

UNDP-GEF Midterm Review

Terms of Reference

1. INTRODUCTION

This is the Terms of Reference (ToR) for the UNDP-GEF Midterm Review (MTR) of the *full-sized* project titled *NAMA Support for the Tunisian Solar Plan* (PIMS 5182) implemented through the *National Agency for Energy Conservation of Tunisia* (*Agence Nationale pour la Maîtrise de l'Énergie, ANME*), which is to be undertaken in *September 2017*. The project started on *6 January 2015* and is in its *third* year of implementation. In line with the UNDP-GEF Guidance on MTRs, this MTR process was initiated before the submission of the second Project Implementation Report (PIR). This ToR sets out the expectations for this MTR. The MTR process must follow the guidance outlined in the document *Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects* (http://web.undp.org/evaluation/documents/guidance/GEF/mid-term/Guidance_Midterm%20Review%20_EN_2014.pdf).

2. PROJECT BACKGROUND INFORMATION

The UNDP-implemented, GEF-financed project (Total GEF funding = US\$3,552,968) to be implemented over the period 2015-2019, was designed to support the Government of Tunisia in the development and implementation of a Nationally Appropriate Mitigation Action in the energy sector, namely a NAMA for the Tunisian Solar Plan (TSP). The project will contribute to the achievement of the energy mitigation targets established voluntarily by the Government of Tunisia, which aim to achieve a contribution of 30% of electricity produced from wind energy, PV and CSP by 2030. The project is structured in the three following components:

- Component 1: The enabling conditions and methodologies are established to support the design and implementation of the TSP NAMA.

Expected outcomes: The enabling conditions, methodologies and tools are developed for de-risking the national policy environment for implementing the TSP through a NAMA.

GEF funding: US\$394,945

Co-financing: US\$790,000 (ANME:US\$190,000; UNDP:US\$600,000)

This technical assistance component will address the institutional and policy frameworks that are required to implement the TSP. It seeks to establish high-level political support and coordination mechanisms that will be invaluable for advocating for, and coordinating, mitigation actions across several sectors.

- Component 2: Architecture for NAMA development is established.

Expected outcomes: A coherent climate finance framework is established for the development of NAMAs to catalyse the transformational capacity of the TSP to generate large emission reductions.

GEF funding: US\$1,212,200

Co-financing: US\$13,876,308 (ANME: US\$13,776,308; Ministry of Equipment, Land Planning and Sustainable development: US\$100,000)

This technical assistance component seeks to establish the necessary conditions to leverage financing to support a NAMA in the energy sector – i.e. the TSP NAMA. This component also addresses regulatory and technical barriers that exist in the baseline and which act to constrain private investment.

- Component 3: Design and implementation of an energy sector NAMA to demonstrate the transformational role of the TSP to reduce GHG emissions.

Expected outcome: The TSP is operationalised by demonstrating a proof-of-concept energy NAMA with quantified GHG emission reductions.

GEF funding: US\$1,776,634

Co-financing: US\$47,477,200 (Société Tunisienne de l'Electricité et du Gaz (STEG): US\$15,675,000; EnerCiel (private company): US\$31,802,200)

This investment company of the project will mainly achieve the following impacts: (1) the reliability of renewable electricity generation from the two baseline projects (the 10 MW Tozeur solar plant and the 24 MW Gabes wind farm) will be enhanced, thereby ensuring enhanced GHG emission reduction capabilities; and (2) the two baseline projects will be implemented as part of the TSP NAMA, with appropriate MRV of emissions reductions.

Regarding the management arrangements, the project is nationally implemented (NIM) by ANME for the Government of Tunisia. UNDP is accountable for the disbursement of funds and the achievement of the project goals, in accordance with the approved work plan.

A Project Steering Committee (PSC) has been established in 2015 to monitor project progress, to guide project implementation and to support the project in achieving its outputs and outcomes. In addition, a Project Management Unit (PMU) was established to carry out the day-to-day management of the project.

3. OBJECTIVES OF THE MTR

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

4. MTR APPROACH & METHODOLOGY

The MTR must provide evidence based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The MTR consultant 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 consultant considers useful for this evidence-based review). The MTR consultant 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 consultant is expected to follow a collaborative and participatory approach¹ ensuring close engagement with the Project Management Unit, government counterparts (the GEF Operational Focal Point), the UNDP Country Office(s), UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Advisers, and other key stakeholders.

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.

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 members of the Project Steering Committee (PSC), members of the Project Management Unit (PMU), officials from executing agencies and private sector investors, key experts and consultants in the areas of energy and climate change.

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 consultant 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.

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

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.

Progress Towards Outcomes Analysis:

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

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

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

Indicator Assessment Key

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

In addition to the progress towards outcomes analysis:

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

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

- 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 done so far and assess the appropriateness and relevance of such revisions.
- Review the multi-year budget revision document prepared by the Project Management Unit for the remaining project duration and assess its relevance/feasibility;
- 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 and ownership:

- 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 Management Unit 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 Management Unit 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 consultant 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 consultant should make no more than 15 recommendations total.

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

Ratings

The MTR consultant 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 NAMA Support for the TSP Project

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

6. TIMEFRAME

The total duration of the MTR will be approximately 30 days over an estimated period of 12 weeks starting 11th of September 2017, and shall not exceed five months from when the consultant is hired. The tentative MTR timeframe is as follows:

TIMEFRAME	ACTIVITY
15 August 2017	Application closes
25 August 2017	Select MTR consultant (contract issued)
11 September 2017	Prep the MTR consultant (handover of Project Documents)
25-28 September 2017 (4 days)	Document review and preparing MTR Inception Report
13 October 2017 (1 day)	Finalization and Validation of MTR Inception Report- latest start of MTR mission
17-26 October 2017 (12 days including days of travel)	MTR mission: project stakeholders' meetings and interviews.
26 October 2017	Mission wrap-up meeting & presentation of initial findings-earliest end of MTR mission
30 October-8 November 2017 (10 days)	Preparing draft report
20-21 November 2017 (2 days)	Incorporating audit trail from feedback on draft report/Finalization of MTR report (note: accommodate time delay in dates for circulation and review of the draft report)
27-28 November 2017	Preparation & Issue of Management Response
	Concluding Stakeholder Workshop (not mandatory for MTR Consultant)
4 December 2017	Expected date of full MTR completion and second mission to Tunisia to present the results to the steering committee members

7. DUTY STATION

This assignment is home-based and requires the consultant to travel to Tunis, Tunisia twice to (1) meet the needs of the MTR mission and (2) to present the findings of the MTR. The proposed duration of the MTR mission is from the 16 October 2017 to 26 October 2017. The proposed date for the presentation of the MTR findings in Tunis, Tunisia is the 4th of December 2017.

8. MIDTERM REVIEW DELIVERABLES

#	Deliverable	Description	Timeframe	Responsibilities
1	MTR Inception Report in French	MTR consultant clarifies objectives and methods of Midterm Review, including sharing questionnaire to use during interviews with the project stakeholders	No later than 2 weeks before the MTR mission: (28 September 2017)	MTR consultant submits to the Commissioning Unit and project management Unit
2	Presentation in French	Initial Findings to be presented at the end of the first mission to Tunisia	End of MTR mission: (26 October 2017)	MTR consultant presents to project management Unit, UNDP CO and the Commissioning Unit
3	Draft MTR Report in English	Full report (using guidelines on content outlined in Annex B) with annexes	Within 3 weeks of the MTR mission: (8 November 2017)	Sent to the Commissioning Unit, reviewed by RTA, UNDP CO, project management Unit, GEF OFP
4	Final Report in English + Summary of the report in English and French	Revised report with audit trail detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final MTR report	Within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft: (21 November 2017)	Sent to the Commissioning Unit
5	PPT presentation on the main findings of the MTR in French and mission to Tunis, Tunisia	conduct a visit to Tunis, Tunisia to present the MTR findings to the Project Steering Committee	4 th of December as per the timeframe	Sent to the Commissioning Unit

9. 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 Tunisia Country Office.

The Project Management Unit will be responsible for liaising with the MTR consultant to provide all relevant documents and set up stakeholder interviews.

10. REQUIRED QUALIFICATIONS OF THE MTR CONSULTANT

An international independent consultant or a national independent consultant with relevant international experience will conduct the MTR. The consultant 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 consultant will be aimed at maximizing the overall qualities in the following technical qualifications: 70% of points will be awarded for the technical qualifications and 30% for the financial bid.

10.1. Required academic qualifications:

Post graduate degree (minimum Master's degree or equivalent degree) in energy, energy studies engineering, environmental science or management, climate change, economics or other closely related field.

10.2. Qualifications regarding the years of experience and the area of expertise:

At least 7 years of work experience in the areas related to climate change mitigation and/or energy efficiency / renewable energies.

10.3. Additional technical qualifications:

- Relevant experience with result-based management evaluation methodologies and/or applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios;
- Experience working with the GEF or GEF-evaluations;
- Project evaluation/review experiences within United Nations system will be considered an asset;
- Excellent communication skills;
- Demonstrable analytical skills;
- Fluent French in speaking, reading and writing;
- Excellent English reading and writing skills to be able to draft the MTR report in English.

11. EVALUATION METHOD

The offers of individual consultants will be evaluated based on the combined scoring method:

- ✓ Technical qualifications (100 points max.) weight: 70%
- ✓ Financial bid (100 points max.) weight: 30%

A two-stage procedure will be utilised in evaluating the offers, with evaluation of the technical qualifications being completed prior to any financial bid being compared. Only the financial bids of the offerors who passed the minimum technical qualifications score of 70 points will be evaluated.

a) Criteria for evaluation of technical qualifications score:

#	Technical evaluation criterion	Highest possible technical qualifications score
1	Relevant work experience in the areas related to climate change mitigation and/or energy efficiency / renewable energies: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 7 years (minimum required): 10 points - More than 7 years but less than 10 years: 15 points - 10 years and more: 20 points 	20 points
2	Relevant experience in projects evaluation/review based on result-based management evaluation methodologies and/or applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 1 project (minimum required): 10 points - 2 projects: 20 points - 3 projects and more: 30 points <p>If the relevant experience (associated to criterion 2) does not exceed 2 projects and only in the case where at least one of these projects was conducted within United Nations system, additional 10 points will be added to the score related to this criterion.</p>	30 points
3	Relevant experience working with the GEF or GEF-evaluations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 1 specific experience (minimum required): 20 points - 2 specific experiences and more: 30 points 	30 points
4	Brief description of approach to work/technical proposal	20 points
TOTAL		100 points

Only the offerors who have attained a minimum technical qualifications score of 70 points will be considered as technical qualified offerors.

b) Financial bid score:

- Only the offers which attained a minimum technical qualifications score of 70 points will be qualified for financial bid comparison.
- Among these qualified offers, the score of 100 points will be attributed to the offer with lowest financial bid. The score of any other qualified offer is calculated using the following formula:

$$\text{Financial bid score of the offer} = (\text{lowest financial bid} / \text{financial bid of the offer}) * 100$$

c) Selection method and award criteria

The award of the contract shall be made to the individual consultant whose offer has been evaluated and determined as:

- Responsive/compliant/acceptable, and;

- Having received the highest score out of a pre-determined set of weighted technical qualifications and financial bid specific to the solicitation. The total score for each offeror will be calculated using the following formula: Total score = Technical qualifications score*70% + Financial bid score*30%

12. PAYMENT MODALITIES AND SPECIFICATIONS

- 20% of payment upon approval of the final MTR Inception Report
- 30% upon submission of the draft MTR report
- 30% upon finalization of the MTR report
- 20% upon the presentation in Tunis, Tunisia of the main findings of the MTR

13. APPLICATION PROCESS⁹

Recommended Presentation of Proposal:

- a) **Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability** using the [template](#) annexed to the Terms of Reference;
- b) **CV or Personal History Form (P11 form¹⁰)** including past experience in similar assignments and at least 3 references;
- c) **Brief description of approach to work/technical proposal** of why the individual consultant considers him/herself as the most suitable for the assignment, and a proposed methodology on how he/she will approach and complete the assignment;
- d) **Financial Proposal** using the **“Breakdown of Costs Supporting the All-inclusive Financial Proposal” template attached to Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability template.** The financial proposal shall be “all- inclusive” and expressed in a lump sum for the total duration of the contract. The term “all-inclusive” implies all costs: professional fees, travel costs, living allowances, etc. If an applicant is employed by an organization/company/institution, and he/she expects his/her employer to charge a management fee in the process of releasing him/her to UNDP under Reimbursable Loan Agreement (RLA), the applicant must indicate at this point, and ensure that all such costs are duly incorporated in the financial proposal submitted to UNDP.

Applications (containing the completed electronic documents specified in the above-mentioned paragraphs a), b), c) and d)) should be submitted by email at the following email address ONLY: procurement.sap-tunisia@undp.org no later than **15 August 2017 at 3 pm Tunis local time**. In the subject of the application email, please indicate “Application for MTR – NAMA support for the TSP”. Incomplete applications will be excluded from further consideration.

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

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 CCM Tracking Tool at CEO endorsement and midterm

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 http://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/corporate/Careers/P11_Personal_history_form.doc

10. Oversight mission reports
11. All monitoring reports prepared by the project
12. Financial and Administration guidelines used by Project Management Unit

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 NAMA Support for the TSP Board Meetings and other meetings (i.e. Project Appraisal Committee meetings)

ToR ANNEX B: Guidelines on Contents for the Midterm Review Report¹¹

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

¹¹ The Report length should not exceed 40 pages in total (not including annexes).

- 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 tool

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?			

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: _____

¹² www.undp.org/unegcodeofconduct

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: _____

