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| **Terms of Reference for International Consultant on ESCO in public buildings in Ukraine Project Mid-Term Review** |

**Project name**: Removing Barriers to Increase Investment in Energy Efficiency in Public Buildings in Ukraine through the ESCO modality in Small and Medium Sized Cities

**Post title:** International Consultant for the Midterm Review (MTR) of full-sized UNDP-GEF energy efficiency project

**Type of contract:** Individual Contract (IC)

**Assignment type:** International Consultant

**Country / Duty Station**: Home Based with one mission of estimated 10 working days (2 week mission) to Ukraine

**Expected places of travel (if applicable)**: Kyiv, Ukraine (and approximately five project pilot sites in four regions of Ukraine)

**Languages required**: English

**Starting date of assignment**: 01 June 2019

**End date of assignment**: 30th September 2019

**Duration of Contract**: 30 working days spread over a 4-month period from 1st June 2019 – 30th September 2019.

**Duration of Assignment**: 30 working days of which a minimum of 10 working days must be spent in Ukraine (20 days home based, 10 working days in Ukraine)

**Payment arrangements**: Lump-sum contract (payments linked to satisfactory performance and delivery of results)

**Administrative arrangements:** The contractor will have to arrange his/her workplace, logistics, and equipment. UNDP Ukraine will pay for travel costs to Ukraine based on the agreed travel itinerary.

**Evaluation method**: Roster Selection followed by desk review with validation interview

1. **INTRODUCTION**

This is the Terms of Reference (ToR) for the UNDP-GEF Midterm Review (MTR) of the full-sized $5.48 million USD project titled **“Removing Barriers to Increase Investment in Energy Efficiency in Public Buildings in Ukraine through the ESCO modality in Small and Medium Sized Cities”** (PIMS#4114, GEF ID #5357) implemented through the UNDP Direct Implementation Modality (DIM), which is to be undertaken in 2019. More information about the project can be found on the GEF website at the following link:

<https://www.thegef.org/project/removing-barriers-increase-investment-energy-efficiency-public-buildings-ukraine-through>

The project started on 14 December 2016 (the Project Document signature date) with the project team being hired starting in April 2017. The project is now in its third year of implementation. In line with the UNDP-GEF Guidance on MTRs, this MTR process was initiated before the submission of the second Project Implementation Report (PIR) which means that this MTR needs to be completed by September 2019.

This ToR sets out the expectations for this MTR. The MTR process must follow the guidance outlined in the January 2019 Evaluations Guidelines document published by the UNDP Evaluation Office. A copy of the January 2019 UNDP Evaluation Guidelines can be found here:

<http://web.undp.org/evaluation/guideline/index.shtml>

For UNDP-GEF projects a reference is also made to the GEF Guidance for Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects which cab be found here:

<http://web.undp.org/evaluation/documents/guidance/GEF/mid-term/Guidance_Midterm%20Review%20_EN_2014.pdf>

**2. PROJECT BACKGROUND INFORMATION**

The Ukrainian economy is characterized by high-energy consumption and high carbon intensity throughout almost all sectors of the economy, including both residential and public buildings. The building sector (residential, commercial and public services) consumes about 37% of total heat and 25% of all electricity in Ukraine, making this sector a major contributor to greenhouse gas emissions. Energy efficiency in buildings in Ukraine is on average approximately three to four times lower than that in West European countries.

The objective of this project is to accelerate implementation of energy efficiency measures in public buildings in Ukraine through the Energy Service Company (ESCO) modality, utilizing Energy Performance Contract (EPC), by leveraging over significant private sector investment over its five-year implementation period (2016 - 2021) as well as by introducing nationwide energy management information systems (EMIS) for Ukraine.

It is expected to implement at least 10 pilot EPC energy savings projects in 10 different municipalities in Ukraine and achieve annually 1,870 MWh of thermal energy and 166 MWh of electrical energy savings; these savings will be resulted in a reduction of 8,893 tons of CO2 equivalent over the 20-year equipment lifetime. The project is expected to achieve this target by introducing a conducive regulatory framework for the establishment and operation of ESCOs through the EPC modality and by putting in place a financial support mechanism that, together, will facilitate private sector participation in implementing energy efficiency measures in public buildings. This will be combined with a single nationwide energy consumption database for energy consumption in public buildings and energy management information system which will facilitate additional investments in energy efficiency.

The project consists of the following four components:

Component 1: To formulate and introduce a streamlined and comprehensive legal and regulatory framework to promote energy efficiency in public buildings through strengthening of monitoring and enforcement mechanisms.

Component 2: To promote private investment in energy efficiency in public buildings through appropriate catalytic financial incentives, including the establishment of a Financial Support Mechanism (FSM).

Component 3: To implement at least 10 pilot projects in selected public buildings to demonstrate the energy and cost-saving potential of energy efficiency measures.

Component 4: To establish an institutional basis and comprehensive nation-wide Energy Management Information System for public buildings in Ukraine to support energy efficiency in public buildings.

A major outcome of the project is intended to be support for improved conditions for private investments in municipal public sector and ESCO market development in Ukraine, including through the signing of at least 10 EPC’s in 10 different cities in Ukraine.

The main current achievements of the Project:

* “Enhanced ESCO model” has been created and 12 pilot projects have been launched. “Enhanced ESCO model” envisaged mutual financial participation in modernization of both: ESCO and municipality (owner of the building). All technical and commercial risks are up to the ESCO investor.
* Consultation and expert support on 38 pilot objects with the classic ESCO model in partner-cities;
* With the direct Project support, 7211 women and 5570 men raised their awareness on energy efficiency, ESCO market and importance of energy efficient measures in small and medium-sized cities;
* Changes on the ESCO legislation were made and registered in the Verkhovna Rada: the Law #9386 dated 10.12.2018 on the changes to the Law of Ukraine on Large Scale Energy Modernization, and the Las #9387 dated 10.12.2918 on the Changes to the Budget Code;
* All- Ukrainian Consultancy Center on Energy Efficiency and Energy Saving was created with the direct support of the UNDP EEPB Project. More than 100 requests were addressed, and expert advisory was provided;
* The first pilot project was completed in Dubno: first tome a blank credit was granted to ESCO from Ukrainian bank, using simplified procedure and with no other collateral except the ESCO contract itself. Partial ESO renovation was completed in 6 public buildings, each building potentially saved up to 25% per year. Ongoing projects: Nizhyn (Chernigiv region), Savran (Odessa region), Slavutych (Kyiv region), Odessa, Borodyanka (Kyiv region), Drogobych (Lviv region);
* 21 energy audits conducted;
* Working Group on the basis of UNDP and Verkhovna Rada on the creation was energy management information system was established;
* 20 conferences, 3 round tables, 3 study tours were organized; 8 guidelines were created and disseminated among the partner municipalities;
* With the direct support of EEPB Project, 10 cities in Ukraine have installed and are successfully using EMIS (energy management information systems). List of cities: Dubno, Ternopil, Chortkiv, Khotyn, Fastiv, Bila Tserkva + Eastern Ukraine (Selidove, Sloviansk, Druzhkivka, Dobropillia);
* Using GEF SGP mechanism Project introduced EMIS in more than 100 objects in two Eastern regions.
* EEPB Project has created a network of partner-cities - 24. List of cities: Sudova Vushnia, Drogobych, Dubno, Chortkiv, Khotyn, Borodyanka, Fastiv, Bila Tserkva, Kaniv, Obukhiv, Slavutych, Nizhyn, Savran, Mykolaiv, Poltava, Bilgorod-Dnistrovkyi, Selidove, Melitipol, Sloviansk, Druzhkivka, Dobropillia, Korosten, Odesa).

According to the ProDoc, Project was designed to use the Financial Support mechanism developed under the UNDP GEF Commercializing Bioenergy Technologies in Ukraine project. However, this mechanism envisaged loans to municipalities only instead of commercial entities. Hence, the Project developed and piloted various financial tools to overcome this barrier:

* blank credit for ESCO company;
* in order to reduce risks, insurance contract was signed with the ESCO company;
* first factoring contract with the ESCO company and commercial bank was signed.

In addition, the Project continues to work on leasing instrument and green bonds as a affordable finances source for investments.

In addition to the GEF grant of $5,48 million USD, the project envisages over $50 million USD of co-financing and the mid-term evaluation should assess to what extent this co-financing is on track to materialize.

**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 strengthen the project and, if necessary, set the project on-track in order to increase the chances of the project achieving its objective and intended results by the end of the project.

The MTR will also review the project’s strategy, its risks to sustainability. The main output of the MTR will be specific recommendations for adaptive management to improve the project over the second half of its lifetime.

**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 he/she 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]](#footnote-1) ensuring close engagement with the Project Team, government counterparts (the GEF Operational Focal Point), the UNDP Country Office, UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Adviser, and other key stakeholders. The MTR Team is expected also to follow **UNDP Evaluation Guidelines** (2019)[[2]](#footnote-2).

Engagement of stakeholders is vital to a successful MTR.[[3]](#footnote-3) Stakeholder involvement should include interviews with stakeholders who have project responsibilities, including but not limited to: UNDP Ukraine, UNDP Istanbul Regional Technical Advisor (RTA) on Climate Change Mitigation, EEPB project team, senior officials and task team/component leaders, key experts and consultants in the subject area, Project Board, project stakeholders, academia, local government and CSOs, etc.

The MTR approach must integrate gender equality concerns and the MTR team is to address gender-specific issues and review to what extend the project contributed to the achievement of the SDGs in the country.

Additionally, the MTR team is expected to conduct 2-week (10 working days, not including travel days or weekends) mission to Ukraine, including visiting the following project sites at partner municipalities in four regions of Ukraine (Eastern (Donetsk), Western (Ternopol and Dubno), Southern (Odessa region) and Central (Kyiv region and Kanyv city).

The mission will start with meetings in Kyiv with central authorities and other key stakeholders and include one day trip to Kaniv city. The middle period of the mission which will start before the end of the first week will include trips to Eastern Ukraine, Western Ukraine and to the Odessa region. Finally, the mission will conclude with 1-2 days in Kyiv before the international consultant flies out. While the mission is for 10 working days it is important to note that at least 12 full days will need to be spent in Ukraine as the mission dates do not include the weekend that will need to be spent in Ukraine during the course of the mission.

During the course of the evaluation, the evaluation team (international consultant + national consultant) should conduct extensive interviews with all the relevant project stakeholders. This includes, but is not limited to, consultants participated in creation of project document, the UNDP GEF Regional Technical Advisor at the Istanbul Regional Hub responsible for this project, UNDP Ukraine staff and management, international and national advisors and consultants employed by the Project, staff at the State Agency for Energy Efficiency of Ukraine, staff working in IFCs and staff working in banks the Project works with and involved in financing energy efficiency in public buildings (e.g. Oshchadbank, Ukrgasbank, ComDen), other donors involved in financing energy-efficiency activities in Ukraine (such as the EBRD, the GiZ, USAID etc.). The international and national consultant should also meet with the NGOs (Non-Governmental Organizations) that were involved in project activities via the GEF Small Grants Programme as well as the UNDP person(s) involved in running the GEF Small Grants Programme in Ukraine.

The international consultant + national consultant should travel to at least five demonstration project sites in four regions of Ukraine. However, given that the project has a goal to introduce both EMIS and ESCO activities in at least 10 different municipalities in Ukraine, the consultants should aim to speak with all stakeholders who have been involved in signing MoUs and/or demonstration projects and so where it is not possible to meet face to face then skype and or telephone interviews should be set up.

The final MTR report should describe the full MTR approach taken and the rationale for the approach making explicit the underlying assumptions, challenges, strengths and weaknesses about the methods and approach of the review.

**5. DETAILED SCOPE OF THE MTR**

The MTR Consultant will assess the following four categories of project progress. See the *Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects* for extended descriptions.

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. 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.
* Review to what extend did the project contribute to the SDGs and the UNDP Strategic Plan?
* 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 the project time frame?
* Is the project on track to achieve its global environmental benefits in terms of tonnes of CO2 to be reduced (direct and indirect GHG emissions) as defined in the project document
* 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 1-1: Progress Towards Results Matrix (Achievement of outcomes against End-of-project Targets)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Project Strategy** | **Indicator[[4]](#footnote-4)** | **Baseline Level[[5]](#footnote-5)** | **Level in 1st PIR (self- reported)** | **Midterm Target[[6]](#footnote-6)** | **End-of-project Target** | **Midterm Level & Assessment[[7]](#footnote-7)** | **Achievement Rating[[8]](#footnote-8)** | **Justification for Rating**  |
| **Objective:**  | Indicator (if applicable): |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Outcome 1:** | Indicator 1: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Indicator 2: |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Outcome 2:** | Indicator 3: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Indicator 4: |  |  |  |  |  |
| Etc. |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Etc.** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Indicator Assessment Key

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

In addition to the progress towards outcomes analysis:

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

**iii. Project Implementation and Adaptive Management**

Management Arrangements:

* Review overall effectiveness of project management as outlined in the Project Document. Have changes been made and are they effective? Are responsibilities and reporting lines clear? Is decision-making transparent and undertaken in a timely manner? Recommend areas for improvement.
* Review the quality of execution of the Executing Agency/Implementing Partner(s) and recommend areas for improvement.
* Review the quality of the financial support mechanism (FSM) between UNDP-IFC and in partnership with Oshchadbank and assess how effective it has been as well as reviewing what can be done to improve matters going forward;
* 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.
* Has the work planning been carried out in a manner which is consistent with the project document and with the project workplan or are there significant deviations.
* 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 meaning that GEF grants should have all leveraged significant co-financing. What is the co-financing ratio?
* Review the changes to fund allocations as a result of budget revisions and assess the appropriateness and relevance of such budget 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 has worked with UNDP Ukraine and the UNDP Istanbul Regional Hub in identifying and implementing adaptive management measures.
* 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 has 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)?
* What is the likelihood of the financial support mechanism being established by the project being sustainable (meaning that the FSM will continue to operate and function beyond the lifetime of the project)

Socio-economic risks to sustainability:

* Are there any social or political risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project outcomes? What is the risk that the level of stakeholder ownership (including ownership by governments and other key stakeholders) will be insufficient to allow for the project outcomes/benefits to be sustained?
* Do the various key stakeholders see that it is in their interest that the project benefits continue to flow? Is there sufficient public / stakeholder awareness in support of the long term objectives of the project? Are lessons learned being documented by the Project Team on a continual basis and shared/ transferred to appropriate parties who could learn from the project and potentially replicate and/or scale it in the future?

Institutional Framework and Governance risks to sustainability:

* Do the legal frameworks, policies, governance structures and processes pose risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project benefits? While assessing this parameter, also consider if the required systems/ mechanisms for accountability, transparency, and technical knowledge transfer are in place.
* To what extent has the project managed to improve or contribute to legal frameworks related to ESCO modality and energy efficiency improvements in Ukraine.

Environmental risks to sustainability:

* Are there any environmental risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project outcomes?

**v. Conclusions & Recommendations**

The MTR International Consultant will include a section of the report setting out the MTR’s evidence-based conclusions, in light of the findings with the main goal of making recommendations on how to significantly improve the project over the second half of the project lifetime.[[9]](#footnote-9)

Recommendations should be succinct suggestions for critical intervention that are specific, measurable, achievable, and relevant.

 A recommendation table should be put in the report’s executive summary. See the *Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects* for guidance on a recommendation table.

It is highly recommended that the MTR International Consultant will make no more than 15 recommendations in total.

**vi. Ratings**

The MTR International Consultant will include its ratings of the project’s results and brief descriptions of the associated achievements in a *MTR Ratings & Achievement Summary Table* in the Executive Summary of the MTR report. See Annex E for ratings scales. Ratings are required for Project Design & Strategy, Progress Towards Results, Project Implementation and Adaptive Management, and Sustainability. An overall project rating is optional. The ratings are 6 points (highly satisfactory), 5 points (satisfactory), 4 points (marginally satisfactory), 3 points (marginally unsatisfactory), 2 points (unsatisfactory), and 1 point (highly unsatisfactory). For sustainability ratings, they are 4 (likely), 3 (moderately likely), 2 (moderately unlikely) and 1 (unlikely).

MTR Ratings & Achievement Summary Table

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Measure** | **MTR Rating** | **Achievement Description** |
| **Overall Rating** | Rating(rate 6 pt. scale) | *(The international consultant should please note that the overall rating is optional)* |
| **Project Design and Strategy** | Rating(rate 6 pt. scale) |  |
| **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) |  |

1. **TIMEFRAME**

The total duration of the MTR will be approximately **30 working days** (20 home-based, one 10-working days mission to Ukraine) over a time-period of 16 weeks (4 months) starting from June 1st 2019 and shall not exceed five months from when the consultant is hired. MTR timeframe is as follows:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **TIMEFRAME 2019** | **No of Days** | **ACTIVITY** |
| By 01 June 2019 | 3 | Contract issuance prior to 1st June 2019 and Preparation for the MTR (initial phone conversation and handover of all relevant Project Documents) |
| June 2019 | Documents review, initial discussions with key stakeholders, and preparation of MTR Inception Report |
| By 10 June 2019 | 1 | Finalization andValidation of MTR Inception Report which includes list of stakeholders for interviews during the mission, and full list of questions being asked by the evaluator. |
| Before end of June 2019 | 10 | MTR mission: stakeholder meetings, interviews, field visits. This includes 2 travel days and 10 working days in Ukraine (the 10 working days does not include weekends) meaning that the total expected number of days in Ukraine is 12-13 days. |
| Mission wrap-up meeting & presentation of initial findings- earliest end of MTR mission. The mission includes 10 working days but minimum number of full days to be spent in Ukraine is 12 days because the weekend is not included as working days. At the end of the mission a power point presentation with initial findings should be made to UNDP Ukraine showing the initial findings of the evaluation. |
| By 31 August 2019 | 12 | Preparing draft MTR report and submitting to Project Manager, UNDP Ukraine, and UNDP Istanbul Regional Hub and holding conference call to discuss the draft report. |
| By 20th September 2019 | 3 | Incorporation of comments into the draft MTR report from the Project Manager, UNDP Ukraine, UNDP IRH, and other key stakeholders. In addition, the consultant should incorporating audit trail from feedback on draft report/Finalization of MTR report with a view to finalization of the draft report. |
| By 30th September 2019  | 1 | Hold conference call with UNDP Ukraine and UNDP IRH related to discussion of the draft Management Response by UNDP Ukraine (to be prepared by UNDP Ukraine in consultation and discussion with MTR Consultant) |
| **TOTAL**  | **30** | Broken down into 20 home based days, and 10 working days in Ukraine |

The two full weeks mission to Ukraine shall include both time spent in Kyiv (start of mission), time spent visiting at least five pilot sites (middle of mission) and then one or two days in Kyiv (end of mission). In order to include 10 full working days in Ukraine, it is required to stay at least one weekend in Ukraine. This weekend is not included as part of the 10 working days which are for days worked Monday-Friday. This means that the total number of days to be spent in Ukraine is at least 12-13 days of which 10 are full working days.

The exact dates of the mission to Ukraine should be discussed with the consultant at the start of the assignment, but preferably the 10 working days mission should take place in June 2019.

The duration of the assignment is expected to be 1st June 2019 to 30th September 2019.

1. **MIDTERM REVIEW DELIVERABLES**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **#** | **Deliverable** | **Description** | **Timing** | **Responsibilities** | **Payment Amount** |
| **1** | **MTR Inception Report** | MTR team clarifies objectives and methods of Midterm Review | No later than 1 week before the MTR mission | MTR team submits to the Commissioning Unit and project management | 10% |
| **2** | **Presentation** | Initial Findings | End of MTR mission in Ukraine | 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 | By 31 August 2019 | Sent to the Commissioning Unit, reviewed by RTA, Project Coordinating Unit | 50% |
| **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 but not later than 20th September 2019 | Sent to the Commissioning Unit | 40% |

\*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.

1. **TEAM COMPOSITION**

The MTR will be conducted by a team of two independent consultants – an International consultant (team leader with experience and exposure to projects and evaluations on other technical assistance projects, preferably including in the Europe & CIS region) and a national consultant (team member, MTR support). The International Consultant will be designated as the team leader and will be responsible for the entire midterm review and respective MTR deliverables mentioned above in line with this ToR, with inputs from the project.

The National Expert will provide assistance to the International Consultant in line with a separate ToR focusing on preparing a baseline information report which includes preparation of the baseline data, review of outputs of the project prepared in Ukrainian or Russian language, organizing and participation in the midterm review mission to Ukraine, incorporation of detailed comments received into the MTR report. The National Expert will also be responsible for translating selected bits of information into English for the lead international consultant, as required.

Both the international and the national consultant cannot have participated in the project preparation, formulation, and/or implementation (including the writing of the Project Document) and should not have a conflict of interest with project’s related activities.

The selection of consultants will be aimed at maximizing the overall “team” qualities with the international consultant having significant experience with working on evaluations of international projects, if possible in the Europe & CIS region, and having prior experience working with the GEF and the national consultant with strong knowledge of the policy and legislative framework related to energy-efficiency in Ukraine.

1. **MTR ARRANGEMENTS**

**Institutional arrangements**

The principal responsibility for managing this MTR resides with the Commissioning Unit. The Commissioning Unit for this project’s MTR is UNDP Ukraine Country Office, working closely with the Regional Technical Advisor at the UNDP Istanbul Regional Hub*.* The commissioning unit will contract the Consultant and ensure the timely provision of per diems and travel arrangements within Ukraine for the MTR Consultant. The Project Team will be responsible for liaising with the MTR Consultant to provide all relevant documents, set up stakeholder interviews, and arrange field visits.

**Duty Station**

Home-based with one 2-week mission (10 working days) to Ukraine, which should be carried out at the start of the assignment, preferably in June 2019.

**Travel:**

* International travel (2-week mission, 10 working days) will be required to Ukraine during the MTR mission. These 10 days do not include travel days and they also do not include weekend days;
* The Basic Security in the Field II course must be successfully completed prior to commencement of travel;
* Individual Consultant is responsible for ensuring he/she has vaccinations/inoculations when travelling to certain countries, as designated by the UN Medical Director.
* Consultant is required to comply with the UN security directives set forth under <https://dss.un.org/dssweb/>

All envisaged travel costs and per diems (DSA) and terminal expenses must NOT be included in the Offeror’s financial proposal. UNDP shall purchase for the consultant with the air tickets (not exceeding those of the economy class) to join duty station (Kyiv) and repatriate, vehicle transport for mission travel in Ukraine and air tickets if domestic flights are required. If the consultant wishes to fly business class, the consultant should cover the cost of upgrade from economy class to business class with their own funds. UNDP shall also pay the consultant a per diem for their time to be spent in Ukraine in accordance with UNDP rules and procedures. The official UNDP DSA rate for Kyiv is currently $212 per day, and for elsewhere it is $68 per day. The means of reimbursement will be via signed F10 form and payment/reimbursement into the nominated bank account of the consultant.

1. **QUALIFICATIONS AND EXPERIENCE REQUIREMENTS**

The MTR Team leader – International Consultant should be an international expert with experience and exposure to energy efficiency projects and evaluations in the Europe & CIS region and/or other regions globally. The international consultant cannot have participated in the project preparation, formulation, and/or implementation (including the writing of the Project Document) and should not have a conflict of interest with project’s related activities, meaning that the international consultant should not have previously been contracted by this project in any manner, shape or form.

**The MTR Team leader should have the following qualifications, competencies and experience:**

**Corporate Competencies:**

* Demonstrates commitment to UNDP´s mission, vision and values;
* Displays cultural, gender, religion, race, nationality and age sensitivity and adaptability;
* Highest standards of integrity, discretion and loyalty.

**Functional Competencies:**

* Ability to work with multidisciplinary and multicultural teams;
* Innovation and initiative;
* Result orientation;
* Analytical and critical judgment ability;
* Able to work under pressure;
* Determination and focus on goals and results;
* Ability of facilitation;
* Good time and task management skill

**Education**

* At least a Master’s degree in Engineering, Energy, Environment, Economics, Law, Business Administration or other closely related field.

**Experience**

* At least 10-years work experience and proven track record with policy advice and/or project development/implementation in energy efficiency, preferably in municipal (buildings) sector including experience with ESCO modality in transition economies.
* Practical experience (within the last seven years) in the mid-term or final performance evaluation of at least five international and/or regional projects funded by multilateral agencies (UNDP, GEF) or other international agencies; including experience with SMART indicators;
* Prior experience in designing projects and initiatives in the field of energy efficiency, either for UNDP or other international agencies.
* Experience or knowledge of UNDP and GEF monitoring and evaluation policy demonstrated by having undertaken the evaluation of at least one other UNDP-GEF project in the past seven years
* Previous working experience in Ukraine which shows familiarity with relevant Ukrainian policy and regulations and standards related to energy efficiency is an advantage.
* Experience of evaluating projects for international development agencies in CIS region (former Soviet Republics) is considered to be an advantage.
* Excellent written and spoken English is a must; Working knowledge of written and spoken Ukrainian or Russian will be considered as an advantage
1. **EVALUATION**

This TOR is being sent to candidates on the CCMSE (Climate Change Mitigation and Sustainable Energy) Roster.

**Technical Scoring for Team Leader**

The following criteria will be rated as indicated below:

* **Educational background** (Advanced University degree, Masters or preferably a PhD, Engineering, Energy, Environment, Economics, Law, Business Administration or related field) – **10 points maximum**: (PhD related to Energy/Environment = 10 points, PhD related to other relevant topic = 8 points, Masters related to Energy/Environment = 7 points, Masters related to other relevant topic = 6 points, combined (2 or more) Masters related to relevant topics = 8).
* **Extensive (at least 10-year) work experience** and proven track record with policy advice and/or project development/implementation related to energy efficiency preferably in municipal (buildings) sector – **20 points maximum:** 10-14 years = 14 points; 15-20 years = 16 points; more than 20 years = 18 points, experience with ESCO = +2 points).
* **Practical experience (within last seven years)** **in mid-term or final performance evaluation** of at least five international and/or regional projects funded by multilateral agencies (including GEF, UNDP) or other international agencies – **17 points maximum:** (5 evaluations = 12 points; 5-10 evaluations = 13 points; more than 10 evaluations = 14 points; evaluations in CIS country +1 point, experience in Ukraine + 2 points).
* **Prior experience in designing projects and initiatives in the field of energy efficiency** – **10 points** **maximum**: (1-3 projects designed - 6 points, 3-5 projects designed - 8 points, over 3 projects designed – 10 points).
* Experience or knowledge of UNDP and GEF monitoring and evaluation policy demonstrated by performance evaluation of at least one other UNDP-GEF project in the past seven years – **7 points maximum**: (1-3 evaluations = 5 points, over 3 evaluations = 7 points)
* Language skills – **6 points maximum**: (superior writing and oral skills in English = 3 points; knowledge of Ukrainian and/or Russian at the working level = +3 points).

**MAXIMUM: 70 points**

Only candidates who score more than 70% of the maximum, meaning at least 49 out of 70 points, will be technically qualified.

**Financial Scoring for Team Leader:**

Financial scoring will be carried out as follows. The lowest financial offer from a technically compliant offer will score 30 points and all other technically compliant offers will score a percentage of 30 points based on the formula of lowest financial offer divided by financial offer of the applicant x 100 x 30%.

**MAXIMUM: 30 points**

The total score will be technical score + financial score (maximum 100 points).

The highest scoring candidate will proceed to the validation interview with the interview panel.

Candidates for this assignment are asked to make financial offers and the panel will meet to discuss and agree which candidate best meets the needs of the assignment.

A validation interview will be held with the selected candidate and reference checks will be undertaken prior to any offer being made.

1. **PAYMENT MODALITIES AND SPECIFICATIONS**

The total payment for the assignment of the international consultant/Team Leader will be a lump sum fee paid in 3 instalments as specified in the table below:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  Instalment | Milestone |
| *10 % of total consultancy fee* | Upon approval by UNDP of the final MTR detailed workplan and submission of related invoice, prior to mission to Ukraine. (Prior to mission to Ukraine) |
| *50% of total consultancy fee* | Upon submission of the draft MTR report and acceptance of the report by UNDP and submission of related invoice (Following on from mission to Ukraine) |
| *40% of total consultancy fee* | Upon finalization of the MTR report and acceptance of the report by UNDP and submission of related invoice (Following on from mission to Ukraine) |
| *Travel Costs*  | 1. 80% of the total travel cost to join the duty station will be paid upon confirmation on the travel dates and provision of a copy of the air ticket (this amount includes two-way economy air ticket, visa costs, and living allowances in Kyiv / field visits.
2. The remaining 20% of travel cost will be paid at the end of the mission upon submission of the UNDP Travel Claim Form (F10)
 |

**Note**

* Travel costs (including ticket to Ukraine and travel within Ukraine, per diems and terminal expenses) must NOT be included in the offeror’s financial proposal as these costs will be covered by UNDP.
* Individual contractor wishing to upgrade his/her travel to business or first class shall do so at his/her own expense.
* Each payment will be made in US dollars upon satisfactory completion of the tasks and respective deliverables as per submission of deliverables/claims by the consultant and the project/UNDP approvals.
* Each payment will be transferred by UNDP through Electronic Fund Transfer to the Dollar account number of the contractor introduced through an official letter indicating full banking information.
* Any payment under this contract will be made using UN Operational Rate of Exchange. For update rates please see: <http://treasury.un.org/operationalrates/OperationalRates.aspx>
* Payments will be made according to UNDP regulations as explained in the contract documents.
* The International Consultant shall not do any work, provide any equipment, materials and supplies or perform any other services which may result in any cost in excess of the agreed contract amount.
1. **APPLICATION PROCESS**

Applicants shall submit the following documents:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Required** |  |
| [x] [x]  | Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability using the template provided by UNDP;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.  |
| [x]  | CV or a Personal History Form (P11 form), including information about past experience in similar assignments and contact details for referees; |



*\*Please note that the* ***financial proposal is all-inclusive*** *and shall take into account various expenses incurred by the consultant/contractor during the contract period (e.g. fee, health insurance, vaccination and any other relevant expenses related to the performance of service, etc.).*

***Travel costs, including those to join duty station (Kyiv) and repatriate, travel costs in Ukraine to perform site visits and per diems (DSA) must NOT be included into the financial proposal and will be provided by UNDP****. The number of overnights is estimated as 12 and not 10 because weekend stay is required during the mission to Ukraine. Therefore, there are two non-working days covered as part of the DSA cost.*

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.

1. **TOR ANNEXES**

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

1. Project Identification Framework (PIF)
2. GEF Request for CEO Endorsement
3. UNDP Project Document
4. UNDP Environmental and Social Screening results
5. Strategic Results Framework (and proposed revision of the SRF)
6. Project Inception Report
7. Project Implementation Report (PIR) 2018
8. Quarterly progress reports and work plans of the various implementation task teams
9. Cooperation Agreements related to pilot projects implementation in partner cities
10. Monitoring/quality assurance reports prepared by the project
11. Finalized GEF CCM Tracking Tool at CEO endorsement and midterm
12. Financial and Administration guidelines used by Project Team
13. Minutes of Project Board meetings

The following documents will also be available:

1. Project operational guidelines, manuals and systems
2. UNDP country/countries programme document(s)
3. Minutes of the Project Steering Committee (Board) and other meetings
4. Project sites location maps

**ToR ANNEX B: Guidelines on Contents for the Midterm Review Report**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **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
* 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
 |

**ToR Annex B**: Example Draft Questionnaire or Interview Guide (with sample questions)

Name: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Email: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Over what period did you work on or with this project? \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ until \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

What was your role on this project? \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

What do you think about the project design and its role in helping to accelerate implementation of energy efficiency measures in public buildings in Ukraine and in promoting Energy Management Information Systems (EMIS) and through the Energy Service Company (ESCO) modality? What are your general views about the project implementation as you have seen it from your point of view?

|  |
| --- |
|  |

What were the specific tasks that were carried out by you and what were the results?

|  |
| --- |
|  |

What more could the project do, in your view, to accelerate implementation of energy efficiency measures in public buildings in Ukraine over its five-year implementation period (2017-2021)

|  |
| --- |
|  |

What are your thoughts about the sustainability of the project activities and outputs?

|  |
| --- |
|  |

Do you have any other comments on this project that you would like to add?

|  |
| --- |
|  |

**Signed: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_ / \_\_\_\_ / 2018

**ToR: ANNEX C: Midterm Review Evaluative Matrix Template**

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

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

**Evaluators/Consultants:**

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

**MTR Consultant Agreement Form**

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

Name of Consultant: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Name of Consultancy Organization (where relevant): \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

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

Signed at *\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ (Place)* on *\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ (Date)*

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**ToR ANNEX E: MTR Ratings**

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

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

|  |
| --- |
| **Ratings for Sustainability:** (one overall rating) |
| 4 | Likely (L) | Negligible risks to sustainability, with key outcomes on track to be achieved by the project’s closure and expected to continue into the foreseeable future |
| 3 | Moderately Likely (ML) | Moderate risks, but expectations that at least some outcomes will be sustained due to the progress towards results on outcomes at the Midterm Review |
| 2 | Moderately Unlikely (MU) | Significant risk that key outcomes will not carry on after project closure, although some outputs and activities should carry on |
| 1 | Unlikely (U) | Severe risks that project outcomes as well as key outputs will not be sustained |

**ToR ANNEX F: MTR Report Clearance Form**

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

**Midterm Review Report Reviewed and Cleared By:**

**Commissioning Unit**

Name: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Advisor**

Name: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

1. For ideas on innovative and participatory Monitoring and Evaluation strategies and techniques, see [UNDP Discussion Paper:Innovations in Monitoring & Evaluating Results](http://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/librarypage/capacity-building/discussion-paper--innovations-in-monitoring---evaluating-results/), 05 Nov 2013. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. <http://web.undp.org/evaluation/guideline/documents/PDF/UNDP_Evaluation_Guidelines.pdf> [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. For more stakeholder engagement in the M&E process, see the [UNDP Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results](http://www.undg.org/docs/11653/UNDP-PME-Handbook-%282009%29.pdf), Chapter 3, pg. 93. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. Populate with data from the Logframe and scorecards [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. Populate with data from the Project Document [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. If available [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. Colour code this column only [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. Use the 6 point Progress Towards Results Rating Scale: HS, S, MS, MU, U, HU [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. Alternatively, MTR conclusions may be integrated into the body of the report. [↑](#footnote-ref-9)