Terms of reference

UNDP

Empowered lives.
Resilient nations.

GENERAL INFORMATION

Title: Mid-Term Review Expert for Climate Change Mitigation – MTRE3 Project (National)
Project Name: Market Transformation through Design and Implementation of Appropriate Mitigation Actions in Energy Sector (MTRE3)
Reports to: Programme Manager of Environment Unit
Duty Station: Home based & Jakarta
Expected Places of Travel (if applicable): Jambi and Kupang
Duration of Assignment: April 2019 – July 2019 (approximately 24 days)

REQUIRED DOCUMENTS FROM HIRING UNIT

4 - Senior Specialist	**CONFIRMATION OF CATEGORY OF LOCAL CONSULTANT , please select :**
	(1) Junior Consultant
	(2) Support Consultant
	(3) Support Specialist
	(4) Senior Specialist
	(5) Expert/ Advisor
	CATEGORY OF INTERNATIONAL CONSULTANT , please select :
	(6) Junior Specialist
	(7) Specialist
	(8) Senior Specialist
X	APPROVED e-requisition

REQUIRED DOCUMENTATION FROM CONSULTANT

X	CV
X	Copy of education certificate
X	Completed financial proposal
X	Completed technical proposal

Need for presence of IC consultant in office:

X   intermittent (deliverables-based)
☐   full time/office based (needs justification from the Requesting Unit)

Provision of Support Services:

Office space: Yes X No
Equipment (laptop, etc.):   Yes X No
Secretarial Services   Yes X No
If yes has been checked, indicate here who will be responsible for providing the support services:

Signature of the Budget Owner: Boyke Lakaseru <Boyke.lakaseru@undp.org>

I. BACKGROUND

Market Transformation through Design and Implementation of Appropriate Mitigation Actions in Energy Sector (MTRE3) is a five-year project (2016-2021) funded by GEF, aimed at supporting the design and implementation of appropriate climate change mitigation actions in the energy generation and energy end use sectors in Indonesia, focusing on renewable-based electricity generation and energy efficiency in buildings.

Indonesia faces a significant electricity challenge in the coming years with an electricity demand increase of 6.8 % annually while still having over 30 million people without electricity access. Indonesia's primary energy mix consists mainly of fossil fuels such as crude oil, coal and natural gas while renewable energy

generates only about 7% of the total final energy demand. The heavy reliance on fossil fuels leaves Indonesia vulnerable to price fluctuations of imported oil and makes the energy sector one of the largest greenhouse gas (GHG) emitters, accounting for one-third of the country's total GHG emissions. Meanwhile, renewable energy resources have an abundant potential in Indonesia, and, together with energy efficiency technologies, can provide clean solutions necessary to address the country's electricity demand, increase access to modern energy, reduce the over-reliance on fossil fuels and contribute to GHG emission reductions.

Despite the Government of Indonesia's efforts in promoting renewable energy development and utilization and energy efficiency technology applications, the increased share of renewable energy in the national primary energy mix and the improved primary energy consumption index both remain much to be desired. Significant policy, institutional, financial and technical barriers remain that hinder the realization of the energy saving and GHG emission reducing potential of renewable energy and energy efficiency technologies in Indonesia.

The MTRE3 project addresses the barriers to investments in renewable based power generation and the application of energy efficient technologies in the energy end use sectors and is arranged around three components: 1) Climate change mitigation options for the renewable energy based energy generation and energy efficiency; 2) Market transformation through implementation of appropriate mitigation actions; 3) Measurement, Reporting, and Verification (MRV) system and national registry for mitigation actions.

The project is implemented by the Ministry of Energy and Mineral Resources in close coordination with the Ministry of Environment and Forestry, Ministry of National Development Planning, Ministry of Finance and Ministry of Public Works and Housing. Local governments and the private sector are other key partners in implementing the project activities.

The project started on 13 March 2017 and is in its third year of implementation. In line with the UNDP-GEF Guidance on Mid-Term Review (MTR), an MTR team consisting of a MTR Team Leader and an MTR Expert will be recruited to conduct MTR for MTRE3 project. This ToR sets out the expectations for this MTR and refers to the requirements and responsibilities for the MTR Expert. 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).

II. SCOPE OF WORK, ACTIVITIES, AND DELIVERABLES

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

Scope of Work
The MTR must provide evidence based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The MTR team will first conduct a document review of project documents (i.e. PIF, UNDP Initiation Plan, Project Document, ESSP, Project Inception Report, PIRs, Project Appraisal Committee meeting minutes, Financial and Administration guidelines used by Project Team, project operational guidelines, manuals and systems, etc.) provided by the Project Team and Commissioning Unit. 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. At the start of the MTR mission, the MTR team will participate in a MTR inception workshop to clarify their understanding of the objectives and methods of the MTR, producing the MTR inception report thereafter. The MTR mission will then consist of interviews and site visits to Lubuk Bangkar village, Merangin Jambi and/or East Nusa Tenggara province.

The MTR team will consist of two independent consultants that will conduct the MTR - one team leader (with experience and exposure to projects and evaluations in other regions globally) and one team expert, usually from the country of the project. 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.

The MTR team will assess the following four categories of project progress and produce a draft and final MTR report. See the *Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects* (hyperlink) for requirements on ratings. No overall rating is required.

1. **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.
   - 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 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.
   - 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. **Progress Towards Results**
   - Review the logframe indicators against progress made towards the end-of-project targets; populate the Progress Towards Results Matrix, as described in 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 the project objective and each outcome; make recommendations from the areas marked as "not on target to be achieved" (red).
   - 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.
   - Identify challenges faced by the project team in achieving the objectives 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.

3. **Project Implementation and Adaptive Management**
   Using the *Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects*; assess the following categories of project progress:
   - Management Arrangements
   - Work Planning
   - Finance and co-finance
   - Project-level monitoring and evaluation systems
   - Stakeholder Engagement
   - Reporting
   - Communications

4. **Sustainability**

---

[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.

Assess overall risks to sustainability factors of the project in terms of the following four categories:
- Financial risks to sustainability
- Socio-economic risks to sustainability
- Institutional framework and governance risks to sustainability
- Environmental risks to sustainability

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

Additionally, the MTR consultant/team is expected to make **recommendations** to the Project Team. 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. The MTR consultant/team should make no more than 15 recommendations total.

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.

Specifically, the MTR National Expert will perform the following tasks:
- Documentation of evaluation and data gathering and consultation meetings;
- Contributing to the development of evaluation plan and methodology;
- Conducting specific elements of the evaluation determined by the MTR Team Leader;
- Contributing to presentation of the evaluation findings and recommendations at the evaluation wrap-up meeting;
- Contributing to the drafting and finalization of the MTR reports, notes of the meetings and other related documents prepared by the international consultant
- Performing translation for the MTR Team Leader (if needed) during meetings with various stakeholders and necessary documents discussed during the MTR mission.

Expected Outputs and deliverables

The MTR consultant/team shall prepare and submit:

- MTR Inception Report: MTR team clarifies objectives and methods of the Midterm Review no later than 2 weeks before the MTR mission. To be sent to the Commissioning Unit and project management. Approximate due date: (22 April)
- Presentation: Initial Findings presented to project management and the Commissioning Unit at the end of the MTR mission. Approximate due date: (24 May)
- Draft Final Report: Full report with annexes within 3 weeks of the MTR mission. Approximate due date: (14 June)
- Final Report*: Revised report with annexed audit trail detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final MTR report. To be sent to the Commissioning Unit within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft. Approximate due date: (5 July)

*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.

TIMEFRAME	ACTIVITY
18 March	Application closes
19 March - 5 April	Select MTR Team
8 April 2019	Prep the MTR Team (handover of Project Documents)
9 – 12 April (2 working days)	Document review and preparing MTR Inception Report
15 – 22 April (2 working days)	Finalization and Validation of MTR Inception Report
6 – 23 May (14 working days)	MTR mission: stakeholder meetings, interviews, field visits
24 May (1 working day)	Mission wrap-up meeting & presentation of initial findings-earliest end of MTR mission
27 May – 14 June (3 working days)	Preparing draft report, submission of draft final report
1– 5 July (2 working days)	Finalization of MTR report/Incorporating audit trail from feedback on draft report
8 – 12 July	Preparation & Issue of Management Response
31 July	Expected date of full MTR completion

Deliverables/ Outputs	Target Due Dates and Payments	Reviewed and required approval
Inception Report MTR team clarifies objectives and methods of Midterm Review	22 April 2019 4 working days (10%)	UNDP Indonesia country Office, Programme Manager
Draft Final Report Full MTR report (using guidelines on content outlined in Annex B) with annexes	14 June 2019 18 working days (80%)	UNDP Indonesia country Office, Programme Manager & Regional Technical Advisor
Final Report Revised report with annexed audit trail detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final MTR report	5 July 2019 2 working days (10%)	UNDP Indonesia country Office, Programme Manager & Regional Technical Advisor

III.   WORKING ARRANGEMENTS

Institutional Arrangement
a. The principal responsibility for managing this MTR resides with the Commissioning Unit. The Commissioning Unit for this project's MTR is UNDP Indonesia Country Office.
b. 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.
c. The MTRE3 Project Team will be responsible for liaising with the MTR team to provide all relevant administrative and financial support, provide documents, set up stakeholder interviews, and arrange field visits as required for the completion of the work.
d. The expected frequency of the reporting is as stated in the Expected Deliverables mentioned-above.

Duration of the Work
a) The duration of work is 24 days from April to July 2019.
b) The expected starting date is 08 April 2019 with expectation of completion on 31 July 2019.
c) The unforeseen delay will be further discussed by UNDP as basis for possible extension.
d) The feedback from UNDP and government partners to the submitted report can be expected within 10 working days from the date of submission.

Duty Station
a) The contractor's duty station will be home-based with possibility of travel to Jakarta, Jambi and/or East Nusa Tenggara provinces.
b) The contractor is working on the output-based, thus no necessity to report or present regularly.

Travel Plan
Travel cost to project sites as below detail;

No	Indicative Location	Frequency	No. of travel days
1	Jambi	1	4
2	Kupang	1	3

IV.   REQUIREMENTS FOR EXPERIENCE AND QUALIFICATIONS

Academic Qualifications:
A Master's degree or higher in a field related to Environment, Energy, Climate Change or other closely related field from an accredited college or university.

Years of experience:

- Work experience for at least 5 years in fields related to Environment, Energy, Climate Change or related fields;
- Experience with result-based management evaluation methodologies;
- Experience applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios;
- Experience in working with national and local development policies, programs and projects of the Government of Indonesia
- Experience working with the GEF or GEF-evaluations, UNDP evaluations or other UN agencies and/or international organizations and/or major donor agencies is an advantage.

III. Competencies and special skills requirement:

- Competence in adaptive management, as applied to GEF- Climate Change Mitigation focal area;
- Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender and climate change mitigation and/or promotion of sustainable and modern energy services in communities; experience in gender sensitive evaluation and analysis;
- Competence within the area of climate finance for renewable energy and energy efficiency is an advantage;
- Familiarity with the challenges developing countries face in climate change mitigation and promotion of sustainable and modern energy services to communities;
- Excellent communication skills;
- Demonstrate analytical skills;
- Fluency in Indonesian and English languages

V.	EVALUATION METHOD AND CRITERIA

Cumulative analysis

Evaluation is based on the weighted scoring method, the award of the contract should be made to the individual consultant whose offer has been evaluated and determined as:
a) responsive/compliant/acceptable, and
b) Having received the highest score out of a pre-determined set of weighted technical and financial criteria specific to the solicitation.
* Technical Criteria weight; 70%
* Financial Criteria weight; 30%
Only candidates obtaining a minimum of **70 point** out of the 100 points listed below with regards to the Technical Criteria would be considered for the Financial Evaluation

Criteria	Weight	Maximum Point
Technical Criteria		100
• Criteria A: qualification requirements as per TOR:	60%	
1. A Master's degree or higher in a field related to Environment, Energy, Climate Change or other closely related field from an accredited college or university.		10
2. Work experience for at least 5 years in fields related to Environment, Energy, Climate Change or related fields;		15
3. Experience in working with national and local development policies, programs and projects of the Government of Indonesia		10
4. Experience with result-based management evaluation methodologies;		10
5. Experience applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios;		10
6. Experience working with the GEF or GEF-evaluations, UNDP evaluations or other UN agencies and/or international organizations and/or major donor agencies		5
• Criteria B: Brief Description of Approach to Assignment	40%	
1. Understands the task and applies a methodology appropriate for the task?		15
2. Important aspects of the task addressed clearly and in sufficient detail?		15
3. Is planning logical, realistic for efficient project implementation?		10
• Criteria C: Further Assessment by Interview (if any)	N/A	

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 (Climate Change Mitigation (CCM) TT)
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 MTRE3's Project 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[2]

    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)*

---

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

      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

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

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

ToR ANNEX D: UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluators/Midterm Review Consultants[3]

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: _____

---

[3] 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 *(to be completed by the Commissioning Unit and UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Advisor 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:
_____