Terms of Reference for International Consultant
UNDP/GEF Project Mid-term Review

Title: Team Leader (international consultant) Mid-Term Project Review
Project: Facilitating Renewable Energy and Energy Efficiency Applications for Greenhouse Gas Emission Reduction (FREAGER)
Duration: 45 days to be completed by 30 April 2020
Supervisor(s): UNDP PNG Country Office; UNDP/GEF Bangkok Regional Hub in consultation with national implementing partner, Climate Change Development Authority (CCDA) and responsible parties, PNG Power Limited, Milne Bay, Eastern Highlands and East Sepik Provincial Governments.
Duty Station: Port Moresby (With travel to Alotau, Goroka and Wewak)

1. INTRODUCTION

This is the Terms of Reference (ToR) for the Mid-Term Review (MTR) for the full-sized UNDP/GEF supported project titled *"Facilitating Renewable Energy and Energy Efficiency Applications for Greenhouse Gas Emission Reduction (FREAGER) (PIMS#:5569)"* implemented through the Climate Change Development Authority, PNG Power Limited, Eastern Highlands Provincial Government and East Sepik Provincial Government. The project started in October 2017 and is in its third year of implementation. This ToR sets out the expectations for this Mid-term Review (MTR). The MTR process must follow the guidance outlined in the document, *Guidance for Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects.*

2. PROJECT BACKGROUND INFORMATION

PNG's greenhouse gas (GHG) reduction efforts to date have focused on the forestry sector. Yet, despite low per capita energy use at present, with only 15 percent of the population having access to electricity. The adoption of renewable energy (RE) and energy efficiency (EE) technologies in PNG has strong potential both to reduce current GHG emissions and avoid future, growing GHG emissions expected as rising per capita energy use and electrification accompany development of the nation. Analysis shows that community RE mini-grid and township diesel center-based EE programs present particularly compelling win-win propositions for PNG. Over time, both will present substantial cost savings over the business-as-usual case, in which diesel is used, while at the same time lowering present or avoiding future GHG emissions. FREAGER will demonstrate the relevant technologies for and aim to achieve widespread replication of micro/mini-hydro mini-grids, solar PV mini-grids, and township EE programs. It will aim to do so by removing barriers to these technologies in the areas of policy and planning, technical and commercial viability, availability of financing, and information and awareness. In the policy and planning area, the project will promote these technologies via: capacity building programs for officials, through which the officials develop actual pipeline RE mini-grid projects and township EE programs; design of policy incentives; standards work; national roadmaps for community RE mini-grids and township EE programs; and provincial level RE and EE plans.

Technical and commercial viability will be supported through capacity building for technical personnel on RE mini-grids and on building and industrial EE. It will also be supported through developing and disseminating information on best international sourcing channels for EE and RE and on the "honest," best costing for community RE mini grids in PNG. Project demos will include two mini-hydro mini-grids and one PV mini-grid, with support also provided for productive use of RE at all three sites. In addition, demos of comprehensive EE programs (including building and industrial energy audits and retrofits, support for residential customers, support for future, large power customers, and street lighting retrofits) will be developed in two townships that are fully powered by diesel. The project will also support demonstration of PPAs and billing systems, as well as O&M training, for two mini-hydro projects that are already under development. Efforts related to financing EE and RE will include capacity building for the financial sector and the set-up of an ESCO fund to finance EE retrofits and a loan fund for community RE projects. Information and awareness work will include support to develop domestic manufacturing of RE mini-grid and EE products (and thus achieve lower cots) and briefings on the cost competitiveness of RE and EE as compared to diesel. It will further include a multi-channel media campaign for RE and EE and educational materials on RE and EE. It will also include RE mini-grid how-to handbooks tailored to PNG, pipeline RE mini-grid project listings, data from RE resource assessments, and curriculum from various project workshops, all available at a one-stop-shop website on RE and EE in PNG.

3. MID-TERM REVIEW OBJECTIVES

The Mid-Term Review (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 and sustainability.

The purpose of MTR is to examine the performance of the project since the beginning of its implementation. The review will include both the review of the progress in project implementation, measured against planned outputs set forth in the Project Document in accordance with rational budget allocation and the assessment of features related to the process involved in achieving those outputs, as well as the initial and potential impacts of the project. The review will also identify underlying causes and issues contributing to targets not adequately achieved This will greatly assist the project team and the implementing partners to take note and introduce changes that will contribute to the achievement of the of the targets.

The MTR is intended to identify weaknesses and strengths of the project design and make recommendations for any changes in the overall design and orientation of the project by evaluating the adequacy, relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, sustainability and ownership of its implementation, as well as assessing the project outputs and outcomes to date. Consequently, the review team is also expected to make detailed recommendations on the work plan for the remaining project period. It will also provide an opportunity to assess early signs of the project success or failure and prompt necessary adjustments.

The review will also identify lessons learnt and best practices from the project which could be applied to future and other on-going projects.

4. MTR APPROACH & METHODOLOGY

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

The MTR team is expected to follow a collaborative and participatory approach[1] ensuring close engagement with the UNDP Project Team, government counterparts (the GEF Operational Focal Point) such as PNG Power Limited, Climate Change Development Authority (CCDA), the UNDP Country Office(s), UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Advisers, and other key stakeholders at National and Provincial levels.

Engagement of stakeholders is vital to a successful MTR. Stakeholder involvement should include interviews with stakeholders who have project responsibilities, including but not limited to key partners and pilot provinces; implementing partners, key experts and consultants in the subject area, Project Board, project stakeholders, academia, local government and CSOs, etc. Additionally, the MTR team is expected to conduct field missions to Port Moresby, Papua New Guinea, including the project sites in Samarai, Milne Bay Province; Wewak and Maprik, East Sepik Province, Gotomi and Miruma in Eastern Highlands Province.

The international consultant required will lead the MTR which will be conducted in a participatory manner working on the basis that the objective is to assess project implementation and impacts in order to recommend improvements and lessons learnt for implementation and other decisions.

The MTR team leader is expected to lead the engagement with the Project Team, government counterparts, the UNDP Country Office(s), UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Advisers, and other key stakeholders.

The review will start with a desk review of project documentation and the following process:
   a. Desk review of project document, outputs, monitoring reports such as Project Inception Report, Minutes of Project Advisory Board and Technical Support and Advisory Team meetings, Project Implementation Report, Quarterly Progress Reports, Annual Progress Reports, mission reports and other internal documents including financial reports and relevant correspondence;
   b. Review of specific products including datasets, management and action plans, publications, audio visual materials, other materials and reports;
   c. Interviews with the Project Manager, other project staff including provinces; and
   d. Consultations and/or interviews with relevant stakeholders involved, including government representatives, local communities, NGO's, private sector, donors, other UN agencies and organizations.

Ensure 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 MID-TERM REVIEW
The MTR team leader make sure the team will assess the following four categories of project progress. Refer to the *Guidance for Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects.*

i. Project Strategy
Project design:
- Review the problem addressed by the project and the underlying assumptions. Review the effect of any incorrect assumptions or changes to the context to achieving the project results as outlined in the Project Document.

---

[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.

- 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 and sustainability mechanisms or approaches in place and beyond the end of the project. Was the project concept in line with the national sector development priorities and plans of the country?
- 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.
- 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, feasible and measurable within its time frame?
- Examine if progress so far has led to or could in the future catalyse beneficial development effects (i.e. income generation, gender equality and women's empowerment, improved governance etc...) that should be included in the project results framework and monitored on an annual basis.
- Ensure broader development and gender aspects of the project are being monitored effectively.

ii. Progress Towards Results

Progress Towards Outcomes Analysis:
- Review shall also assess the logframe indicators against progress made towards the end-of-project targets using the Progress Towards Results Matrix; 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: Progress Towards Results Matrix (Achievement of outcomes against End-of-project Targets)

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

[2] Populate with data from the Logframe and scorecards

[3] Populate with data from the Project Document

[4] If available

[5] Colour code this column only

[6] Use the 6 point Progress Towards Results Rating Scale: HS, S, MS, MU, U, HU

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 Project Results Tracker within the PIR at the Baseline with the one completed right before the Midterm Review.
- Identify remaining barriers to achieving the project objective in the remainder of the project.
- By reviewing the aspects of the project that have already been successful, identify ways in which the project can further expand these benefits.

iii. Project Implementation and Adaptive Management

Management Arrangements:

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

Work Planning:

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

Finance and co-finance:

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

Project-level Monitoring and Evaluation Systems:

- Review the monitoring tools currently being used: Do they provide the necessary information? Do they involve key partners? Are they aligned or mainstreamed with national systems? 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 Advisory Board.
- Assess how well the Project Team and partners undertake and fulfil UNDP/GEF reporting requirements (i.e. how have they addressed poorly rated PIRs, if applicable?)
- Assess how lessons derived from the adaptive management process have been documented, shared with key partners and internalized by partners.

Communications:
- Review internal project communication with stakeholders: Is communication regular and effective? Are there key stakeholders left out of communication? Are there feedback mechanisms when communication is received? Does this communication with stakeholders contribute to their awareness of project outcomes and activities and investment in the sustainability of project results?
- Review external project communication: Are proper means of communication established or being established to express the project progress and intended impact to the public (is there a web presence, for example? Or did the project implement appropriate outreach and public awareness campaigns?)
- For reporting purposes, write one half-page paragraph that summarizes the project's progress towards results in terms of contribution to sustainable development benefits, as well as global environmental benefits.

iv. Sustainability
- Validate whether the risks identified in the Project Document, PIRs, and the ATLAS Risk Management Module are the most important and whether the risk ratings applied are appropriate and up to date. If not, explain why.
- In addition, assess the following risks to sustainability:

Financial risks to sustainability:
- What is the likelihood of financial and economic resources not being available once the GEF assistance ends (consider potential resources can be from multiple sources, such as the public and private sectors, income generating activities, and other funding that will be adequate financial resources for sustaining project's outcomes)?

Socio-economic risks to sustainability:
- Are there any social or political risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project outcomes? What is the risk that the level of stakeholder ownership (including ownership by governments and other key stakeholders) will be insufficient to allow for the project outcomes/benefits to be sustained? Do the various

key stakeholders see that it is in their interest that the project benefits continue to flow? Is there sufficient public/stakeholder awareness in support of the long-term objectives of the project? Are lessons learned being documented by the Project Team on a continual basis and shared/ transferred to appropriate parties who could learn from the project and potentially replicate and/or scale it in the future?

<u>Institutional Framework and Governance risks to sustainability:</u>
- 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.

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

Conclusions & Recommendations

The MTR team leader will work with the team to include a section of the report setting out the MTR's evidence-based conclusions, in light of the findings.[7]

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.

Rec #	Recommendation	Entity Responsible
A	*(State Outcome 1)* (Outcome 1)	
A.1	**Key recommendation:**	
A.2		
A.3		
B	*(State Outcome 2)* (Outcome 2)	
B.1	**Key recommendation:**	
B.2		
B.3		
C	*(State Outcome 3)* (Outcome 3), etc.	
C.1	**Key recommendation:**	
C.2		
C.3		
D	Project Implementation & Adaptive Management	
D.1	**Key recommendation:**	
D.2		
D.3		
E	Sustainability	
E.1	**Key recommendation:**	
E.2		
E.		

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

---

[7] Alternatively, MTE conclusions may be integrated into the body of the report.

Ratings

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

Table. MTR Ratings & Achievement Summary Table for (*Project Title*)

Measure	MTR Rating	Achievement Description
Project Strategy	N/A	
Progress Towards Results	Objective Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale)	
	Outcome 1 Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale)	
	Outcome 2 Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale)	
	Outcome 3 Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale)	
	Etc.	
Project Implementation & Adaptive Management	(rate 6 pt. scale)	
Sustainability	(rate 4 pt. scale)	

6. PROPOSED SCHEDULE

This consultancy will be for approximately 45 working days starting in January 2020 and will not exceed five months from when the consultant(s) are hired. The tentative MTR timeframe is as follows:

TIMEFRAME	ACTIVITY
11 November 2019	Application closes
18 - 22 November 2019	Select MTR Team/Signing of Contracts
25-29 November 2019	Prep the MTR Team (handover of Project Documents)/Discuss workplan
25 November –04 December 2019	Document review and preparing MTR Inception Report
09 - 10 December 2019	Finalization and Validation of MTR Inception Report
17 February – 28 February 2020	MTR field mission to project sites for meeting with stakeholders
02 - 03 March 2020	Mission wrap-up & presentation of initial findings- earliest end of MTR mission
20 March 2020	Draft MTR report due
23 - 27 March 2020	Circulate Draft MTR for stakeholder review and comments
30 - 31 March 2020	Receive all consolidated stakeholder comments from MTR team members supported by UNDP Project Team
01 -03 April 2020	Incorporating audit trail from feedback on draft report/Finalization of MTR report
07 – 10 April 2020	Preparation & Issue of UNDP Management Responses to MTR Recommendations
24 April 2020	Expected date of full MTR completion

Options for site visits should be provided in the inception report.

7. DELIVERABLES

The report together with the annexes shall be written in English and shall be presented in electronic form in MS Word format.

The tentative MTR schedule of deliverables, responsibilities and timeframes is detailed below:

#	Deliverable	Description	Timing	Due Date	Responsibilities
1	MTR Inception Report	MTR team clarifies objectives and methods of Midterm Review	No later than 2 weeks before the MTR mission	10 December 2019	MTR team submits to the Commissioning Unit and project management
2	Presentation	Initial Findings	End of MTR mission	27 February 2020	MTR Team presents to project management and the Commissioning Unit
3	Draft Report	Full report (using guidelines on content outlined in Annex B) with annexes	Within 3 weeks of the MTR mission	20 March 2020	Sent to the Commissioning Unit, reviewed by RTA, Project Coordinating Unit, GEF OFP
4	Final Report*	Revised report with audit trail detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final MTR report	Within 2 weeks of receiving UNDP comments on draft	24 April 2020	Sent to the Commissioning Unit

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

8. MTR ARRANGEMENTS

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

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

9. TEAM COMPOSITION

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

The team leader will be supported by national expert consultant to conduct the MTR.

The selection of consultants will be aimed at maximizing the overall "team" qualities in the following areas:

Position	Team Leader (International Consultant)
General Qualifications and Experience	

Academic Qualifications:

Master's degree Electrical Engineering or other closely related field such as Environment or Natural Resources Management from an accredited College or University. Additional training in Renewable Energy and Energy Efficiency including climate change related fields is an advantage.

Experience:

- Recent experience with result-based management and/or evaluation methodologies;
- Experience in evaluating Renewable Energy and Energy Efficiency Projects;
- Experience applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios;
- Competence in adaptive management, as applied to biodiversity conservation;
- Experience working in Papua New Guinea, Pacific Islands, or Developing Countries;
- Familiarity with the challenges developing countries face in sustainable natural resource management and biodiversity conservation that includes communities;
- Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender and biodiversity conservation and/or community-based conservation/natural resource management; experience in gender sensitive evaluation and analysis.
- Experience working with GEF or GEF evaluations, UNDP evaluations or other UN agencies and/or international organizations and/or major donor agencies is an advantage;
- Excellent communication skills;
- Demonstrable analytical skills;

Language:

- Excellent written and oral English skills is a necessary requirement

10. PAYMENT MODALITIES AND SPECIFICATIONS

The international and national consultants will be paid on lump sum basis including international and domestic travel and DSA upon satisfactory delivery.

10% of payment upon approval of the final MTR Inception Report
10% of payment upon approval and presentation of Initial Findings
30% of payment upon submission of the draft MTR report
50% of payment upon finalization and approval of the MTR report

Evaluation

Cumulative analysis

The proposals will be evaluated using the cumulative analysis method with a split 70% technical and 30% financial scoring. The proposal with the highest cumulative scoring will be awarded the contract. Applications will be evaluated technically, and points are attributed based on how well the proposal meets the requirements of the Terms of Reference using the guidelines detailed in the table below:

When using this weighted scoring method, the award of the contract may 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 weighting; 70%
* Financial Criteria weighting; 30%

Only candidates obtaining a minimum of 49 points in the Technical Evaluation would be considered for the Financial Evaluation. Interviews may be conducted as part of technical assessment for shortlisted proposals.

Criteria	Points	Percentage
Qualification		**12%**
Master's degree Electrical Engineering or other closely related field such as Environment or Natural Resources Management from an accredited College or University. Additional training in Renewable Energy and Energy Efficiency including climate change related fields is an advantage.	12	
Experience		**56%**
• Recent experience with result-based management and/or evaluation methodologies	10	
• Experience in evaluating Renewable Energy and Energy Efficiency Projects	10	
• Experience applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios	10	
• Competence in adaptive management, as applied to biodiversity conservation	6	
• Experience working in Papua New Guinea, Pacific Islands, or Developing Countries	5	
• Familiarity with the challenges developing countries face in sustainable natural resource management and biodiversity conservation that includes communities	5	
• Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender and biodiversity conservation and/or community-based conservation/natural resource management; experience in gender sensitive evaluation and analysis	5	
• Experience working with GEF or GEF evaluations, UNDP evaluations or other UN agencies and/or international organizations and/or major donor agencies is an advantage	5	
Competencies		**2%**
• Excellent communication skills; • Demonstrable analytical skills.	1 1	
Technical Criteria		70%
**If necessary interviews shall also be conducted as part of the technical evaluation to ascertain best value for money.		
Financial Criteria – Lowest Price		30%
Total		**100%**

Documents to be included when submitting Consultancy Proposals

The following documents may be requested:

a) Duly executed **Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability** using the template provided by UNDP;

b) **CV**, indicating all past experience from similar projects, as well as the contact details (email and telephone number) of the Candidate and at least three (3) professional references;

c) **Brief description** of why the individual considers him/herself as the most suitable for the assignment, and a methodology, if applicable, on how they will approach and complete the assignment. A methodology is recommended for intellectual services, but may be omitted for support services;

d) **Financial Proposal** that indicates the all-inclusive fixed total contract price, supported by a breakdown of costs, as per template provided. If an Offeror 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 Offeror must stipulate that arrangement at this point, and ensure that all such costs are duly incorporated.

Lump-sum contracts

The financial proposal shall specify a total lump-sum amount, and payment terms around specific and measurable (qualitative and quantitative) deliverables (i.e. whether payments fall in instalments or upon completion of the entire contract). Payments are based upon output, i.e. upon delivery of the services specified in the TOR. To assist the requesting unit in the comparison of financial proposals, the financial proposal will include a breakdown of this lump-sum amount (including travel, living expenses, and number of anticipated working days).

Travel

All envisaged travel costs must be included in the financial proposal. This includes all travel to join duty station/repatriation travel. In general, UNDP should not accept travel costs exceeding those of an economy class ticket; should the IC wish to travel on a higher class, they should do so using their own resources.

In the case of unforeseeable travel, payment of travel costs including tickets, lodging, and terminal expenses should be agreed upon, between the respective business unit and Individual Consultant, prior to travel and will be reimbursed.

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 (PIRs)
7. Quarterly progress reports and work plans of the various implementation task teams
8. Audit reports
9. Finalized BD Tracking Tools at CEO endorsement and midterm (*fill in Results Tracker tab of the Project Performance Review*)
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 Annual Project Board Meetings and other meetings (i.e. Project Appraisal Committee (LPAC) meetings)
16. Project site location maps

ToR ANNEX B: Guidelines on Contents for the Midterm Review Report[8]

   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)
- MTE 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

---

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

- 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 (review 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 MTE mission, etc.)	(i.e. document analysis, data analysis, interviews with project staff, interviews with stakeholders, etc.)
Progress Towards Results: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved thus far?			
Project Implementation and Adaptive Management: Has the project been implemented efficiently, cost-effectively, and been able to adapt to any changing conditions thus far? To what extent are project-level monitoring and evaluation systems, reporting, and project communications supporting the project's implementation?			
Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, socio-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?			

Evaluators/Consultants:

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

MTR Consultant Agreement Form

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

Name of Consultant: _____

Name of Consultancy Organization (where relevant): _____

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

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

Signature: _____

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

Midterm Review Report Reviewed and Cleared By:

Commissioning Unit

Name: _____

Signature: _____   Date: _____

UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Advisor

Name: _____

Signature: _____   Date: _____

Prepared by: _____
        Linda Kapus-Barae, Programme Associate (Energy and Environment)

Approved by: _____
        Edward Vrkic, Senior Advisor, Climate Change