

Terms of Reference

Midterm Review of the UNDP-GEF Project on Energy Efficiency Improvement in Commercial and High-Rise Residential Buildings in Viet Nam (EECB)

Project title:	Energy Efficiency Improvement in Commercial and High-Rise Residential Buildings in Viet Nam (EECB)
Implementing Partner:	Ministry of Construction (MOC)
Duty Location:	Hanoi (Viet Nam) with in-country travel as required
Duration:	December 2018 – August 2019

1. INTRODUCTION

This is the Terms of Reference (ToR) for the UNDP-GEF Midterm Review (MTR) of the *full* sized project titled *Energy Efficiency Improvement in Commercial and High-Rise Residential Buildings in Viet Nam (EECB) (PIMS 5245)* implemented through the *Ministry of Construction (MOC)*, which is to be undertaken in 2018-2019. The project started on the 22 April 2016 and is in its *third* year of implementation. In line with the UNDP-GEF Guidance on MTRs, and progress of the project, this MTR process was initiated after 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).

The MTR is primarily a monitoring tool to identify challenges and outline corrective actions to ensure that a project is on track to achieve maximum results by its completion. The output/deliverable of a MTR process is the MTR report with issues and management responses that will be useful for the project steering committee, implementing partner (MOC), Project management unit and UNDP for necessary corrective actions (if any) and continued management and implementation of the project towards achievement of its results by its completion.

2. PROJECT BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Viet Nam's socio-economic growth is the rapid urbanization of Viet Nam and has led to development of construction sector as well as higher energy demand for building sector. The report by World Business Council for Sustainable Development (WBCSD) showed that energy use in buildings accounts for 40% of the world energy use and generates an amount of CO2 emissions accounting for 30%.

In response to the challenges, Vietnamese Government has set forth many sustainable solutions namely National targeted program on climate change, National Strategy and Action Plan on Green Growth, Law on Energy Efficiency and Conservation. These are important legal

bases for implementing activities on energy efficiency in building sector, namely the Decision No. 811/QD-BXD by the Ministry of Construction dated 18 August 2016 on Action Plan in response to climate change of the Building sector, period of 2016-2020; the Energy Efficiency building code (QCXD09:2013) and the Green Growth Action Plan of the construction sector.

Under this situation, the Ministry of Construction (MOC) in cooperation with the United Nations Development Program (UNDP) implements the Project “Energy Efficiency Improvement in Commercial and High-Rise Residential Buildings in Viet Nam” (EECB) funded by Global Environment Fund (GEF). The Project’s goal is to reduce intensity of GHG emissions from the building sector in Viet Nam. The project objective is to improve the energy utilization performance of commercial and high-rise residential buildings in Viet Nam. Realization of this objective will be achieved through implementation of three components: (i) Improvement and Enforcement of Energy Efficiency Building Code; (ii) Building Market Development Support Initiatives, and (iii) Building EE Technology Applications and Replication

The Project will be implemented over a 4-year period starting from April 2016 and is expected to generate GHG emission reductions of about 37,680 tCO₂e. The cumulative direct reduction in GHG emissions over the lifetime of the project is envisioned to be 236,382 tCO₂e.

The total funding of the project is USD 24,696,550 of which GEF grant funding is \$3,198,000 and the remaining amount of \$21,498,550 is co-financed by national counterparts including MOC and building owners.

The project was formally launched in August 2016 and should end by end of 2020. All project components are under implementation.

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. DETAILED SCOPE OF THE MTR

The MTR team will consist of two independent consultants that will conduct the MTR - one international consultant as team leader and one national expert as team member.

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 and efficient 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/Log-frame:

- 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 ¹	Baseline Level ²	Level in 1 st PIR (self-reported)	Midterm Target ³	End-of-project Target	Midterm Level & Assessment ⁴	Achievement Rating ⁵	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 Evaluation.
- 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.

¹ Populate with data from the Logframe and scorecards

² Populate with data from the Project Document

³ If available

⁴ Colour code this column only

⁵ Use the 6 point Progress Towards Results Rating Scale: HS, S, MS, MU, U, HU

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.⁶

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 MTE report. See Annex E for ratings scales. No rating on Project Strategy and no overall project rating is required.

Table. MTE Ratings & Achievement Summary Table for Energy Efficiency Improvement in Commercial and High-Rise Residential Buildings in Viet Nam (EECB)

Measure	MTE 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	

⁶ Alternatively, MTR conclusions may be integrated into the body of the report.

	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)	

5. 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 approach⁷ ensuring close engagement with the Project Team, government counterparts (the GEF Operational Focal Point), the UNDP Country Office(s), UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Adviser, and other key stakeholders. Engagement of stakeholders is vital to a successful MTR.⁸ Stakeholder involvement should include interviews with stakeholders who have project responsibilities, including but not limited to 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 local provinces in Viet Nam, including the project sites where project activities such as demonstration, replication and training have taken place.

The review will follow UNEG norms and standards for evaluations, as well as ethical guidelines.

⁷ For ideas on innovative and participatory Monitoring and Evaluation strategies and techniques, see [UNDP Discussion Paper: Innovations in Monitoring & Evaluating Results](#), 05 Nov 2013.

⁸ 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.

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.

6. MIDTERM EVALUATION DELIVERABLES

#	Deliverable	Description	Timing	Responsibilities
1	MTR Inception Report	MTR team clarifies objectives and methods of Midterm Review	No later than 2 weeks before the MTR mission	MTR team submits to the UNDP and project management
2	Presentation	Initial Findings	End of MTR mission:	MTR Team presents to project management and the UNDP
3	Draft Final Report with Notes of all meetings with stakeholders	Full report (using guidelines on content outlined in Annex B) with annexes	Within 3 weeks of the MTR mission:	Sent to the UNDP, 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 MTE report	Within 2 weeks of receiving UNDP comments on draft:	Sent to UNDP

*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.

7. TIMEFRAME, DUTY STATION AND EXPECTED PLACES OF TRAVEL

Duration and Timing: Estimated 20 working days for an international consultant and 15 working days for one national consultant during the December 2018 – August 2019.

Duty station: Home based and Hanoi with in-country travel as required

The detailed schedule will be developed and agreed with the UNDP and project management team (UNDP) before commencing. The assignment shall include a 5-working day mission in Hanoi, Viet Nam. In case of in-country travel (if needed), travel costs will be covered by the Project based on the UNDP policy.

Options for site visits should be discussed in advance with the PMU and UNDP and provided in the Inception Report.

The tentative MTR timeframe is as follows:

TIMEFRAME	ACTIVITY
<i>(26 October 2018)</i>	Application closes
<i>(20 November 2018)</i>	Select MTR Team
<i>(10 December 2018)</i>	Prep the MTR Team (handover of Project Documents)
<i>(24 December 2018)</i>	Document review and preparing draft MTR Inception Report
<i>7 January 2019</i>	Finalization and Validation of draft MTR Inception Report- latest start of MTR mission
<i>5 days (21 – 25 January 2019)</i>	MTR mission: stakeholder meetings, interviews, field visits
<i>25 January 2019</i>	Mission wrap-up meeting & presentation of initial findings- earliest end of MTR mission
<i>25 February 2019</i>	Preparing draft report including suggestion for Preparation and Issues of management response (note: taking into account of 1 week off for Christmas and New Year)
<i>15 March 2019</i>	Incorporating audit trail (see Annex G) from feedbacks on draft report/Finalization of MTR report (note: accommodate time delay in dates for circulation and review of the draft report and the Vietnamese New Year in early February)
<i>30 March 2019</i>	Finalisation of Preparation & Issues recommended for Management Response
<i>30 May 2019</i>	Expected date of full MTR completion

8. TEAM COMPOSITION AND EXPECTED QUALIFICATIONS

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 ideal candidates shall have the following minimum qualifications and experience:

For International Consultant (Team Leader)

- Master’s degree in project management, energy efficiency, environmental sciences or relevant fields.
- At least ten (10) years of international experience in the areas of project development, project implementation, and project evaluation for donor-funded development projects in developing countries.

- Recent experience with results-based management evaluation methodologies; Experience working with the GEF or GEF-evaluations; Project evaluation/review experiences within United Nations system will be considered an asset;
- Work experience in climate change mitigation projects in developing countries in Asia is an advantage; work experience in energy efficiency in buildings is an advantage
- Experience applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios; Experience applying participatory monitoring approaches;
- Good interpersonal and analytical skills and ability to work under diverse/varied cultural environments;
- Demonstrated command over writing professional reports in English.

Specifically, the international expert (team leader) will perform the following tasks:

- Lead and manage the evaluation mission;
- Design the detailed evaluation scope and methodology (including the methods for data collection and analysis);
- Recommend the division of labor within the evaluation team;
- Conduct an analysis of the outcome, outputs and partnership strategy (as per the scope of the evaluation described above);
- Draft the evaluation report and recommend issues for management response; and
- Finalize the entire evaluation report.

For National Consultant (Team member)

- Graduate degree in degree in project management, energy efficiency, environmental sciences or relevant fields
- At least five (5) years of experience in the areas of project development, project implementation, and project evaluation for donor-funded development projects in Viet Nam;
- Familiarity and past experience with evaluation of GEF projects, especially in energy efficiency or energy efficiency in buildings projects is an advantage
- Work experience in climate change mitigation for donor-supported projects is an advantage
- Experience applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios; Experience applying participatory monitoring approaches
- Good interpersonal and analytical skills and ability to work under diverse/varied cultural environments;
- Excellent English skills with evidence through practical experience.

Specifically, the national expert will perform the following tasks:

- Documentation of evaluation and data gathering and consultation meetings;
- Contributing to the development of evaluation plan and methodology;
- Conducting specific elements of the evaluation determined by the International Lead Consultant;

- Contributing to presentation of the evaluation findings and recommendations at the evaluation wrap-up meeting;
- Contributing to the drafting and finalization of the MTR reports, notes of the meetings and other related documents prepared by the international consultant
- Performing translation for the international consultants during meetings with various stakeholders and necessary documents discussed during the international consultant’s mission.

9. MTE IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS

UNDP CO in Viet Nam will be responsible for selection and procurement of both international and local consultant. The international consultant will be the team leader and responsible for overall planning, execution and quality, contents and timely completion of the deliverables. Upon selection and procurement of international and local consultants, the UNDP CO in Viet Nam shall coordinate the initial communication between the two consultants and PMU, after which the international consultant shall assume the leadership role.

The selected consultants will work closely with UNDP programme Officer and Project Management Unit (PMU) under the guidance of the Head of Climate Change and Environment Unit at UNDP Viet Nam. All logistical arrangements (transport, accommodation, communications, arranging meetings, supplying copies of required documentation, etc.) to support evaluation team will be supported by PMU/UNDP.

With the exception of a 5-day field mission, the members of the MTR team are expected to work mostly from their home based offices and communicate among themselves and with UNDP, PMU and other stakeholders electronically. The MTR team can seek out both UNDP and PMU for reasonable assistance and support that they may require to fulfill their responsibilities.

10. PAYMENT MODALITIES AND SPECIFICATIONS

- The first installment of 60% of contract value will be paid upon submission and approval of the draft MTR report with supporting documents and notes of the meetings.
- The second and final payment of 40% will be paid upon the completion of the final products under the contract, with satisfactory acceptance by UNDP.

11. CONSULTANT PRESENCE REQUIRED ON DUTY STATION/UNDP PREMISES

NONE PARTIAL INTERMITTENT FULL-TIME

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

1. PIF
2. UNDP Initiation Plan
3. UNDP Project Document
4. UNDP Environmental and Social Screening results
5. Project Inception Report
6. All Project Implementation Reports (PIR's)
7. Quarterly progress reports and work plans of the various implementation task teams
8. Audit reports
9. Finalized GEF focal area Tracking Tools at CEO endorsement and midterm (*climate change mitigation*)
10. Oversight mission reports
11. All monitoring reports prepared by the project
12. Financial and Administration guidelines used by Project Team

The following documents will also be available:

13. Project operational guidelines, manuals and systems
14. UNDP country/countries programme document(s)
15. Minutes of the Project Board Meetings and other meetings (i.e. Project Appraisal Committee meetings)
16. Project site location maps
17. Guidance for conducting mid-term reviews of UNDP-supported, GEF-financed projects
18. [UNDP Evaluation Policy](#)
19. UNEG Norms and Standards for Evaluation
20. UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN System
21. UNEG Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation
22. UNDP Viet Nam Policy on Gender-Responsive Evaluation

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

- i. Basic Report Information (*for opening page or title page*)
 - Title of UNDP supported GEF financed project
 - UNDP PIMS# and GEF project ID#
 - MTR time frame and date of MTR report
 - Region and countries included in the project
 - GEF Operational Focal Area/Strategic Program
 - Executing Agency/Implementing Partner and other project partners
 - MTR team members
 - Acknowledgements
- ii. Table of Contents
- iii. Acronyms and Abbreviations
1. Executive Summary (*3-5 pages*)

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

- 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 and notes of meetings with stakeholders
- 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 Consultants¹⁰

Evaluators/Consultants:

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

MTR Consultant Agreement Form

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

Name of Consultant: _____

Name of Consultancy Organization (where relevant): _____

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

Signed at _____ (Place) on _____ (Date)

Signature: _____

¹⁰ www.undp.org/uneocodeofconduct

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

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

document)

ToR ANNEX G: Audit Trail Template

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

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

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

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

EVALUATION CRITERIA WITH ASSIGNED SCORES

International Consultant

Consultant(s)' experiences/qualification related to the services		
1	Master's degree in project management, energy efficiency, environmental sciences or relevant fields	150
2	At least ten (10) years of international experience in the areas of project development, project implementation, and project evaluation for donor-funded development projects in developing countries	200
3	Recent experience with results-based management evaluation methodologies; Experience working with the GEF or GEF-evaluations; Project evaluation/review experiences within United Nations system will be considered an asset;	200
4	Work experience in climate change mitigation projects and energy efficiency in buildings in developing countries in Asia is an advantage	200
5	Experience applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios; Experience applying participatory monitoring approaches;	150
6	Demonstrated command over writing professional reports in English.	100
Total		1000

EVALUATION CRITERIA WITH ASSIGNED SCORES

National Consultant

Consultant(s)' experiences/qualification related to the services		
1	Graduate degree in degree in project management, energy efficiency, environmental sciences or relevant fields	150
2	At least five (5) years of experience in the areas of project development, project implementation, and project evaluation for donor-funded development projects in Viet Nam	200
3	Familiarity and past experience with evaluation of GEF projects, especially energy efficiency or energy efficiency in building projects, will be an advantage	200
4	Work experience in climate change mitigation for donor-supported projects is an advantage	150
5	Experience applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios; Experience applying participatory monitoring approaches;	100
6	Excellent English skills with evidence through practical experience.	200
Total		1000