

TERMS OF REFERENCE

UNDP-GEF MIDTERM REVIEW

Project title: Sound Chemicals Management Mainstreaming and UPOPs reduction in Kenya.

1. INTRODUCTION

This is the Terms of Reference (ToR) for the UNDP-GEF Midterm Review (MTR) of the full-sized project titled *Sound Chemicals Management Mainstreaming and UPOPs reduction in Kenya* (PIMS#5361) implemented through the Ministry of Environment and Forestry (Implementing Partner) which is to be undertaken in 2019. The project started on 21st July 2016 and is in its 3rd 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 follows the guidance outlined in the document *Guidance for Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects*.

2. PROJECT BACKGROUND INFORMATION

The project was designed to protect human health and the environment by managing the risks posed by production, use, import and export of chemicals and reducing / preventing the release of U-POPs and toxic compounds originating from the unsafe management of waste in two key sectors: Health Care Waste and Municipal Waste. These sectors are among the highest priorities identified in the reviewed and updated NIP. On the Health Care Waste Management side, the project will adopt an integrated approach aimed at increasing the proper management of waste within the hospital facilities (increasing segregation, reducing waste generation) and by replacing the dangerous disposal waste modalities currently adopted (open burning or burning in single chamber incinerators) by SC-compliant equipment. Training will be delivered both at Health Care Facility level and in classroom training events, and will be based on the WHO blue book guidance tailored to the country needs. On the municipal waste side, the project intends to reinforce the 3R (Reduce, Reuse, Recycle) economy on two specific waste streams, by enhancing their upstream collection, ensuring the quality of recovered material, and securing access to national market by promoting cooperation with domestic industries. This is for providing a valid alternative to the dumpsite economy, and preventing the release in the environment of U-POPs and toxic substance upon open burning of these waste streams. The project also includes a component related to the sound management of chemicals, by implementing activities on U-POPs monitoring, upgrading of the relevant regulation on chemicals, and establishing a PRTR database.

The project partners (Ministry of Health, National Environment Management authority, Government Chemist Department, Water Resources Authority, University of Nairobi, Kenya Association of Manufacturers, Kenya Disaster Concern and Green Belt Movement), in line with their designated roles

and responsibilities; support national efforts to mainstream sound chemical management into policies and legislation, capacity build actors in the chemicals utilisation value chain, and promote adoption of non-burn technology for the reduction in UPOPs emissions.

The **Objective** of the project is the "Reduction of the release of U-POPs and other substances of concern and the related health risks, through the implementation of environmentally sound management of municipal and healthcare wastes and of an integrated institutional and regulatory framework covering management of and reporting on POPs."

The project comprises five complementary components, which are cost-shared by the GEF and co-financing as follows: -

- Component 1.** Streamlining sound management of chemicals and waste into national and county development activities through capacity building of MENR, MOH, county governments of Nairobi, Kisumu, Nakuru and Mombasa and the NGOs.
- Component 2.** Introducing environmentally sound management of health care waste in selected healthcare facilities; policy and strategic plans to prepare them to adopt BAT and BEP disposal.
- Component 3.** Demonstration of sound healthcare waste disposal technologies in a selected number of healthcare facilities in each county.
- Component 4.** Minimizing releases of unintentionally produced POPs from open burning of waste.
- Component 5.** Monitoring, learning, adaptive feedback, outreach and evaluation.

The project implementation runs from July 2016 to July 2021 with a total budget of USD 25,523,803 of which GEF grant is USD 4,515,000 and a co-finance of USD 21,008,803.

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 quarterly reports, 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 approach¹ 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.

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

Engagement of stakeholders is vital to a successful MTR.² Stakeholder involvement should include interviews with stakeholders who have project responsibilities, including but not limited to Ministry of Health, National Environment Management Authority, University of Nairobi, Kenya Association of Manufacturers, Kenya Disaster Concern and Green Belt Movement as executing agencies, senior officials and task team/component leaders, key experts and consultants in the subject area, Project Board, project stakeholders, academia, local government, health care facilities and CSOs, etc. Additionally, the MTR team is expected to conduct field missions to the project sites in Mombasa, Nairobi, Nakuru and Kisumu.

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 on the achievement of 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)?
- 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 are included in the project design and implementation. 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.

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.

- Analyse whether broader development and gender aspects of the project are being monitored effectively. If not, recommend SMART ‘development’ indicators, including sex-disaggregated indicators and indicators that capture development benefits.

ii. Progress Towards Results

Progress Towards Outcomes Analysis:

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

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

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

Indicator Assessment Key

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

In addition to the progress towards outcomes analysis:

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

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

- 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?
- Is the sequencing of the action the most effective one to reach the intended project objectives?
- 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? If the need is identified, 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?

- Coordination: is there sufficient coordination among the different actors and stakeholders involved in the project to maximize positive project results, including whether there is sufficient awareness and capacity among the various stakeholder groups for them to benefit as intended

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 key stakeholders left out of communication? Does communication with stakeholders contribute to raise 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.
- Review the extent to which the project has contributed to increased income from sustainable use of natural resources (with respect to Outcome 3), and to assess the magnitude, distribution and sustainability of any such increased income.
- In addition, assess the following risks to sustainability:

Financial risks to sustainability:

- Are the financial and economic resources likely to be available once the GEF assistance ends adequate (consider potential resources from multiple sources, such as the public and private sectors, income generating activities, and other funding that is likely to be available 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?

Process-related risks to sustainability:

- Are lessons learned 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 shall include a section of the report setting out the MTR’s evidence-based conclusions, in light of the findings.⁸

Recommendations shall be succinct suggestions for critical intervention that are specific, measurable, achievable, and relevant. A recommendation table should be put in the report’s Executive Summary. See the *Guidance for Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects* for guidance on a recommendation table.

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

Ratings

The MTR team 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 the Project: Sound Chemicals Management Mainstreaming and UPOPs reduction in Kenya

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	

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

	Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale)	
	Outcome 3 Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale)	
	Etc.	
Project Implementation & Adaptive Management	(rate 6 pt. scale)	
Sustainability	(rate 4 pt. scale)	

6. TIMEFRAME

The total duration of the MTR will be approximately 35 days spread over a time period of 12 weeks starting 16th May 2018 and shall not exceed five months from when the consultant is hired. The tentative MTR timeframe is as follows:

TIMEFRAME	ACTIVITY
30 th May 2019	Application closes
21 st June 2019	Select MTR Consultant
21 st June 2019	Prep the MTR Team (handover of Project Documents)
24 th to 28 th June 2019 (5days)	Document review and preparing MTR Inception Report
5 th July 2019 (CO Review period)	Finalization and Validation of MTR Inception Report- latest start of MTR mission
15 th to 31 st July 2019 (17days)	MTR mission: stakeholder meetings, interviews, field visits
1 st to 2 nd August 2019 (2 days)	Mission wrap-up meeting & presentation of initial findings- earliest end of MTR mission
5 th to 16 th August 2019 (6 days)	Preparing draft report
26 th to 27 th August 2019 (2 days)	Incorporating audit trail from feedback on draft report/Finalization of MTR report
16 th September 2019 (CO review)	Preparation & Issue of Management Response
12 th September 2019	(optional) Concluding Stakeholder Workshop (not mandatory for MTR consultant)
30 th September 2019 (3days)	Expected date of full MTR completion

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

7. MIDTERM REVIEW DELIVERABLES

#	Deliverable	Description	Timing	Responsibilities
1	MTR Inception Report	MTR consultant clarifies objectives and methods of Midterm Review	No later than 1 weeks before the MTR mission: (28 th June 2019)	MTR Consultant submits to the Commissioning Unit and project management

#	Deliverable	Description	Timing	Responsibilities
2	Presentation	Initial Findings	End of MTR mission: (2 nd August 2019)	MTR Consultant 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: (20 th August 2019)	MTR Consultant submits 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: (30 th September 2019)	MTR Consultant submits to the Commissioning Unit

*The final MTR report must be in English. If applicable, the Commissioning Unit may choose to arrange for a translation of the report into a language more widely shared by national stakeholders.

8. MTR ARRANGEMENTS

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

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 Team to provide all relevant documents, set up stakeholder interviews, and arrange field visits.

9. CONSULTANT QUALIFICATIONS

An independent consultant with the regional experience and exposure to projects and evaluations of natural resource management interventions will conduct the MTR. The consultant will not 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 any project-related activities.

Qualifications and evaluation criteria

- Post graduate (PhD or master's degree) in a relevant field such as Environmental Health/ Public Health, environmental protection and management, chemical and industrial engineering, or other relevant fields and with professional specialization in issues of sound chemicals management (15 marks)
- Knowledge/work experience of sound chemicals management/UPOPs reduction (15 marks)
- Recent experience with result-based management evaluation methodologies; (5 marks)
- Experience applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios; (5 marks)
- Competence in adaptive management, as applied to Chemicals Focal Area; (10 marks)
- Experience working in Kenya/East African Region; (10 marks)
- Work experience in relevant technical areas for at least 10 years; (10 marks)

- Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender and Chemicals Focal Area; experience in gender sensitive evaluation and analysis; (5 marks)
- Excellent communication skills; excellent mastery of drafting in the English language (10 marks)
- Demonstrable analytical skills; (5 marks)
- Project evaluation/review experiences within GEF/United Nations system will be considered an asset; (10 marks)

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.

Only those candidates that meet the minimum level of education and relevant years of experience requirements will be considered for the technical evaluation. The technical evaluation will include a desk review to select the shortlisted candidates.

Only candidates obtaining a minimum of 49 points (70%) on technical evaluation will be considered for the Financial Evaluation.

Financial evaluation (maximum 30 points):

The following formula will be used to evaluate financial proposal:

$$p = y (\mu/z), \text{ where}$$

- p = points for the financial proposal being evaluated
- y = maximum number of points for the financial proposal
- μ = price of the lowest priced proposal
- z = price of the proposal being evaluated

10. PAYMENT MODALITIES AND SPECIFICATIONS

- 20% of payment upon approval of the final MTR Inception Report
- 40% upon submission of the draft MTR report
- 40% upon finalization of the MTR report

Transport for field work and DSA will be provided to the consultant while in the field at the UN applicable rates.

11. APPLICATION PROCESS

Recommended Presentation of Proposal:

- a) Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability using the template provided;
- b) CV and a Personal History Form ([P11 form](#));
- 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; (using IC proposal template provided)

- d) Financial Proposal (using the template provided) 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.

Qualified candidates are requested to email their applications to consultants.ken@undp.org to reach us not later than **COB on tbd.**

Please quote **“KEN-IC-... – UNDP-GEF MTR”** on the subject line.

Attachments

Attachment 1 - TERMS OF REFERENCES (TOR)

Attachment 2 - IC PROPOSAL FORM

Attachment 3 - P11 TEMPLATE

Attachment 4- OFFEROR’S LETTER TO UNDP

Attachment 5 - INDIVIDUAL CONSULTANT GENERAL TERMS AND CONDITIONS

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

1. PIF
2. UNDP Initiation Plan
3. UNDP Project Document
4. UNDP Environmental and Social Screening results
5. Project Inception Report
6. All Project Implementation Reports (PIR’s)
7. Quarterly progress reports and work plans of the various implementation task teams
8. Audit reports
9. Finalized GEF focal area Tracking Tools at CEO endorsement and midterm
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 *Sound Chemicals Managements and UOPs Reduction in Kenya* 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 Report⁹

- i.** Basic Report Information (*for opening page or title page*)
 - Title of UNDP supported GEF financed project
 - UNDP PIMS# and GEF project ID#
 - MTR time frame and date of MTR report
 - Region and countries included in the project
 - GEF Operational Focal Area/Strategic Program
 - Executing Agency/Implementing Partner and other project partners
 - MTR team members
 - Acknowledgements
- ii.** Table of Contents
- iii.** Acronyms and Abbreviations
- 1.** Executive Summary (*3-5 pages*)
 - Project Information Table
 - Project Description (brief)
 - Project Progress Summary (between 200-500 words)
 - MTR Ratings & Achievement Summary Table
 - Concise summary of conclusions
 - Recommendation Summary Table
- 2.** Introduction (*2-3 pages*)
 - Purpose of the MTR and objectives
 - Scope & Methodology: principles of design and execution of the MTR, MTR approach and data collection methods, limitations to the MTR
 - Structure of the MTR report
- 3.** Project Description and Background Context (*3-5 pages*)
 - Development context: environmental, socio-economic, institutional, and policy factors relevant to the project objective and scope
 - Problems that the project sought to address: threats and barriers targeted
 - Project Description and Strategy: objective, outcomes and expected results, description of field sites (if any)
 - Project Implementation Arrangements: short description of the Project Board, key implementing partner arrangements, etc.
 - Project timing and milestones
 - Main stakeholders: summary list
- 4.** Findings (*12-14 pages*)
 - 4.1** Project Strategy
 - Project Design
 - Results Framework/Logframe
 - 4.2** Progress Towards Results
 - Progress towards outcomes analysis
 - Remaining barriers to achieving the project objective
 - 4.3** Project Implementation and Adaptive Management
 - Management Arrangements
 - Work planning
 - Finance and co-finance

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

- 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 (POPs TT)

ToR ANNEX C: Midterm Review Evaluative Matrix Template

Evaluative Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
Project Strategy: To what extent is the project strategy relevant to country priorities, country ownership, and the best route towards expected results?			
(include evaluative question(s))	(i.e. relationships established, level of coherence between project design and implementation approach, specific activities conducted, quality of risk mitigation strategies, etc.)	(i.e. project documents, national policies or strategies, websites, project staff, project partners, data collected throughout the MTR mission, etc.)	(i.e. document analysis, data analysis, interviews with project staff, interviews with stakeholders, etc.)

Progress Towards Results: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved thus far?			
Project Implementation and Adaptive Management: Has the project been implemented efficiently, cost-effectively, and been able to adapt to any changing conditions thus far? To what extent are project-level monitoring and evaluation systems, reporting, and project communications supporting the project's implementation?			
Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, socio-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?			

Evaluators/Consultants:

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

MTR Consultant Agreement Form

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

Name of Consultant: _____

Name of Consultancy Organization (where relevant): _____

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

Signed at _____ (Place) on _____ (Date)

Signature: _____

¹⁰ www.undp.org/unegcodeofconduct

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

Midterm Review Report Reviewed and Cleared By:	
Commissioning Unit	
Name: <u>Evelyn Koech: Team Leader; ERU</u>	
Signature: _____	Date: _____
UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Advisor	
Name: _____	
Signature: _____	Date: _____

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