consultants in the subject area, Project Board, project stakeholders, academia, local government and CSOs, etc. Additionally, the MTR team is expected to conduct field missions to West Java and East Java, including the following project sites Bekasi, Cirebon and Surabaya.

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

5. DETAILED SCOPE OF THE MTR

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

i. Project Strategy

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

---

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

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

Results Framework/Logframe:

- Undertake a critical analysis of the project's logframe indicators and targets, assess how "SMART" the midterm and end-of-project targets are (Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Relevant, Time-bound), and suggest specific amendments/revisions to the targets and indicators as necessary.
- Are the project's objectives and outcomes or components clear, practical, and feasible within its time frame?
- Examine if progress so far has led to, or could in the future catalyse beneficial development effects (i.e. income generation, gender equality and women's empowerment, improved governance etc...) that should be included in the project results framework and monitored on an annual basis.
- Ensure broader development and gender aspects of the project are being monitored effectively. Develop and recommend SMART 'development' indicators, including sex-disaggregated indicators and indicators that capture development benefits.

ii. Progress Towards Results

Progress Towards Outcomes Analysis:

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

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

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

Indicator Assessment Key

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

In addition to the progress towards outcomes analysis:

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

---

[3] Populate with data from the Logframe and scorecards
[4] Populate with data from the Project Document
[5] If available
[6] Colour code this column only
[7] Use the 6 point Progress Towards Results Rating Scale: HS, S, MS, MU, U, HU

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]

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 (*PBDEs & UPOPs*)

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

6. TIMEFRAME

The total duration of the MTR will be approximately *25* working days over a time period of *14* of weeks, and shall not exceed five months from when the consultant(s) are hired. The tentative MTR timeframe is as follows:

ACTIVITY	NUMBER OF WORKING DAYS	COMPLETION DATE
Document review and preparing MTR Inception Report (MTR Inception Report due no later than 2 weeks before the MTR mission)	*3 days*	*17 January 2019*
MTR mission: stakeholder meetings, interviews, field visits	*7 days*	*7 February 2019*
Presentation of initial findings- last day of the MTR mission	*1 day*	*21 February 2019*

---

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

Preparing draft report (due within 3 weeks of the MTR mission)	*10 days*	*14 March 2019*
Finalization of MTR report/ Incorporating audit trail from feedback on draft report (due within 2 weeks of receiving UNDP comments on the draft) *(note: accommodate time delay in dates for circulation and review of the draft report)*	*4 days*	*19 April 2019*

Options for site visits should be provided in the Inception Report. Also, note that the international consultant shall give a measure of direction from the national consultant to ensure timely collection of data and information on the ground and overall inputs to various written deliverables.

7. MIDTERM REVIEW DELIVERABLES

#	Deliverable	Description	Timing	Responsibilities
1	**MTR Inception Report**	MTR team clarifies objectives and methods of Midterm Review	No later than 2 weeks before the MTR mission (due date: 17 January 2019)	MTR team submits to the Commissioning Unit and project management
2	**Presentation**	Initial Findings	End of MTR mission (due date: 21 February 2019)	MTR Team presents to project management and the Commissioning Unit
3	**Draft Final Report**	Full report (using guidelines on content outlined in Annex B) with annexes	Within 3 weeks of the MTR mission (due date: 14 Match 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 2 weeks of receiving UNDP comments on draft (due date: 19 April 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.

8. MTR ARRANGEMENTS

The principal responsibility for managing this MTR resides with the Commissioning Unit. The Commissioning Unit for this project's MTR is *the UNDP Indonesia Country Office*.

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

9. TEAM COMPOSITION

A team of two independent consultants (international and national consultants) will conduct the MTR - one team leader (with experience and exposure to projects and evaluations in other regions globally) and one team expert, usually from the country of the project. 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 in the following areas:

1. Recent experience with result-based management evaluation methodologies (10 marks);
2. Experience applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios for at least 7 years (10 marks);
3. Competence in adaptive management, especially on hazardous chemicals or Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs) (10 marks);
4. Experience working with the GEF or GEF-evaluations for at least 5 years (5 marks);
5. Experience working in Asia-Pacific Countries for at least 3 years (5 marks)
6. Work experience in relevant technical areas for at least 15 years including experience on project monitoring and evaluation (10 marks);
7. Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender and hazardous chemicals; experience in gender sensitive evaluation and analysis (10 marks);
8. Excellent communication skills (10 marks);
9. Demonstrable analytical skills (10 marks);
10. Project evaluation/review experiences within United Nations system will be considered an asset (10 marks);
11. A Master's degree in chemical science, chemical engineering, natural science, environment science, environmental engineering, or other closely related field (10 marks);

10. PAYMENT MODALITIES AND SPECIFICATIONS

10% of payment upon approval of the final MTR Inception Report
30% on presentation of findings
30% upon submission of the draft MTR report
30% upon finalization of the MTR report

11. APPLICATION PROCESS[9]

Recommended Presentation of Proposal:

a) **Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability** using the template[10] provided by UNDP;
b) **CV** and a **Personal History Form** (P11 form[11]);
c) **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)
d) **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

---

[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
[10] https://intranet.undp.org/unit/bom/pso/Support%20documents%20on%20IC%20Guidelines/Template%20for%20Confirmation%20of%20Interest%20and%20Submission%20of%20Financial%20Proposal.docx
[11] http://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/corporate/Careers/P11_Personal_history_form.doc

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 United Nations Development Programme, Menara Thamrin 8-9th Floor. Jl. MH Thamrin Kav.3 Jakarta 10250, Indonesia; in a sealed envelope indicating the following reference "Consultant for PBDEs & UPOPs Midterm Review" or by email at the following address ONLY: yusef.millah@undp.org by **23 November 2018.** Incomplete applications will be excluded from further consideration.

Criteria for Evaluation of Proposal: Only those applications which are responsive and compliant 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.

ToR ANNEX A: List of Documents to be reviewed by the MTR Team
1. UNDP Project Document
2. UNDP Environmental and Social Screening results
3. Project Inception Report
4. All Project Implementation Reports (PIR's)
5. Quarterly progress reports and work plans of the various implementation task teams
6. Audit reports
7. Finalized GEF focal area Tracking Tools at CEO endorsement and midterm
8. All monitoring reports prepared by the project
9. Financial and Administration guidelines used by Project Team
10. PIF
11. UNDP Initiation Plan
12. Oversight mission reports
13. Project site location maps

The following documents will also be available:
14. Project Standard Operational Procedure (SOP), and any other operational guidelines, manuals and systems
15. UNDP country/countries programme document(s)
16. Minutes of the PBDEs & POPs Board Meetings

ToR ANNEX B: Guidelines on Contents for the Midterm Review Report[12]

    i.   Basic Report Information *(for opening page or title page)*
- Title of UNDP supported GEF financed project
- UNDP PIMS# and GEF project ID#
- MTR time frame and date of MTR report
- Region and countries included in the project
- GEF Operational Focal Area/Strategic Program
- Executing Agency/Implementing Partner and other project partners
- MTR team members
- Acknowledgements

    ii.   Table of Contents
    iii.   Acronyms and Abbreviations

---

[12] The Report length should not exceed *40* pages in total (not including annexes).

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

g t)

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

Evaluative Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
Project Strategy: To what extent is the project strategy relevant to country priorities, country ownership, and the best route towards expected results?			
(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?			

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.

<div align="center">**MTR Consultant Agreement Form**</div>

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: _____

---

[13] http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/100

		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: _____

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

To the comments received on (date) from the Midterm Review of (*PBDEs & UPOPs*) (UNDP Project ID-*PIMS #5073*)

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

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