ANNEXES

Annex 1: MTR Terms of Reference

UNDP-GEF Midterm Review Terms of Reference

**Consultancy for UNDP-GEF Midterm Review of the
Sustainable Fuelwood Management Project in Nigeria**

Location	Nigeria
Project Title:	Sustainable Fuelwood Management in Nigeria
Application Deadline:	30th September 2019
Type of Contract	Individual Contract – International
Start Date:	October 2019
Assignment Type	Individual Contract (IC) – International
Language Required	English
Duration of Initial Contract	
Expected Duration of Assignment	3 months

1. INTRODUCTION

This is the Terms of Reference (ToR) for the UNDP-GEF Midterm Review (MTR) of the full-sized project titled "**Sustainable Fuelwood Management in Nigeria** (PIMS # 5366) implemented through the Energy Commission of Nigeria (ECN), which is to be undertaken in Q2 2019. The project started on Feb 7, 2017 and is in its second year of implementation. In line with the UNDP-GEF Guidance on MTRs, this MTR process was initiated before the submission of the second Project Implementation Report (PIR). This ToR sets out the expectations for this MTR. The MTR process must follow the guidance outlined in the document Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF- Financed Projects (http://web.undp.org/evaluation/guidance.shtml#gef).

2. PROJECT BACKGROUND INFORMATION

The Sustainable Fuelwood Management (SFM) project in Nigeria was designed to address the problem of deforestation in Nigeria. Over half of Nigeria's estimated 170 million inhabitants live below the poverty line, with over 70% of the population still relying on biomass for fuelwood. Rapid deforestation is a major concern with over half of the country's primary forests cut down in the last 10 years, exacerbated by rapid population growth of 2.5%. The unsustainable production and utilization of biomass resources represents one of the key drivers of deforestation and land degradation in Nigeria. In response to this challenge, the Government of Nigeria has secured funding from the Global Environment Facility (GEF) for a sustainable fuelwood management project. The project, which began implementation in May 2017, has a GEF grant of $4,410,000 and co-financing of $16,400,000.

The objective of the project is sustainable fuelwood production and consumption to secure the flow of multiple environmental benefits, including carbon storage and sequestration. This will be achieved through i) supply side management (the production and procurement of certified fuelwood from sustainably sourced feedstock from a) woodlands outside the protected forests in Cross River and Delta State in the South and b) from farmer-managed woodlots in Kaduna State in the North and ii) demand side management through the promotion of improved stoves/kilns in the domestic sub-sector as an inclusive business to reduce fuelwood demand, improve health and reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

To achieve this, the project has been divided into four main components:
- *Component 1*: Sustainable Fuelwood Supply
- *Component 2:* Fuelwood Demand Management

- *Component 3:* Domestic Industry for Clean Cook Stoves and Other Clean Energy Alternatives
- *Component 4:* Financial Models for Sustainable Fuelwood Management

The following outcomes are expected from the project:
- *Expected outcome of component 1:* **Models for sustainable fuelwood production demonstrated in:**
    - a. At least 10 communities in Cross River and Delta State leading to:
    - 50,000 ha of forestlands under improved multifunctional forest management;
    - Forest Management Committees (FMCs) created/strengthened in SFM
    - b. At least 10 communities in Kaduna State leading to:
    - 3,003 ha of degraded land restored with Sustainable Land Management measures like woodlots;
    - SLM Management Committee created/strengthened in SLM
- *Expected outcome of component 2:*
    - Improved awareness and acceptance of alternative (renewable and more efficient) energy technologies for domestic, institutional and industrial sub-sectors in Cross River, Delta and Kaduna States.
    - Increased penetration of improved/alternative energy technologies for domestic needs in targeted communities by at least 20% (BAU: 0.1%);
    - Avoided emissions of 40,000 t CO_2 eq/year from combustion of un-sustainable biomass in inefficient cook stoves/kilns (replaced by more efficient or other alternatives)
- *Expected outcome of component 3:*
    - Improved efficiency, quality and affordability of domestically manufactured cooking/heating appliances for domestic, institutional and industrial sub-sectors.
    - Strengthened domestic supply chain for EE/RE cooking and heating appliances
- *Expected outcome of component 4:*
    - Consumer financing model for EE cook stove/kiln successfully operates.
    - Sales of efficient cook stoves/kilns increased by at least 20% in Cross River, Delta and Kaduna State.
    - Investment in sustainable forest management in Cross River and Delta State increased

The project duration is 5 years starting from Feb 7, 2017 and ending Feb 6 2022 with an overall GEF budget of US $ 4,410,000 and co-financed by UNDP US$300,000, National Government (in –kind) 1,900,000, National Government (Grant) US$2,200,000, MFBs/MFIs US$3,000,000, UNREDD+ US$ 4,000,000, SME US$ 2,000,000, ICEED US$2,000,000, DARE US$1,000,000 total budget US$ 20,810,000.The project is nationally implemented (NIM) by the Energy Commission of Nigeria with UNDP Country office support.

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 to set the project on-track to achieve its intended results. The MTR will also review the project's strategy, its risks to sustainability.

4. MTR APPROACH & METHODOLOGY

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

collaborative and participatory approach ensuring close engagement with the Project Team, government counterparts (the GEF Operational Focal Point), the UNDP Country Office(s), UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Advisers, and other key stakeholders. Engagement of stakeholders is vital to a successful MTR. Stakeholder involvement should include interviews with stakeholders who have project responsibilities, including but not limited to the Project Steering Committee members, and the Energy Commission of Nigeria (ECN), Federal Ministry of Environment (FMEnv.), Federal Ministry of Finance (FMF), Federal Ministry of Budget and National Planning, Nigerian Alliance for Clean Cookstoves (NACC), National Orientation Agency, Cross River State Forestry Commission, Delta State Ministry of Environment, Kaduna State Ministry of Agriculture and Environment, Standard Organization of Nigeria (SON), Consumer Protection Council, Federal Ministry of Women Affairs, etc. Additionally, the MTR team is expected to conduct field missions to the three States where the project is focusing. The final MTR report should describe the full MTR approach taken and the rationale for the approach making explicit the underlying assumptions, challenges, strengths and weaknesses about the methods and approach of the review.

5. DETAILED SCOPE OF THE MTR

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

i   Project Strategy

Project design:
- Review the problem addressed by the project and the underlying assumptions.
- Review the effect of any incorrect assumptions or changes to the context 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?
- Review decision-making processes: were perspectives of those who would be affected by project decisions, those who could affect the outcomes, and those who could contribute information or other resources to the process, taken into account during project design processes?
- Review the extent to which relevant gender issues were raised in the project design. See Annex 9 of *Guidance for Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects* for further guidelines.
- If there are major areas of concern, recommend areas for improvement.

Results Framework/Log frame:
- Undertake a critical analysis of the project's Log frame indicators and targets, assess how "SMART" the midterm and end-of-project targets are (Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Relevant, Time bound), and suggest specific amendments/revisions to the targets and indicators as necessary.
- Are the project's objectives and outcomes or components clear, practical, and feasible   within its time frame?
- Examine if progress so far has led to / or could in the future catalyse beneficial development effects (i.e. income generation, gender equality and women's empowerment, improved governance etc...) that should be included in the project results framework and monitored on an annual basis.
- Ensure broader development and gender aspects of the project are being monitored effectively. Develop and recommend SMART 'development' indicators, including sex-disaggregated indicators and indicators that capture development benefits.

ii   Progress Towards Results Progress Towards Outcomes Analysis:

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

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

Project Strategy	Indicator (if applicable)	Baseline Level	Level in 1st PIR	Mid-Term Target	End of project Target	Mid-Term Level & Assessment	Achievement rating	Justification for Rating
Objective:								
Outcome 1:	Indicator 1:							
	Indicator 2:							
Outcome 2:	Indicator 3:							
	Indicator 4:							
	Etc.							
Etc.								

Indicator keys

Green = Achieved	Yellow = on target to be achieved	Red = not on target to be achieved

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

iii   Project Implementation and Adaptive Management

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

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 cofinancing: is co-financing being used strategically to help the objectives of the project? Is the Project Team meeting with all co-financing partners regularly in order to align financing priorities and annual work plans?

Project-level Monitoring and Evaluation Systems:

- Review the monitoring tools currently being used: Do they provide the necessary information? Do they involve key partners? Are they aligned or mainstreamed with national systems? Do they use existing information? Are they efficient? Are they cost-effective? Are additional tools required? How could they be made more participatory and inclusive?
- Examine the financial management of the project monitoring and evaluation budget. Are sufficient resources being allocated to monitoring and evaluation? Are these resources being allocated effectively?

Stakeholder Engagement:

- Project management: Has the project developed and leveraged the necessary and appropriate partnerships with direct and tangential stakeholders?
- Participation and country-driven processes: Do local and national government stakeholders support the objectives of the project? Do they continue to have an active role in project decision-making that supports efficient and effective project implementation?
- Participation and public awareness: To what extent has stakeholder involvement and public awareness contributed to the progress towards achievement of project objectives?

Reporting:

- Assess how adaptive management changes have been reported by the project management and shared with the Project Board.
- Assess how well the Project Team and partners undertake and fulfil GEF reporting requirements (i.e. how have they addressed poorly-rated PIRs, if applicable?)
- Assess how lessons derived from the adaptive management process have been documented, shared with key partners and internalized by partners.

Communications:

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

Sustainability

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

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

Socio-economic risks to sustainability:
- Are there any social or political risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project outcomes? What is the risk that the level of stakeholder ownership (including ownership by governments and other key stakeholders) will be insufficient to allow for the project outcomes/benefits to be sustained? Do the various key stakeholders see that it is in their interest that the project benefits continue to flow? Is there sufficient public / stakeholder awareness in support of the long term objectives of the project? Are lessons learned 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.

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

Conclusions & Recommendations
The MTR team will include a section of the report setting out the MTR's evidence-based conclusions, considering the findings.

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

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

Table. MTR Ratings & Achievement Summary Table for Sustainable Fuelwood Management (SFM) in Nigeria

Measures	MTR achievements	Achievements description
Project Strategy	N/A	
Progress Towards Results	Objective Achievement Rating: (rate 6-point scale)	
	Outcome 1 achievement ratings (rate 6-point scale)	
	Outcome 2 achievement ratings (rate 6-point scale rating)	
	Outcome 3 achievement rating (rate 6-point scale rating)	
	Etc.	
Project implementation & adaptive management	(rate 6-point scale rating)	
Sustainability	(rate 4-point scale rating)	

6   TIMEFRAMES

The total duration of the MTR will be approximately twenty-one (21) days over a time period of six (6) weeks starting (13 May 2019), and shall not exceed three (3) months from when the consultant(s) are hired. The tentative MTR timeframe is as follows:

Time Frame	Activity
27 September, 2019	Application closes
Before 7th October, 2019	Selected MTR Team
18 October, 2019	Prep the MTR Team (handover of Project Documents)
2 days (before 21 October 2019)	Document review and preparing MTR Inception Report
2 days (before 25 October 2019)	Finalization and Validation of MTR Inception Report- latest start of MTR mission
7 days (between 11 November 2019 and 20 November 2019)	MTR mission: stakeholder meetings, interviews, field visits
Between 18 - 20 November 2019)	Mission wrap-up meeting & presentation of initial findings earliest end of MTR mission
7days (25 November - 6 December 2019)	Preparing draft report
3 Weeks (28 December 2019)	Incorporating audit trail from feedback on draft report/Finalization of MTR report
TBD	Preparation & Issue of Management Response
TBD	Expected date of full MTR completion

Options for site visit should be provided in the inception report

7. MIDTERM REVIEW DELIVERABLES

S/N	Deliverables		Timeline		Payment
1	**MTR Inception Report**	MTR team clarifies objectives and methods of Midterm Review	No later than 2 weeks before the MTR mission: 25 October 2019	MTR team submits to the Commissioning Unit and project management	20%
2	**Presentation**	Initial Findings	End of MTR mission: 20 November 2019	MTR Team presents to project management and the Commissioning Unit	30%
3	**Draft Final Report**	Full report (using guidelines on content outlined in Annex B) with annexes	Within 3 weeks of the MTR mission: 6 December 2019	Sent to the Commissioning Unit, reviewed by RTA, Project Coordinating Unit, GEF OFP	30%
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: 28 December 2019	Sent to the Commissioning Unit	20%

*The final MTR report must be in English.

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

ToR ANNEX A:

List of Documents to be reviewed by the MTR Team

1. GEF Project Information Form (PIF)
2. UNDP Initiation Plan
3. UNDP Project Document
4. UNDP Environmental and Social Screening results
5. Project Inception Report
6. All Project Implementation Reports (PIR's)
7. Quarterly progress reports and work plans of the various implementation task teams
8. Audit reports
9. Finalized GEF focal area Tracking Tools at CEO endorsement and midterm (GEF CC Mitigation Tracking Tool)
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 SFM Project Steering Committee (PSC) Meetings and other meetings (i.e. Project Appraisal Committee meetings)
16. Project site location maps.

ToR ANNEX B:

Guidelines on Contents for the Midterm Review Report

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

5.2 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

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

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

MTR report
Annexed in a separate file: Relevant midterm tracking tools (METT, FSC, Capacity scorecard, etc.)