

UNDP-GEF Midterm Review Terms of Reference

Standard Template 1: Formatted for attachment to [UNDP Procurement Website](#)

1. INTRODUCTION

This is the Terms of Reference (ToR) for the UNDP-GEF Midterm Review (MTR) of the full - sized project titled **Promotion of Sustainable Charcoal in Angola through a Value Chain Approach** (PIMS #5331) implemented through the Ministry of Environment of the Government of Angola. The 6-year project started on April 1st, 2016 and is at the beginning of its third year of implementation. 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 project is funded by the Global Environment Facility (GEF) and is implemented by UNDP. This ToR relates to the evaluation of the UNDP implemented components of the project.

The Project aims to introduce energy-efficient charcoal technologies in Angola and trigger market demand for certified, sustainable charcoal. Through selected Responsible Partners, energy-efficient charcoal kilns, briquetting machines and efficient stoves will be transferred to rural and peri-urban beneficiaries, thereby adding value along the chain while creating opportunities for income and job creation. Environmental benefits are attained by mitigation of baseline greenhouse gas emissions, reduction of local pollution, and saving of forest-based biomass resources. The Project will deliver key elements for building and financing a sustainable charcoal sector, including a policy white paper and sustainability criteria and verification mechanisms. The Project will further build relevant human resources at all levels for implementing and sustaining low-emission development strategies in Angola, with a focus on charcoal and rural biomass utilization. Finally, the Project will mainstream sustainable charcoal into existing Governmental poverty reduction and rural development programs.

Energy end-use in Angola clearly reflects the economic and geographical divide between the social strata. Overall access to electricity is about 37% (2010-2014) but almost non-existing in rural areas. The use of oil products is limited to the urban areas. Firewood and charcoal represent over 57% of total energy consumption, followed by petroleum products (41.7%) and LPG (less than 1%). Charcoal is the main source of energy in peri-urban areas of the main coastal cities (Luanda, Benguela); rural dwellers rely on firewood. Population growth and increasing energy demand has triggered charcoal production in the interior of Angola, where it often represents the only opportunity to generate cash income. It is estimated that around 100,000 people are involved in the activity of wood collection and charcoal production. Only a small fraction of charcoal production and trade is formalized and compliant with national regulation.

Charcoal demand is having a particularly adverse impact on the natural Miombo woodlands of Huambo Province, leading to losses in forest stock, biodiversity and opportunities for rural livelihoods. Moreover, environmental degradation exacerbates the effects of global climate change, increasing vulnerability of settlements. Persistent floods and drought exacerbate erosion and loss of soils, thereby accelerating deforestation and losses of livelihood. In spite of substantial progress over the last decade, there are challenges of institutional coordination, data management, institutional capacity, the need to work across sectors, and insufficient tools and capabilities to prepare and carry out public or private works, and to translate policy objectives into effective governance. The absence of a corps of capable human resources as a direct result of the conflict, is a great limiting factor.

Charcoal has the potential to be a sustainable and affordable (transition) fuel. To attain sustainability, improvements are needed along each step of the value chain : (1) forest management; (2) carbonization; (3) transport, (4) distribution (including warehousing) and retail; and (5) consumption. UNDP believes that it is important to improve the production and use of charcoal as well as aim at achieving sustainability across its entire value chain. Doing so will address multiple goals and generate important co-benefits. Providing people with cleaner charcoal that is produced in a low-carbon manner and used more efficiently (in improved stoves) will have critical environmental dividends (in the form of reduced greenhouse gas emissions and reduced deforestation); can professionalize the value chain and create jobs and livelihoods; and will be beneficial to the end-users (health-wise but also resulting in cost-savings and hence will have a positive impact on household budgets).

The project executed by the Ministry of the Environment (MINAMB) of Angola with support from UNDP is divided into four main components:

- Component 1: Strengthen the policy framework to support a sustainable charcoal value chain in Angola;
- Component 2: Transfer of sustainable charcoal technology to agents along the charcoal value chain;
- Component 3: Strengthen of human capacities and institutions;
- Component 4: Monitoring and Evaluation.

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, and analysis methods integrated gender considerations, use of disaggregated data and outreach to diverse stakeholders' groups.

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 team 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 approach 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. Stakeholder involvement should include interviews with stakeholders who have project responsibilities, including but not limited to MINAMB and UNEP; 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.

The MTR consultant is expected to provide details of how cross-cutting issues will be evaluated, considered and analysed throughout the evaluation. Also, should specify how methods for data collection and analysis will integrate gender considerations, ensure that data collected is disaggregated by sex and other relevant categories, and employ a diverse range of data sources and processes to ensure inclusion of diverse stakeholders, including the most vulnerable where appropriate.

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.

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).

Progress Towards Results Matrix

Project Strategy	Indicator	Baseline Level	Level in 1 st PIR	Mid-term Target	End-of-project Target	Midterm Level & Assessment	Achievement Rating	Justification for Rating

Objective: To reduce the current unsustainable and GHG-intensive mode of charcoal production and utilization from Angola's Miombo woodlands via an integrated set of interventions in the national charcoal value chain	(Aa) Achieved direct GHG emission reductions over lifetime (ton CO2eq); (Ab) Estimated indirect GHG emission reductions over lifetime (ton CO2eq);	(Aa) 0 ton CO2eq; (Ab) 0 ton CO2eq;	On track	(Aa) 0 ton CO2eq; (Ab) 0 ton CO2eq;	(Aa) 209k ton CO2eq; (Ab) 1.2 M ton CO2eq			
	(Ba) Number of people with improved energy access as a result of UNDP-supported intervention. (Bb) Percentage of households benefitting from improved access to energy which are female-headed households (Bc) Average monetary savings by households using sustainable charcoal in efficient stoves (US\$/(household-year)).	(Ba) 0; (Bb) 25% (Bc) 0 US\$/(hh-y)		(Ba) 200; (Bb) 50% (Bc) 100 US\$/(hh-y)	(Ba) 10,000; (Bb) 50% (Bc) 100 US\$/(hh-y)			
	(C) Policy and regulatory framework for sustainable charcoal sector supported.	(C) rated "1" (no policy/regulation/strategy in place)		(C) rated "2" policy/regulation/s strategy discussed and proposed)	(C) rated "4" (policy/regulation/s strategy adopted but not enforced)			

Outcome 1: Information and strengthening of the policy framework for sustainable charcoal	(1a) white paper on sustainable charcoal, endorsed by Government;	(1a) no concept for white paper	On track	(1a) concept for white paper presented	(1a) white paper completed and endorsed			
	(1b) certification and MRV mechanism designed and implemented	(1b) no certification and no MRV mechanism designed nor implemented (0,0);		(1b) certification and MRV mechanism for sustainable charcoal production chain designed (1,0);	(1b) certification and MRV mechanism for sustainable charcoal designed and implemented in government programs (1,2)			
Outcome 2: The benefits of sustainable charcoal production technology, briquetting and energy-efficient charcoal stoves, have been accepted by producers and peri-urban consumers	(2a) Number of improved charcoal kilns and briquetting machined effectively in use;	(2a) No improved charcoal kilns (0), nor briquetting machines in use (0)	On track	(2a) 18 improved kilns and 3 briquetting machines	(2a) 270 improved kilns and 10 briquetting machines;			
	(2b) Annual volume of certified, sustainable charcoal delivered to consumers (ton/yr);	(2b) No certified, sustainable charcoal delivered (0 ton.yr);		(2b) No certified, sustainable charcoal delivered (0 ton.yr);	(2b) 3,024 ton/yr certified, sustainable charcoal delivered per year			
	(2c) Number of energy-efficient (EE) charcoal stoves delivered to peri-urban consumers.	(2d) No EE charcoal stoves delivered		(2c) 3,000 EE charcoal stoves delivered	(2c) 10,000 EE charcoal stoves delivered.			

Outcome 3: Institutional and human capacities for sustainable charcoal production and utilization have been strengthened through partnerships for knowledge transfer and professional training	(3a) Number of persons skilled in sustainable forest management and charcoal technology (male, female); (3b) Number of partnerships strengthened and active at project termination;	(3a) No persons skilled in charcoal technology (0 male, 0 female) (3b) 1 partnership in place (UCO-UJES)	On track	(3a) 40 persons skilled (20 male ; 20 female) (3b) 2 active partnerships	(3a) 150 persons skilled (75 male ; 75 female) (3b) 3 active partnerships			
Outcome 4: Monitoring & Evaluation plan	(4a) Mid-term review (1) and follow-up on recommendations (1) on gender mainstreaming and sustainability of project results (4b) Terminal Evaluation document	(4a) No Mid-term Review and no recommendations (4a) No Terminal Evaluation	On track	(4a) Mid-term Review completed (4b) No Terminal Evaluation	(4a) Follow-up on MTR recommendations completed (4b) Terminal Evaluation completed			

Indicator Assessment Key

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

In addition to the progress towards outcomes analysis:

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

iii. Project Implementation and Adaptive Management

Management Arrangements:

- Review overall effectiveness of project management as outlined in the Project Document. Have changes been made and are they effective? Are responsibilities and reporting lines clear? Is decision-making transparent and undertaken in a timely manner? Recommend areas for improvement.

- Review the quality of execution of the Executing Agency/Implementing Partner(s) and recommend areas for improvement.
- Review the quality of support provided by the GEF Partner Agency (UNDP) and recommend areas for improvement.

Work Planning:

- Review any delays in project start-up and implementation, identify the causes and examine if they have been resolved.
- Are work-planning processes results-based? If not, suggest ways to re-orientate work planning to focus on results?
- Examine the use of the project's results framework/ logframe as a management tool and review any changes made to it since project start.

Finance and co-finance:

- Consider the financial management of the project, with specific reference to the cost-effectiveness of interventions.
- Review the changes to fund allocations as a result of budget revisions and assess the appropriateness and relevance of such revisions.
- Does the project have the appropriate financial controls, including reporting and planning, that allow management to make informed decisions regarding the budget and allow for timely flow of funds?
- Informed by the co-financing monitoring table to be filled out, provide commentary on co-financing: is co-financing being used strategically to help the objectives of the project? Is the Project Team meeting with all co-financing partners regularly in order to align financing priorities and annual work plans?

Project-level Monitoring and Evaluation Systems:

- Review the monitoring tools currently being used: Do they provide the necessary information? Do they involve key partners? Are they aligned or mainstreamed with national systems and UNDP requirements? 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?

Human rights

- To what extent have poor, indigenous and physically challenged, women and other disadvantaged and marginalized groups benefited from the work of UNDP in the country?

Gender equality

- To what extent have gender equality and the empowerment of women been addressed in the design, implementation and monitoring of the project?
- Is the gender marker data assigned to this project representative of reality?
- To what extent has the project promoted positive changes in gender equality and the empowerment of women? Were there any unintended effects?

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 UNDP/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.

Relevance:

- To what extent was the project in line with the national development priorities, the country programme's outputs and outcomes, the UNDP Strategic Plan and the SDGs?
- To what extent does the project contribute to gender equality, the empowerment of women and the human rights-based approach?
-

Effectiveness:

- To what extent were the project outputs achieved?
- In which areas does the project have the greatest achievements? Why and what have been the supporting factors? How can the project build on or expand these achievements?

Efficiency:

-
- To what extent was the project management structure as outlined in the project document efficient in generating the expected results?
- To what extent have the UNDP project implementation strategy and execution been efficient and cost-effective?

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 consultant will include a section of the report setting out the MTR's evidence-based conclusions, in light of the findings.

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 consultant should provide specific findings, lessons learned and recommendations for accelerating the implementation of the project and for ensuring that project deliverables can be achieved by the end of the project.

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.

MTR Ratings & Achievement Summary Table for Promotion of Sustainable Charcoal in Angola through a Value Chain Approach

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)	
	Outcome 4 Achievement Rating: (rate 6pt. scale)	
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 days over a time period of 12 of weeks starting September 2019 and shall not exceed five months from when the consultant is hired. The tentative MTR timeframe is as follows:

DATE	ACTIVITY	RESPONSIBLE
16 September 2019	Handover of Project Documents	UNDP CO
17 – 19 September 2019 (3 days)	Document review and preparing MTR Inception Report	Consultant
25 September 2019 (1 day)	Finalization and Validation of MTR Inception Report- latest start of MTR mission	Consultant, UNDP CO, UNDP Regional Office
05 – 15 October 2019 (8 days in Luanda)	MTR mission: stakeholder meetings, interviews, field visits	Consultant with UNDP CO support
15 October 2019	Mission wrap-up meeting & presentation of initial findings- earliest end of MTR mission	Consultant
16 – 30 October 2019	Preparing draft report	Consultant
13 - 14 November 2019 (2 days)	Incorporating audit trail from feedback on draft report/Finalization of MTR report	Consultant
15 November – 29 November 2019	Preparation & Issue of Management Response	UNDP CO
13 December 2019	Expected date of full MTR completion	Consultant, UNDP CO, UNDP Regional Office

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: 10 July 2019	MTR team submits to the Commissioning Unit project management and RBM Unit
2	Presentation	Initial Findings	End of MTR mission: 31 July 2019	MTR Team presents to project management the Commissioning Unit and RBM Unit
3	Draft Final Report	Full report (using guidelines on content outlined in Annex B) with annexes	Within 3 weeks of the MTR mission: 15 August 2019	Sent to the Commissioning Unit, RBM Unit, reviewed by RTA, Project Coordinating Unit, GEF OFP

4	Final Report*	Revised report with audit trail detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final MTR report	Within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft: 30 September 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 UNDP Angola.

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

9. TEAM COMPOSITION

An independent consultant will conduct the MTR - (with experience and exposure to projects and evaluations in other regions globally). 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 areas:

- Criterion A: Work experience in climate change mitigation, energy, capacity development or environment, economics and/or development related field for at least 7 years – max points: 10;
- Criterion B: Recent experience with result-based management evaluation methodologies – max points: 10;
- Criterion C: Experience working with the GEF or GEF-evaluations and experience applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios – max points: 10;
- Criterion D: A Master's degree in environmental sciences, environmental policies, social sciences, economics, business administration, international relations, or other closely related field – max points: 10;
- Criterion E: Fluency in English and Portuguese – max points: 10;
- Criterion F: Experience in southern-central Africa – max points: 10;
- Criterion G: Experience in cross-cutting issues such as gender equality, rights-based approach, capacity development and climate change analysis – max points: 10.

10. PAYMENT MODALITIES AND SPECIFICATIONS

20 % of payment upon approval of the final MTR Inception Report and approval of work plan
30% upon submission of the draft MTR report
50% upon finalization of the MTR report

11. APPLICATION PROCESS

Recommended Presentation of Proposal:

- a) **Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability** using the [template](#)¹ provided by UNDP;
- b) **CV and a Personal History Form** ([P11 form](#)²);
- 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 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 Edifício Rosalinda, Luanda, Angola in a sealed envelope indicating the following reference “MTR Consultant for Coastal Adaptation MTR” or by email at the following address ONLY: aguiar.cuiundana@undp.org before the announced deadline. Incomplete applications may 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 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)

¹

<https://intranet.undp.org/unit/bom/psa/Support%20documents%20on%20IC%20Guidelines/Template%20for%20Confirmation%20of%20Interest%20and%20Submission%20of%20Financial%20Proposal.docx>

² http://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/corporate/Careers/P11_Personal_history_form.doc

7. Work plans
8. Audit reports
9. Finalized GEF focal area Tracking Tools at CEO endorsement and midterm
10. All monitoring reports prepared by the project
11. Financial and Administration guidelines used by Project Team

The following documents will also be available:

12. Project operational guidelines, manuals and systems
13. UNDP country/countries programme document(s)
14. Angola National Development Plan- 2013-2017
15. PDNA
16. UNDP environment outcome evaluation report

ToR ANNEX B: Guidelines on Contents for the Midterm Review Report³

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

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)
 - Conclusions
 - 5.1
 - Comprehensive and balanced statements (that are evidence-based and connected to the MTR's findings and lessons learned) which highlight the strengths, weaknesses and results of the project
 -
 - Recommendations
 - 5.2
 - Corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project
 - Actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the project
 - Proposals for future directions underlining main objectives

6. Annexes

- MTR ToR (excluding ToR annexes)
- MTR evaluative matrix (evaluation criteria with key questions, indicators, sources of data, and methodology)
- Example Questionnaire or Interview Guide used for data collection
- Ratings Scales
- MTR mission itinerary
- List of persons interviewed
- List of documents reviewed
- Co-financing table (if not previously included in the body of the report)
- Signed UNEG Code of Conduct form
- Signed MTR final report clearance form
- Annexed in a separate file: Audit trail from received comments on draft MTR report
- Annexed in a separate file: Relevant midterm tracking tools (METT, FSC, Capacity scorecard, etc.)

ToR ANNEX C: Midterm Review Evaluative Matrix Template

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

Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, socio-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?			

ToR ANNEX D: UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluators/Midterm Review Consultants

Evaluators/Consultants:

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

MTR Consultant Agreement Form

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

Name of Consultant: _____

Name of Consultancy Organization (where relevant): _____

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

Signed at _____ (Place) on _____ (Date)

Signature: _____

ToR ANNEX E: MTR Ratings

Ratings for Progress Towards Results: (one rating for each outcome and for the objective)

6	Highly Satisfactory (HS)	The objective/outcome is expected to achieve or exceed all its end-of-project targets, without major shortcomings. The progress towards the objective/outcome can be presented as “good practice”.
5	Satisfactory (S)	The objective/outcome is expected to achieve most of its end-of-project targets, with only minor shortcomings.
4	Moderately Satisfactory (MS)	The objective/outcome is expected to achieve most of its end-of-project targets but with significant shortcomings.
3	Moderately Unsatisfactory (HU)	The objective/outcome is expected to achieve its end-of-project targets with major shortcomings.
2	Unsatisfactory (U)	The objective/outcome is expected not to achieve most of its end-of-project targets.
1	Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)	The objective/outcome has failed to achieve its midterm targets, and is not expected to achieve any of its end-of-project targets.

Ratings for Project Implementation & Adaptive Management: (one overall rating)		
6	Highly Satisfactory (HS)	Implementation of all seven components – management arrangements, work planning, finance and co-finance, project-level monitoring and evaluation systems, stakeholder engagement, reporting, and communications – is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management. The project can be presented as “good practice”.
5	Satisfactory (S)	Implementation of most of the seven components is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management except for only few that are subject to remedial action.
4	Moderately Satisfactory (MS)	Implementation of some of the seven components is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management, with some components requiring remedial action.
3	Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)	Implementation of some of the seven components is not leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive, with most components requiring remedial action.
2	Unsatisfactory (U)	Implementation of most of the seven components is not leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management.
1	Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)	Implementation of none of the seven components is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management.

Ratings for Sustainability: (one overall rating)		
4	Likely (L)	Negligible risks to sustainability, with key outcomes on track to be achieved by the project’s closure and expected to continue into the foreseeable future
3	Moderately Likely (ML)	Moderate risks, but expectations that at least some outcomes will be sustained due to the progress towards results on outcomes at the Midterm Review

2	Moderately Unlikely (MU)	Significant risk that key outcomes will not carry on after project closure, although some outputs and activities should carry on
1	Unlikely (U)	Severe risks that project outcomes as well as key outputs will not be sustained

ToR ANNEX F: MTR Report Clearance Form

(to be completed by the Commissioning Unit and UNDP-GEF RTA and included in the final document)

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