UNDP-GEF Midterm Review Terms of Reference
Sixth Operational Phase of the GEF Small Grants Programme in Egypt

1. INTRODUCTION

This is the Terms of Reference (ToR) for the UNDP-GEF Midterm Review (MTR) of the **full-sized** **project titled *Sixth Operational Phase of the GEF SGP in Egypt*** (PIMS 5471) implemented through UNOPS, which is to be undertaken in *2018*. The project started on the *24th of April 2017* and is in its *second* 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 project is designed to enable community organizations in Egypt to take collective action for adaptive landscape management for socio-ecological resilience, through design, implementation and evaluation of grant projects for global environmental benefits and sustainable development. The SGP Programme intends to invest in strategic projects to catalyze and connect local projects to each other and to other large-scale initiatives to bring about sustainable impacts over a broader area over the long run. While the SGP cannot bring about landscape changes by itself, it is geared to advance tactical projects in given geographic areas, which will synergize with various levels of local action to bring about measurable progress in landscape resilience. The project will be implemented in strategic landscapes in the Delta, Fayoum and Upper Egypt governorates. Low-emission technologies will also be demonstrated and/or tested and implemented in the urban centres of Greater Cairo and Fayoum City.

Local organizations and communities will be the main vehicles of this project as they will be the agents who identify needs, design approaches for collective action, implement interventions and reap the sustainable development benefits. The key feature of the SGP will be for community- based organizations to pilot, test, innovate and analyze new initiatives through a process of learning-by doing. Successful initiatives will be replicated and up-scaled in other locations within the governorate and landscapes. However, concentrating the majority of the interventions in defined geographic areas (landscapes) will allow results to accrue and produce a critical mass of experience and lessons. By employing a landscape approach, the SGP will enable local actors to better understand the complex relationship they have with a given environment and how best to effect sustainable impacts on the landscape through their individual and combined efforts.

Beyond the activities piloted in the landscape area, there will be contributions to the national level as well. Lessons learned in the landscapes will be cross-referenced, and shared, and best practices and lessons learned will be used to inform the policy context at the national level.

The 4-year project (expected operational closure April 24th, 2021) is implemented by UNDP and executed by UNOPS, under the existing mechanism of the GEF Small Grants Programme including the approval of each initiative by the National Steering Committee CDN, as well as the due monitoring which will be provided, under the leadership of the National Program Coordinator. The overall total project cost is $ 2,843,241.00 (grant amount without fee), with an expected co-financing of $ 4,073,461.

3. OBJECTIVES OF THE MTR

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

4. MTR APPROACH & METHODOLOGY

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

The MTR team is expected to follow a collaborative and participatory approach[1] ensuring close engagement with the Project Team, government counterparts (the GEF Operational Focal Point), the UNDP Country Office(s), UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Advisers, and other key stakeholders.

Engagement of stakeholders is vital to a successful MTR.[2] Stakeholder involvement should include interviews with stakeholders who have project responsibilities, including but not limited to; 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 mission to (Egypt), including the following project sites based on the agreed schedule (Wadi Degla Protected area in Greater Cairo and Fayoum Landscape).

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.

---

[1] For ideas on innovative and participatory Monitoring and Evaluation strategies and techniques, see UNDP Discussion Paper: Innovations in Monitoring & Evaluating Results, 05 Nov 2013.
[2] For more stakeholder engagement in the M&E process, see the UNDP Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results, Chapter 3, pg. 93.

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).

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

Description					
Objective **To enable community organizations in Egypt to take collective action for adaptive landscape management for socio-ecological resilience through design, implementation and evaluation of grant projects for global environmental benefits and sustainable development.**					
Description of Indicator	**Baseline Level**	**Midterm target level**	**End of project target level**	**Level at 30 June 2017**	**Cumulative progress since project start**
A. Area under resilient landscape management whose biodiversity, agro-ecology, and sustainable livelihoods are protected.	5,000 ha sustainably managed in the three targeted rural landscapes.	*(not set or not applicable)*	45,000 ha with sustainable management activities under implementation in the three target rural landscapes that promote long-term biodiversity conservation/agro-ecology and alternative sustainable livelihoods.	*(not set or not applicable)*	Sustainable Management activities are planned in the 3 targeted rural landscapes; Fayoum,Upper Egypt (Minia, Qena and Luxor Governorates), Delta Landscape (Skarkia, Dakahlia and Kafr El Skeikh governorates), covering an expected area of 45,000 ha by the end of the project. On-the-ground activities are yet to be implemented which will contribute to the expected target. A first landscape baseline assessment workshop for the development of the landscape strategy, took place in Fayoum on 28 June 2018. Over 70 participants attended this consultation, representing local authorities concerned with agriculture, water resources and irrigation, tourism, youth, social solidarity, health, National Council for Women, media representatives, NGOs, university of Fayoum, GEF FSPs implemented in Fayoum, the Egyptian Environmental Affairs Agency (Regional Branch Office), Nature Conservation Sector, etc. Participants highlighted urgent challenges related to agriculture and land degradation, also the importance of having modern irrigation systems to conserve water and reduce pollution of water canals. Those challenges, among others, are being included into the landscape strategy. The second landscape baseline assessment workshop for Upper Egypt landscape was organized in Luxor on 11 July 2018. Multi-stakeholders Representatives of Minia and Qena governorates attended this workshop to develop a landscape strategy based on community needs and challenges, in coordination with local and national plans. Over 100 participants discussed challenges and potential opportunities for future partnerships as well as community-based initiatives needed to achieve sustainable livelihoods. They highlighted the importance of promoting biogas units, especially as no biogas units were installed in Luxor and Qena governorates in previous phases and based on

					experiences from the Minia governorate. Also, lining of irrigation canals and using modern methods to conserve water and energy were highlighted as essential. Initiatives that take into consideration gender and women & youth empowerment through providing sustainable jobs should be a priority. The third landscape baseline assessment workshop targeting rural landscape for the Delta governorates was held in Dakahlia on 26 July 2018. Over 80 participants representing multi-stakeholders from Dakahlia, Skarkia and Kafr El Sheikh governorates were present in the workshop. During the intensive discussions, participants highlighted the significant challenge facing Lake Burullus and the need for community-based initiatives to reduce the pollution of the lake due to lack of sanitation services as well as projects to improve the livelihoods of fishermen. Recycling of agricultural wastes was also recognized as an urgent need to reduce air pollution due to burning of waste. The landscape strategies, currently under development, are expected to be finalized by September 2018.
B. Number of communities whose resilience is strengthened by experimenting, innovating and learning through landscape planning and management processes in the five rural/urban landscapes.	Four communities participating in community based rural and urban landscape planning and management processes experimenting and innovating with technologies and alternative sustainable practices.	*(not set or not applicable)*	At least 20 communities participating in community-based landscape / seascape planning and management experimenting and innovating with technologies and alternative sustainable practices.	*(not set or not applicable)*	Activities are yet to be implemented on the ground. The targeted 4 landscapes include 10 governorates. At least 2 local communities will be involved in each governorate. During the preparation phase for the landscape baseline consultation workshops, the SGP Team in coordination with relevant stakeholders; governorates, local authorities, other GEF FSP projects, NGOs, community leaders, etc. identified participating and targeted communities. In the first landscape consultation workshop implemented in Fayoum, over 70 representatives from 4 different communities have participated and contributed to identifying needed sustainable practices for future implementation through community-based projects implemented by NGOs. In the second landscape workshop, for Upper Egypt landscape over 100 participants representing 9 different communities were present. In the third landscape workshop for Delta landscape, over 80 participants attended from 8 communities. In the fourth landscape workshop for Greater Cairo landscape, over 70 participants were representing 6 communities.

C. Increased use of renewable energy or energy efficiency technologies at community level implemented in the target landscape by type and technology.	Five communities using renewable energy or energy efficiency technologies in the target landscapes, by type of technology.	*(not set or not applicable)*	At least 20 communities using renewable energy or energy efficiency technologies in the target landscapes, by type of technology.	*(not set or not applicable)*	The first call for proposals is planned to be launched in September 2018 just after finalizing and approving the Landscapes Strategies for the 4 landscapes, expected to be approved by the SGP National Steering Committee (NSC) during the first half of September.
D. Increased number of communities, within the target landscapes participating in capacity development activities, to improve the technical, social and financial sustainability of their organizations.	20 CSO representatives participating in trainings to improve the financial and administrative sustainability their community organizations.	*(not set or not applicable)*	250 producers trained in agro-ecological practices and systems 100 livestock producers trained in pastoral systems At least 70 CSO representatives participating in trainings to improve the financial and administrative sustainability of their community organizations; eight workshops for knowledge sharing, exchange of experiences and fora in which project participants have participated.	*(not set or not applicable)*	Trainings to improve the technical, social and financial sustainability of CSOs are planned by the Project Management Team to be conducted starting October 2018 for the first set of CSOs applying for the SGP grants. At least 40 CSOs representatives are expected to participate in the first training for the first approved set of initiatives. Community based initiatives will include also trainings and capacity building activities targeting different segments of community members (farmers, producers, women, youth, etc..) to develop their capacities towards sustainable practices in their communities.
E. Number of case studies and publications documenting lessons learned from SGP-supported projects.	Zero case studies/publication prepared and disseminated in previous Operational Phases highlighting experiences following a community-based rural urban landscape management approach.	*(not set or not applicable)*	At least one case study per targeted rural/urban landscape synthetizing best practices and lessons learned.	*(not set or not applicable)*	During the landscape baseline assessments workshops, case studies were discussed with the multi-stakeholders in order to document the rural and urban landscape approach, which will be followed during this operational phase for the first time.
The progress of the objective can be described as:	**On track**				

Outcome 1 Component 1: Resilient rural landscapes for sustainable development and global environmental protection Outcome 1: Multi-stakeholder partnerships, networks, and landscape policy platforms in Fayoum depression, Upper Nile, Delta and Cairo landscapes, develop and execute adaptive management plans, and support policy development to enhance landscape and community resilience and global environmental benefits.					
Description of Indicator	**Baseline Level**	**Midterm target level**	**End of project target level**	**Level at 30 June 2017**	**Cumulative progress since project start**
1.1.1 Number of multistakeholder governance platforms/partnerships established and strengthened to support participatory landscape / planning and adaptive management in the three rural landscapes.	0 multi-stakeholder governance platforms established in the three rural landscapes.	*(not set or not applicable)*	At least four multi-stakeholder landscape / governance platforms in place and functioning.	*(not set or not applicable)*	Four landscape-wide baseline assessment workshops have been organized in Fayoum landscape, in Luxor for the Upper Egypt landscape, in Cairo for the Greater Cairo landscape and finally in Dakahlia for the Delta landscape. During the workshops, participants confirmed the importance of the Multi-Stakeholders Policy Platforms, which are planned to be launched for each landscape before the end of 2018 to follow up and monitor the progress of the implementation of landscape strategies. In these workshops, the project team has encouraged the participation of multi-stakeholder's representatives, including local authorities concerned with agriculture, water resources and irrigation, tourism, youth, social solidarity, health, National Council for Women, media representatives, NGOs, university of Fayoum, GEF FSPs implemented in Fayoum, the Egyptian Environmental Affairs Agency (Regional Branch Office), Nature Conservation Sector, etc. During the discussions, challenges and needs of the local communities in the 4 landscapes have been highlighted and fully discussed. Also, participants discussed potential projects and initiatives that can be implemented by NGOs to overcome those challenges within the local priorities and plans to enhance landscape resilience. In addition, potential coordination and partnerships with the private sector, national agencies, local authorities, GEF FSPs were discussed.
1.1.2 number of participatory landscape strategies and management plans for the three targeted rural landscapes.	0 strategies to enhance social and ecological resilience of the in the three rural landscapes.	*(not set or not applicable)*	Five landscape strategies (three rural and two urban) and plans delineating landscape outcomes and typology of community-based activities linked to those outcomes.	*(not set or not applicable)*	The National Landscape Baseline Assessment Consultant tasked to prepare 4 participatory landscape strategies, and to synthetize lessons learned from the consultation process and baseline assessments has started his assignment on 27 June 2018. Four strategies are targeted (instead of five) as the landscape strategy for Fayoum will cover both rural and urban areas.

					As per the National Consultant's field work plan, participatory landscape baseline assessment multi-stakeholder's workshops have been conducted as follows: - 28 June 2018: first landscape workshop in Fayoum for the Fayoum Landscape. - 11 July 2018: second landscape workshop in Luxor governorate in which stakeholders from the Upper Egypt landscape were present (Luxor, Minia, and Qena governorates) - 25 July 2018: third landscape workshop in Cairo in which stakeholders from the Greater Cairo landscape were present (Cairo, Giza, and Qalyoubia governorates) - 26 July 2018, fourth landscape workshop in Dakahlia in which stakeholders from the Delta landscape were present (Dakahlia, Sharkia, and Kafr El Sheikh governorates) The National Consultant is expected to deliver the draft landscape strategies and the lessons learned document by the end of August 2018 for the technical revision of the UNDP GEF Global Coordinator for the SGP Upgraded Country Programmes, and the final review and approval by the NSC in order to launch the first call for proposals in September 2018.
1.1.3. number of relevant project and portfolio experiences systematized and codified (case studies) for dissemination to policy platform participants as well as community organizations and networks and second level organizations.	0 experiences systematized and codified for dissemination to policy makers, community organizations and others.	*(not set or not applicable)*	At least 10 project and portfolio experiences (2 case studies) systematized, codified and disseminated to policy platform participants and community organizations and networks.	*(not set or not applicable)*	Lessons learned from the consultation process are currently being gathered and drafted by the National Landscape Baseline Assessment Consultant in collaboration with the CPM (Country Programme Manager) and the Project Team. Case studies will be prepared by the NGOs on their implemented projects to be widely disseminated among the SGP network and partners to maximize the benefits.
The progress of the objective can be described as:	**On track**				

Outcome 2					
Community-based multifocal projects selected, developed and implemented to bring biodiversity protection, agro-ecological practices, alternative livelihoods, and adoption of successful SGP-supported technologies, strategies, practices/systems to a tipping point in each landscape.					
Description of Indicator	**Baseline Level**	**Midterm target level**	**End of project target level**	**Level at 30 June 2017**	**Cumulative progress since project start**
2.1 Typology of community level projects developed and agreed by multi-stakeholder groups (together with eligibility criteria) as outputs to achieve landscape level outcomes.	No agreed typology of potential priority projects in existence at this time.	*(not set or not applicable)*	Prioritized list of projects aligned with landscape outcomes in each landscape.	*(not set or not applicable)*	Through the landscape baseline assessment workshops, in which challenges, gaps, local and national plans, potential partnerships were fully discussed by all relevant local stakeholders, a prioritized list of projects - aligned with the targeted outcomes in each landscape – has been identified and included in each landscape strategy. In the first landscape baseline assessment workshop in Fayoum, 2 main priorities were identified: agro-ecological practices and biodiversity protection through awareness raising and capacity building programs, which include reducing water pollution on Lake Qaroun, sustainable solid waste management systems, improved irrigation systems, and using renewable energies (solar energy and biogas units), etc. Special activities to promote long-term biodiversity conservation are planned to be implemented in Fayoum protected areas in full coordination with the GEF FSPs implemented by the Ministry of Environment in Fayoum.
2.2 Number of community-based projects implemented by CBOs and NGOs in partnership with others in the target landscapes.	195 projects implemented in the target landscapes to date.	*(not set or not applicable)*	At least 30 community based projects implemented by CBOs and NGOs in the targeted rural landscapes.	*(not set or not applicable)*	The first call for proposals is planned to be launched in September 2018 just after finalizing and approving the Landscape Baseline Assessments for the 4 landscapes by the NSC. At least 15 community-based projects implemented by CBOs and NGOs are expected to be approved by the NSC in the targeted rural landscapes in this first call for proposals. Then, the second call for proposals is expected to be launched during the first quarter of 2019 to reach the expected target.
2.3 Increased area under management for biodiversity conservation and sustainable use.	3,000 hectares under management in the four landscape/seascapes as community conservation areas.	*(not set or not applicable)*	11,000 hectares under management across the three rural landscape/seascapes as community conservation areas.	*(not set or not applicable)*	Areas and hectares to be sustainably managed for biodiversity conservation have been identified during the landscape baseline assessments by relevant multi-stakeholder groups in the 3 rural landscapes based on community needs, local and national priorities, potential partnerships to be established, and coordination with local authorities and active partners.
2.4 Increased area under reforestation or farmer managed natural regeneration.	4,000 hectares under reforestation or farmer managed natural regeneration.	*(not set or not applicable)*	11,000 hectares under reforestation or farmer managed natural regeneration across the	*(not set or not applicable)*	Hectares and lands to be sustainably managed by farmers in the 3 rural landscapes have been identified during the landscape baseline assessments by relevant multi-stakeholder

			three landscapes.		groups based on community needs, local and national priorities, potential partnerships to be established, and coordination with local authorities and active partners.
2.5 Increased area under improved grazing regimes.	3,000 hectares under improved grazing regimes and livestock management 30 livestock producers implementing improved grazing regimes and livestock management systems	*(not set or not applicable)*	10,000 hectares under improved grazing regimes and livestock management across the three landscapes At least 100 livestock producers implementing improved grazing regimes and livestock management systems	*(not set or not applicable)*	This outcome has been discussed during the landscape baseline assessment workshops with the multi-stakeholder groups. CSOs in rural landscapes will build on the lessons learned from the previous phase and will exchange experience in this regard. Community-based initiatives will be implemented aiming to improve grazing regimes and livestock management systems.
2.6 Increased area of agricultural land under agro-ecological practices and systems that increase sustainability and productivity and/or conserve crop genetic resources.	500 hectares of agricultural land under agro-ecological practices and systems that increase sustainability and productivity and/or conserve crop genetic resources.	*(not set or not applicable)*	13,000 hectares of agricultural land under agro-ecological practices and systems that increase sustainability and productivity and/or conserve crop genetic resources.	*(not set or not applicable)*	Increased area of agricultural land under agro-ecological practices and systems to increase sustainability and productivity and/or conserve crop genetic resources have been fully discussed and planned in the 3 rural landscapes as they are considered urgent needs for local communities and farmers' communities. During the landscape baseline assessment workshop in Fayoum, stakeholders highlighted the need to follow innovative practices, improve irrigation systems and reconsider agricultural practices in order to increase agricultural land productivity.
2.7 Number of second level organizations established in the landscape/seascapes and seascapes grouping individual community producer organizations in sustainable production of agroforestry, fisheries and waste management.	No multi-stakeholder groups with a focus on landscape / seascape resilience engaged in analysis and planning of strategic approaches to upscaling successful experiences in agroforestry, forestry and waste management	*(not set or not applicable)*	Three landscape-level multi-stakeholder groups involved in analysis of experience, lessons learned and development of strategies for sustainable production of agroforestry, fisheries and waste management. At least 20 second-level organizations established or strengthened.	*(not set or not applicable)*	The formation of multi-stakeholder groups / platforms was discussed during the 4 consultation workshops organized in June and July 2018. The idea was welcomed by all the participants. By the end of 2018, 3-4 multi stakeholder groups will be formed to be involved not only in analysis of experience, lessons learned and the development of strategies towards sustainable livelihoods, but in the follow up and monitoring of the implementation of the landscapes strategies.
2.8 Number of strategic projects that support these economic activities	No strategy currently exists to enable and facilitate upscaling by community organizations of these economic activities based on the detailed analysis of successful SGP supported community experiences and identification of upscaling requirements and opportunities.	*(not set or not applicable)*	Three strategic projects to enable and facilitate upscaling of successful SGP-supported initiatives.	*(not set or not applicable)*	Strategic projects were proposed and discussed by the participants during the 4 landscape baseline assessments workshops. One project to support the CBD COP14, another one to contribute to the depollution of lake Qaroun in Fayoum landscape and act as a demonstration project to be upscaled to solve the significant challenges facing lake Qaroun and its surrounding communities. Another strategic project was discussed to build on the lessons learned from previous phases in Upper Egypt landscape related to irrigation water and using innovative mechanisms to

					improve the irrigation system in rural areas to conserve water, energy and land. During the Internal Session and the External Session of the Inception Workshop, NSC members agreed on supporting the CBD COP 14, which will be organized in Sharm El Skeikh, Egypt, 17-29 November, 2018, by funding a strategic project to be implemented in full coordination with the National Team in the Ministry of Environment. This project's main goal is to mainstream biodiversity in national and local plans and policies related to sustainable development, and raise the awareness of community members on the national level, especially youth, on the concepts of biodiversity which will reflect on the sustainable management of protected areas and biodiversity conservation. This project will build on the successes and experiences gained by grantees in previous phases. This project is also expected to support the visibility and contribution of SGP in such an event, which is for the first time organized in Africa and the Arab Region. This strategic project will continue to follow up on the Cop 14 decisions and will enable participating CSOs to contribute to the sustainable management of PAs in full coordination with the Nature Conservation Sector, Ministry of Environment. The project is expected to be approved by the NSC members in September 2018 to start implementation immediately before the conference commencing on the 17th of November.
2.9 Increased alternative livelihoods and innovative products developed through support of services for ecotourism, green value chains, agroforestry, sustainable fisheries, waste management projects, and access to markets.	4 existing enterprises and staff in ecotourism 0 Types of green value chain products produced in landscape 2 waste management enterprises 50 people employed in sustainable agroforestry 50 people employed in sustainable fisheries	*(not set or not applicable)*	At least 10 new ecotourism enterprises At least 10 new green value chain enterprises At least 5 new waste management enterprises covering 15,000 hectares per landscape At least 1,000 people switching to sustainable agroforestry production At least 700 people switching to sustainable fisheries production	*(not set or not applicable)*	During the Inception workshop and the 4 landscape baseline consultation workshops organized in Fayoum, Upper Egypt, Delta and Greater Cairo multi stakeholders welcomed and suggested initiatives to be implemented by NGOs to increase alternative livelihoods and innovative products developed through 1) support of services for ecotourism, especially in relation to protected areas of Fayoum, and 2) waste management projects, either through waste recycling or producing organic compost, especially in Delta landscape, in addition to 3) crops cultivated on rooftop gardens, and the importance of access to markets, especially in Greater Cairo Landscape, 4) with regards to Lake Brullus, Kafr El Sheikh governorate, Delta landscape, special community-based initiatives will target fishermen aiming to achieve sustainable fisheries production.
The progress of the objective can be described as:	**On track**				

UNDP-GEF MTR ToR Standard Template 1 for UNDP Procurement Website   11

Outcome 3					
Component 2. Promote community-based integrated low-emission urban systems					
Outcome 3: Multi-stakeholder partnerships, networks and policy platforms develop and execute adaptive management plans, and support policy development for low-emission urban development					
Description of Indicator	**Baseline Level**	**Midterm target level**	**End of project target level**	**Level at 30 June 2017**	**Cumulative progress since project start**
3.1 Number and type of multi-stakeholder partnerships/community networks for managing the development and implementation of community-based urban integrated low-emission systems.	0 partnerships	*(not set or not applicable)*	At least 10 partnerships	*(not set or not applicable)*	It is expected that this target will be achieved as the project is moving towards on the ground implementation, as establishing strong partnerships has been a clear target since the first day of project implementation. The Project Team has encouraged significant partners to participate in the external session of the inception workshop as well as in the landscape baseline assessment consultation workshops. Partners varied from the GEF Full-Size projects implemented by ministries, local authorities who are implementing in line projects, national agencies such as the Desert Research Center and the National Council for Women, which provides necessary technical assistance to SGP initiatives.
3.2 Number of participatory strategies and management plans for the two urban landscapes	0 participatory strategies and management plans for two urban landscapes	*(not set or not applicable)*	At least two participatory strategies and two management plans for low-emission urban development in Greater Cairo and Fayoum City	*(not set or not applicable)*	The National Landscape Baseline Assessment Consultant recruited by the project has started his assignment on 27 June 2018 to prepare four participatory landscape strategies including two participatory strategies for low-emission urban development. During the landscape baseline workshop held in Fayoum, stakeholders highlighted the need to follow innovative practices, improve irrigation systems and reconsider agricultural practices in order to increase agricultural land productivity. During the landscape baseline consultation workshop for Greater Cairo landscape, participants discussed challenges and opportunities for low-emission initiatives to be implemented in urban areas building on the lessons learned from previous phases focusing on sustainable transport projects, promoting solar energy, rooftop gardens, etc.
3.3. Number of relevant project and portfolio experiences systematized and codified (case studies) for dissemination to policy platform participants as well as community organizations and networks and second level organizations	0 case studies	*(not set or not applicable)*	At least 2 case studies – one per landscape type (rural and urban) at a minimum.	*(not set or not applicable)*	Lessons learned from the consultation process are currently being gathered and drafted by the National Landscape Baseline Assessment Consultant in collaboration with the CPM and the Project Team. Case studies will be prepared by the NGOs on their implemented projects to be widely disseminated among SGP network and partners to maximize the benefits. It is planned to conduct at least 4 case studies, one on each landscape.

The progress of the objective can be described as:	On track				
Outcome 4 **Outcome 4: Selection, development and implementation of community-based projects promoting low-emission urban systems and SGP-technologies, supported by stakeholders (private, public, institutions, CSOs).**					
Description of Indicator	**Baseline Level**	**Midterm target level**	**End of project target level**	**Level at 30 June 2017**	**Cumulative progress since project start**
4.1 Typology of urban neighborhood projects developed and agreed by multi-stakeholder groups (together with eligibility criteria) as outputs to achieve urban landscape level outcomes.	2 urban neighborhoods using renewable energy technologies in the target landscapes, by type of technology.	*(not set or not applicable)*	Prioritized list of projects aligned with neighborhood outcomes in each urban landscape.	*(not set or not applicable)*	A prioritized list of projects is currently being included in each landscape strategy (under development). The list of projects is aligned with the targeted outcomes in each landscape, and it is based on findings from the landscape-wide baseline assessment workshops where challenges, gaps, local and national plans, potential partnerships were fully discussed by the relevant multi-stakeholders. In Fayoum landscape, SGP projects will target urban and rural areas. During the first consultation workshop, participants prioritized rooftop gardens, sustainable transport (neighborhood bicycling systems; local fleet (taxi) fuel switching to natural gas), solid waste management and solar energy & energy efficiency, while in rural areas they highlighted improving the irrigation systems, lining of irrigation canals, increasing agricultural land productivity, biogas energy and recycling of agricultural wastes to produce organic compost.
4.2 Number of community-based projects implemented by CBOs and NGOs in partnership with others in the target urban landscapes/neighborhoods.	n/a	*(not set or not applicable)*	Prioritized list of projects aligned with neighborhood outcomes in each urban landscape.	*(not set or not applicable)*	The first call for proposals is planned to be launched in September 2018 just after finalizing and approving the Landscapes Baseline Assessments for the 4 landscapes by the NSC. 8-10 community- based projects to be implemented by CBOs and NGOs are expected to be approved by the NSC members in the targeted urban landscapes (Fayoum & Greater Cairo) in the first round.
4.3 Increased use of renewable energy and energy efficiency technologies at neighborhood level implemented in the target urban landscape by type and technology.	*(not set or not applicable)*	*(not set or not applicable)*	Prioritized list of projects aligned with neighborhood outcomes in each urban landscape At least 14 pilot experiences with renewable energy or energy efficiency technologies systematized, codified and disseminated to policy platforms and community organizations and networks.	*(not set or not applicable)*	The first call for proposals is planned to be launched in September 2018 just after finalizing and approving the Landscapes Baseline Assessments for the 4 landscapes by NSC. 5-7 community-based projects implemented by CBOs and NGOs are expected to be approved by the NSC members in the targeted urban landscapes in the first round to increase the use of renewable energy and energy efficiency technologies at neighborhood level.
4.4 Number of strategic	*(not set or not applicable)*	*(not set or not	Two strategic projects to	*(not set or not	During the Inception workshop (internal and

projects (up to USD 150,000) to implement strategies enabling and facilitating upscaling of application of renewable energy or energy efficiency technologies		*applicable)*	enable and facilitate upscaling of successful application of renewable energy or energy efficiency technologies	*applicable)*	external sessions), stakeholders and NSC members were in favor of funding one strategic project in each landscape. Two strategic projects are targeted to be funded aiming to implement strategies enabling and facilitating upscaling of application of renewable energy (either solar or biogas technology) or promote and raise the awareness of local communities on energy efficiency technologies, building on the lessons learned from previous SGP phases, and in line with national and local priorities.			
The progress of the objective can be described as:	**On track**							

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

Indicator Assessment Key

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

In addition to the progress towards outcomes analysis:

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

iii. Project Implementation and Adaptive Management

Management Arrangements:
- Review overall effectiveness of project management as outlined in the Project Document. Have changes been made and are they effective? Are responsibilities and reporting lines clear? Is decision-making transparent and undertaken in a timely manner? Recommend areas for improvement.
- Review the quality of execution of the Executing Agency/Implementing Partner(s) and recommend areas for improvement.
- Review the quality of support provided by the GEF Partner Agency (UNDP) and recommend areas for improvement.

---

[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

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 to be documented by the Project Team on a continual basis and shared/ transferred to appropriate parties who could learn from the project and potentially replicate and/or scale it in the future?

Institutional Framework and Governance risks to sustainability:
- Do the legal frameworks, policies, governance structures and processes pose risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project benefits? While assessing this parameter, also consider if the required systems/ mechanisms for accountability, transparency, and technical knowledge transfer are in place.

Environmental risks to sustainability:
- Are there any environmental risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project outcomes?

Conclusions & Recommendations

The MTR team will include a section of the report setting out the MTR's evidence-based conclusions, in light of the findings.[8]

Recommendations should be succinct suggestions for critical intervention that are specific, measurable, achievable, and relevant. A recommendation table should be put in the report's executive summary. See

---

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

the *Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects* for guidance on a recommendation table.

The MTR team should make no more than 15 recommendations total.

Ratings

The MTR team will include its ratings of the project's results and brief descriptions of the associated achievements in a *MTR Ratings & Achievement Summary Table* in the Executive Summary of the MTR report. See Annex E for ratings scales. No rating on Project Strategy and no overall project rating is required.

Table. MTR Ratings & Achievement Summary Table for Sixth Operational Phase of the GEF Small Grants Programme in Egypt

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 *24* working days over a time period of *8* weeks and shall not exceed five months from when the consultant(s) is hired. The tentative MTR timeframe is as follows:

ACTIVITY	NUMBER OF WORKING DAYS	COMPLETION DATE
Document review and preparing MTR Inception Report (MTR Inception Report due no later than 2 weeks before the MTR mission)	*3 days (recommended: 2-4 days)*	*January 26, 2019*
MTR mission: stakeholder meetings, interviews, field visits	*8 days (recommended: 7-15 days)*	*February 5, 2019*
Presentation of initial findings- last day of the MTR mission	*1 day*	*February 6, 2019*
Preparing draft report (due within 3 weeks of the MTR mission)	*8 days (recommended: 5-10 days)*	*February 26, 2019*
Finalization of MTR report/ Incorporating audit trail from feedback on draft report (due within 1 week of receiving	*5 days (recommended: 3-4 days)*	*March 10, 2019*

UNDP comments on the draft) *(note: accommodate time delay in dates for circulation and review of the draft report)*			

Options for site visits should be provided in the Inception Report.

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	MTR team submits to the Commissioning Unit and project management
2	**Presentation**	Initial Findings	End of MTR mission	MTR Team presents to project management and the Commissioning Unit
3	**Draft Final Report**	Full report (using guidelines on content outlined in Annex B) with annexes	Within 3 weeks of the MTR mission	Sent to the Commissioning Unit, reviewed by RTA, Project Coordinating Unit, GEF OFP
4	**Final Report***	Revised report with audit trail detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final MTR report	Within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft	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 UNOPS.

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

9. TEAM COMPOSITION

A team of one independent consultants will conduct the MTR - with experience and exposure to projects and evaluations in other regions globally) and from the country of the project. The consultants cannot have participated in the project preparation, formulation, and/or implementation (including the writing of the Project Document) and should not have a conflict of interest with project's related activities.

The selection of consultants will be aimed at maximizing the overall "team" qualities in the following areas: *(give a weight to all these qualifications so applicants know what the max amount of points is they can earn for the technical evaluation)*

- Recent experience with result-based management evaluation methodologies;
- Experience applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios;

- Competence in adaptive management, as applied to Biodiversity Conservation, Climate Change and Land Degradation;
- Experience working with the GEF or GEF-evaluations; especially with SGP - Small Grants Programme;
- Experience working in the Latin America and the Caribbean region;
- Work experience in relevant technical areas for at least 10 years;
- Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender and Biodiversity Conservation, Climate Change and Land Degradation; experience in gender sensitive evaluation and analysis.
- Excellent communication skills;
- Demonstrable analytical skills;
- Project evaluation/review experiences within United Nations system will be considered an asset;
- A Master's degree in areas of environment and sustainable development, or other closely related field.

10. PAYMENT MODALITIES AND SPECIFICATIONS

10% of payment upon approval of the final MTR Inception Report
30% upon submission of the draft MTR report
60% upon finalization of the MTR report

Or, as otherwise agreed between the Commissioning Unit and the MTR team.

11. APPLICATION PROCESS[9]

Recommended Presentation of Proposal:

a) **Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability** using the template[10] provided by UNDP;
b) **CV** and a **Personal History Form** (P11 form[11]);
c) **Brief description of approach to work/technical proposal** of why the individual considers him/herself as the most suitable for the assignment, and a proposed methodology on how they will approach and complete the assignment; (max 1 page)
d) **Financial Proposal** that indicates the all-inclusive fixed total contract price and all other travel related costs (such as flight ticket, per diem, etc), supported by a breakdown of costs, as per template attached to the Letter of Confirmation of Interest template. If an applicant is employed by an organization/company/institution, and he/she expects his/her employer to charge a management fee in the process of releasing him/her to UNDP under Reimbursable Loan Agreement (RLA), the 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 following email address:
procurementnotice.egypt@undp.org
And (Heba.helmy@undp.org)

Subject must indicate the following reference

---

[9] Engagement of the consultants should be done in line with guidelines for hiring consultants in the POPP: https://info.undp.org/global/popp/Pages/default.aspx

[10] https://intranet.undp.org/unit/bom/pso/Support%20documents%20on%20IC%20Guidelines/Template%20for%20Confirmation%20of%20Interest%20and%20Submission%20of%20Financial%20Proposal.docx

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

"Consultant for Sixth Operational Phase of the GEF Small Grants Programme in Egypt Midterm Review "

Application deadline: __29 November 2018__*. Incomplete applications will be excluded from further consideration.*

Criteria for Evaluation of Proposal: Only those applications which are responsive and compliant will be evaluated. Offers will be evaluated according to the Combined Scoring method – where the educational background and experience on similar assignments will be weighted at 70% and the price proposal will weigh as 30% of the total scoring. The applicant receiving the Highest Combined Score that has also accepted UNDP's General Terms and Conditions will be awarded the contract.

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

1. 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 (*fill in specific TTs for this project's focal area*)
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 Title*) Board Meetings and other meetings (i.e. Project Appraisal Committee meetings)
16. Project site location maps

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

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

ii. Table of Contents

iii. Acronyms and Abbreviations

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

---

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

4. Findings *(12-14 pages)*
    4.1 Project Strategy
- Project Design
- Results Framework/Logframe

4.2 Progress Towards Results
- Progress towards outcomes analysis
- Remaining barriers to achieving the project objective

4.3 Project Implementation and Adaptive Management
- Management Arrangements
- Work planning
- Finance and co-finance
- Project-level monitoring and evaluation systems
- Stakeholder engagement
- Reporting
- Communications

4.4 Sustainability
- Financial risks to sustainability
- Socio-economic to sustainability
- Institutional framework and governance risks to sustainability
- Environmental risks to sustainability

5. Conclusions and Recommendations *(4-6 pages)*

5.1 Conclusions
- Comprehensive and balanced statements (that are evidence-based and connected to the MTR's findings) which highlight the strengths, weaknesses and results of the project

5.2 Recommendations
- Corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project
- Actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the project
- Proposals for future directions underlining main objectives

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

ToR ANNEX C: Midterm Review Evaluative Matrix Template

(Questions to be filled out by the Commissioning Unit)

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

Annex VII : Evaluation Criteria Matrix

Evaluative Criteria	Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
Relevance: How does the project relate to the main objectives of the UNCBD and to the GEF Biodiversity focal area, and to the environment and development priorities at the local, regional and national levels for indigenous crop and livestock diversity conservation in Egypt?				
Is the project relevant to the UNCBD objectives?	• How does the project support the objectives of the UNCBD?	• UNCBD priorities and areas of work incorporated in project design • Extent to which the project is implemented in line with incremental cost argument	• Project documents • National policies and strategies to implement the UNCBD, other international conventions, or related to environment more generally • UNCBD and other international convention web sites	• Documents analyses • Interviews with project team, UNDP and other partners
Is the project relevant the GEF biodiversity focal area?	• How does the project support the GEF biodiversity focal area and strategic priorities related to agro-biodiversity conservation	• Existence of a clear relationship between the project objectives and GEF biodiversity focal area	• Project documents • GEF focal areas strategies and documents	• Documents analyses • GEF website • Interviews with UNDP and project team
Is the project relevant to Egypt's environment and sustainable development objectives?	• How does the project support the environment and sustainable development objectives of Egypt? • Is the project country-driven? • What was the level of stakeholder participation in project design? • What was the level of stakeholder ownership in implementation? • Does the project adequately take into account the national realities, both in terms of institutional and policy framework in its design and its implementation?	• Degree to which the project supports national environmental objectives • Degree of coherence between the project and national's priorities, policies and strategies • Appreciation from national stakeholders with respect to adequacy of project design and implementation to national realities and existing capacities • Level of involvement of government officials and other partners in the project design process	• Project documents • National policies and strategies • Key project partners	• Documents analyses • Interviews with UNDP and project partners

		• Coherence between needs expressed by national stakeholders and UNDP-GEF criteria		
Is the project addressing the needs of target beneficiaries at the local and regional levels?	• How does the project support the needs of relevant stakeholders? • Has the implementation of the project been inclusive of all relevant stakeholders? • Were local beneficiaries and stakeholders adequately involved in project design and implementation?	• Strength of the link between expected results from the project and the needs of relevant stakeholders • Degree of involvement and inclusiveness of stakeholders in project design and implementation	• Project partners and stakeholders • Needs assessment studies • Project documents	• Document analysis • Interviews with relevant stakeholders
Is the project internally coherent in its design?	• Are there logical linkages between expected results of the project (log frame) and the project design (in terms of project components, choice of partners, structure, delivery mechanism, scope, budget, use of resources etc)? • Is the length of the project sufficient to achieve project outcomes?	• Level of coherence between project expected results and project design internal logic • Level of coherence between project design and project implementation approach	• Program and project documents • Key project stakeholders	• Document analysis • Key interviews
How is the project relevant with respect to other donor-supported activities?	• Does the GEF funding support activities and objectives not addressed by other donors? • How do GEF-funds help to fill gaps (or give additional stimulus) that are necessary but are not covered by other donors? • Is there coordination and complementarily between donors?	• Degree to which program was coherent and complementary to other donor programming nationally and regionally	• Documents from other donor supported activities • Other donor representatives • Project documents	• Documents analyses • Interviews with project partners and relevant stakeholders
Does the project provide relevant lessons and experiences for other similar projects in the future?	• Has the experience of the project provided relevant lessons for other future projects targeted at similar objectives?		• Data collected throughout evaluation	• Data analysis
Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been/be achieved?				
Has the project been effective in achieving the expected outcomes and objectives?	• Has the project been effective in achieving its expected outcomes?	• See indicators in project document results framework and logframe	• Project documents • Project team and relevant stakeholders • Data reported in project annual and quarterly reports	• Documents analysis • Interviews with project team • Interviews with relevant stakeholders
How is risk and risk mitigation being managed?	• How well are risks, assumptions and impact drivers being managed? • What was the quality of risk mitigation strategies developed? Were these sufficient? • Are there clear strategies for risk mitigation related with long-term sustainability of the project?	• Completeness of risk identification and assumptions during project planning and design • Quality of existing information systems in place to identify emerging risks and other issues • Quality of risk mitigations strategies developed and followed	• Project documents • UNDP, project team, and relevant stakeholders	• Document analysis • Interviews
What lessons can be drawn	• What lessons have been learned from the project regarding achievement of		• Data collected throughout	• Data analysis

regarding effectiveness for other similar projects in the future?	• outcomes? • What changes could have been made (if any) to the design of the project in order to improve the achievement of the project's expected results?		evaluation	

Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards?

Was project support provided in an efficient way?	• Was adaptive management used or needed to ensure efficient resource use? • Did the project logical framework and work plans and any changes made to them use as management tools during implementation? • Were the accounting and financial systems in place adequate for project management and producing accurate and timely financial information? • Were progress reports produced accurately, timely and responded to reporting requirements including adaptive management changes? • Was project implementation as cost effective as originally proposed (planned vs. actual) • Did the leveraging of funds (co-financing) happen as planned? • Were financial resources utilized efficiently? Could financial resources have been used more efficiently? • Was procurement carried out in a manner making efficient use of project resources? • How was results-based management used during project implementation?	• Availability and quality of financial and progress reports • Timeliness and adequacy of reporting provided • Level of discrepancy between planned and utilized financial expenditures • Planned vs. actual funds leveraged • Cost in view of results achieved compared to costs of similar projects from other organizations • Adequacy of project choices in view of existing context, infrastructure and cost • Quality of results-based management reporting (progress reporting, monitoring and evaluation) • Occurrence of change in project design/ implementation approach (i.e. restructuring) when needed to improve project efficiency • Cost associated with delivery mechanism and management structure compare to alternatives	• Project documents and evaluations • UNDP • Project team	• Document analysis • Key interviews
How efficient are partnership arrangements for the project?	• To what extent partnerships/linkages between institutions/ organizations were encouraged and supported? • Which partnerships/linkages were facilitated? • What was the level of efficiency of cooperation and collaboration arrangements? • Which methods were successful or not and why?	• Specific activities conducted to support the development of cooperative arrangements between partners, • Examples of supported partnerships • Evidence that particular partnerships/linkages will be sustained • Types/quality of partnership cooperation methods utilized	• Project documents and evaluations • Project partners and relevant stakeholders	• Document analysis • Interviews
Did the project efficiently utilize local capacity in implementation?	• Was an appropriate balance struck between utilization of international expertise as well as local capacity? • Did the project take into account local capacity in design and implementation of the project? • Was there an effective collaboration between institutions responsible for implementing the project?	• Proportion of expertise utilized from international experts compared to national experts • Number/quality of analyses done to assess local capacity potential and absorptive capacity	• Project documents and evaluations • UNDP • Beneficiaries	• Document analysis • Interviews
What lessons can be drawn regarding efficiency for other similar projects in	• What lessons can be learnt from the project regarding efficiency? • How could the project have more efficiently carried out implementation (in terms of		• Data collected throughout evaluation	• Data analysis

the future?	management structures and procedures, partnerships arrangements etc…)? • What changes could have been made (if any) to the project in order to improve its efficiency?			
Results: What are the current actual, and potential long-term, results of activities supported by the project?				
How is the project effective in achieving its long-term objectives?	• Will the project achieve its overall objective? • Is the globally significant biodiversity of the target area likely to be conserved? • What barriers remain to achieving long-term objectives, or what necessary steps remain to be taken by stakeholders to achieve sustained impacts and Global Environmental Benefits? • Are there unanticipated results achieved or contributed to by the project?	• Change in capacity: o To pool/mobilize resources o For related policy making and strategic planning o For implementation of related laws and strategies through adequate institutional frameworks and their maintenance • Change in use and implementation of sustainable livelihoods • Change in the number and strength of barriers such as: o Knowledge about biodiversity conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity resources, and economic incentives in these areas o Cross-institutional coordination and inter-sectoral dialogue o Knowledge of biodiversity conservation and sustainable use practices by end users o Coordination of policy and legal instruments incorporating biodiversity conservation and agro-environmental strategies o Agro-environmental economic incentives for stakeholders	• Project documents • Key stakeholders • Monitoring data	• Documents analysis • Meetings with UNDP, project team and project partners • Interviews with project beneficiaries and other stakeholders
How is the project effective in achieving the objectives of the UNCBD?	• What are the impacts or likely impacts of the project? o On the local environment; o On economic well-being; o On other socio-economic issues.	• Provide specific examples of impacts at species, ecosystem or genetic levels, as relevant	• Project documents • UNCDB documents • Key Stakeholders • Monitoring data	• Data analysis • Interviews with key stakeholders
Future directions for results	• How can the project build on its successes and learn from its weaknesses in order to enhance the potential for impact of ongoing and future initiatives?		• Data collected throughout evaluation	• Data analysis
Sustainability: Are the conditions in place for project-related benefits and results to be sustained?				
Are sustainability issues adequately integrated in	• Were sustainability issues integrated into the design and implementation	• Evidence / quality of sustainability strategy	• Project documents	• Document analysis

project design?	of the project?	• Evidence / quality of steps taken to ensure sustainability	and evaluations • UNDP and project personnel and project partners • Beneficiaries	• Interviews
Financial sustainability	• Did the project adequately address financial and economic sustainability issues? • Are the recurrent costs after project completion sustainable? • What are the main institutions/organizations in country that will take the project efforts forward after project end and what is the budget they have assigned to this?	• Level and source of future financial support to be provided to relevant sectors and activities after project ends • Evidence of commitments from international partners, governments or other stakeholders to financially support relevant sectors of activities after project end • Level of recurrent costs after completion of project and funding sources for those recurrent costs	• Project documents and evaluations • UNDP and project personnel and project partners • Beneficiaries	• Document analysis • Interviews
Institutional and governance sustainability	• Were the results of efforts made during the project implementation period well assimilated by organizations and their internal systems and procedures? • Is there evidence that project partners will continue their activities beyond project support? • What degree is there of local ownership of initiatives and results? • Were laws, policies and frameworks addressed through the project, in order to address sustainability of key initiatives and reforms? • What is the level of political commitment to build on the results of the project? • Are there policies or practices in place that create perverse incentives that would negatively affect long-term benefits?	• Degree to which project activities and results have been taken over by local counterparts or institutions/organizations • Level of financial support to be provided to relevant sectors and activities by in-country actors after project end • Efforts to support the development of relevant laws and policies • State of enforcement and law making capacity • Evidences of commitment by government enactment of laws and resource allocation to priorities	• Project documents and evaluations • UNDP and project personnel and project partners • Beneficiaries	• Document analysis • Interviews
Social-economic sustainability	• Are there adequate incentives to ensure sustained benefits achieved through the project?		• Project documents and evaluations • UNDP, project personnel and project partners • Beneficiaries	• Interviews • Documentation review
Environmental sustainability	• Are there risks to the environmental benefits that were created or that are expected to occur? • Are there long-term environmental threats that have not been addressed by the project? • Have any new environmental threats emerged in the project's lifetime?	• Evidence of potential threats such as infrastructure development • Assessment of unaddressed or emerging threats	• Project documents and evaluations • Threat assessments • Government documents or other external published information • UNDP,	• Interviews • Documentation review

			• project personnel and project partners • Beneficiaries	
Individual, institutional and systemic capacity development	• Is the capacity in place at the regional, national and local levels adequate to ensure sustainability of the results achieved to date?	• Elements in place in those different management functions, at the appropriate levels (regional, national and local) in terms of adequate structures, strategies, systems, skills, incentives and interrelationships with other key actors	• Project documents • UNDP, project personnel and project partners • Beneficiaries • Capacity assessments available, if any	• Interviews • Documentation review
Replication	• Is there potential to scale up or replicate project activities? • Did the project's Exit Strategy actively promote replication?	• Number/quality of replicated initiatives • Number/quality of replicated innovative initiatives • Scale of additional investment leveraged	• Project Exit Strategy • UNDP, project personnel and project partners	• Document analysis • Interviews
Challenges to sustainability of the project	• What are the main challenges that may hinder sustainability of efforts? • Have any of these been addressed through project management? • What could be the possible measures to further contribute to the sustainability of efforts achieved with the project?	• Challenges in view of building blocks of sustainability as presented above • Recent changes which may present new challenges to the project • Education strategy and partnership with school, education institutions etc.	• Project documents and evaluations • Beneficiaries • UNDP, project personnel and project partners	• Document analysis • Interviews
Future directions for sustainability and catalytic role	• Which areas/arrangements under the project show the strongest potential for lasting long-term results? • What are the key challenges and obstacles to the sustainability of results of the project initiatives that must be directly and quickly addressed?		• Data collected throughout evaluation	• Data analysis

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

effectively, and been able to adapt to any changing conditions thus far? To what extent are project-level monitoring and evaluation systems, reporting, and project communications supporting the project's implementation?			
Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, socio-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?			

Evaluators/Consultants:

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

<div align="center">

MTR Consultant Agreement Form

</div>

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

Name of Consultant: _____

Name of Consultancy Organization (where relevant): _____

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

Signed at _____ *(Place)*   on _____ *(Date)*

Signature: _____

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: _____

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