UNDP-GEF Midterm Review
Terms of Reference

Standard Template 1: Formatted for attachment to UNDP Procurement Website

1. INTRODUCTION

This is the Terms of Reference (ToR) for the UNDP-GEF Midterm Review (MTR) of the full-sized project titled Improving the Performance and Reliability of RE Power Systems in Samoa (IMPRESS) (PIMS 5669) implemented through the Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment, which is to be undertaken in 2020. The project started on the 2nd August 2017 and is 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). 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.

2. PROJECT BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Samoa is a small island developing state in the Pacific that is highly vulnerable to the impacts of climate change, and it is only responsible for an insignificant amount of global greenhouse gas emissions. However, Samoa is committed to combating and addressing issues associated with climate change including adaptation and mitigation measures to demonstrate to the world that all nations can take responsibility for a low-carbon future. Samoa submitted its Samoa’s Second National Communication to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) in 2007 and submitted Intended Nationally Determined Contribution (INDC) and information to facilitate the clarity, transparency and understanding of the contribution in September 2015.

It is clearly highlighted in the INDC report that the Energy Sector with a focus on the Electricity subsector is the main target sector for GHG emission reduction, and Samoa aims to achieve 100% electricity generation from RE by 2025. Assistance required to reach this target include human, technological and financial resources. Further economy-wide emissions reductions are conditional on Samoa receiving external financial assistance from the international community.

This project does not only directly respond to the requirements highlighted in the INDC report, but also complement the SDS, the Samoa Energy Sector Plan and the Energy Bill being planned and implemented by GOS. MNRE is the designated implementing agency for this GEF-funded project, and the key agency for RE development and implementation in Samoa with key partners being SOEs such as STEC and EPC.

The objective of the IMPRESS project therefore is the improved sustainable and cost-effective utilization of indigenous renewable energy resources for energy production in Samoa. This will be realized through development of RE and DSM/EE policies and regulatory frameworks, adoption of RE-based technologies in electricity generation and financing RE, and DSM/EE investments in Samoa. The project comprises the five (5) components:

- Component 1: Enhancement of Renewable Energy Policy Formulation and Implementation;
- Component 2: RE-based Energy System Improvements;
• Component 3: Financing of Initiatives for Electricity Saving, Productive and Social Uses of RE
  Electricity, and Electricity System Performance Improvement;
• Component 4: Productive & Social Uses of RE;
• Component 5: Enhancement of Awareness on the Applications and Benefits of RE/EE.

This project will be implemented over a 60 months period and is expected to achieve GHG emission reductions through the displacement of diesel electricity generation. Direct GHG emission reduction over the lifetime of the project is estimated to be 25,267 tCO2e.

The project is implemented over the course of 5 years and has started in 2017. UNDP is the GEF Implementing Agency and the Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment (MNRE), is the project’s lead Implementing Partner and STEC and EPC being responsible parties.

The project is being nationally executed as per UNDP National Implementation Modality (NIM) procedures. According to UNDP guidelines on National Implementation Modality (2011), the Government is responsible for the management and delivery of programme activities to achieve project outcomes/outputs. Government regulations, rules and procedures therefore apply to project implementation to the extent that they do not contravene the principles of the Financial Regulations and Rules of UNDP.

Project monitoring and evaluation will be conducted in accordance with established UNDP and GEF procedures and will be provided by the project team and the UNDP Multi-Country Office (UNDP-MCO) in Apia with support from the UNDP Regional Bureau for Asia-Pacific (RBAP) region in Bangkok.

The total GEF trust funds for this project is US$ 6,075,828 with in kind co-financing of US$ 46,439,200

3. OBJECTIVES OF THE MTR

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

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.

---

1 For ideas on innovative and participatory Monitoring and Evaluation strategies and techniques, see UNDP Discussion Paper: Innovations in Monitoring & Evaluating Results, 05 Nov 2013.
Engagement of stakeholders is vital to a successful MTR. Stakeholder involvement should include interviews with stakeholders who have project responsibilities, including but not limited to the Ministry of Natural Resources & Environment – Ministry of Finance – Ministry of Works, Transport, and Infrastructure (MWTI) – Ministry of Women, Communities and Social Development – Ministry of Commerce Industry and Labour – National Energy Coordinating Committee – Samoa Trust Estates Corporation – Electric Power Corporation – Scientific Research Organization of Samoa – Office of the Regulator – Small Business Enterprise Centre - Educational Institutions – Banks and Financial Institutions – Office of the Attorney General – Project Management Unit; executing agencies, 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. Additionally, the MTR team is expected to conduct field missions to Samoa, including a selection of the project sites on Samoa.

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 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/Logframe:
- Undertake a critical analysis of the project’s log frame indicators and targets, assess how “SMART” (Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Relevant, Time-bound) the indicators are, and whether the midterm and end-of-project targets are realistically achievable, and suggest specific amendments/revisions to the targets and indicators as necessary.
- Are the project’s objective and outcomes clear, practical, and feasible to be realized within its time frame?

2 For more stakeholder engagement in the M&E process, see the UNDP Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results, Chapter 3, pg. 93.
• Are each of the project components comprised of the relevant and necessary activities that will deliver the required outputs that will collectively bring about the expected outcome in each component?
• Examine if progress so far has led to or could in the future catalyze 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 log frame 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; color 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)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Strategy</th>
<th>Indicator(^3)</th>
<th>Baseline Level(^4)</th>
<th>Level in 1st PIR (self-reported)</th>
<th>Midterm Target(^5)</th>
<th>End-of-project Target</th>
<th>Midterm Level &amp; Assessment(^6)</th>
<th>Achievement Rating(^7)</th>
<th>Justification for Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Objective:</td>
<td>Indicator (if applicable):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 1:</td>
<td>Indicator 1:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indicator 2:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 2:</td>
<td>Indicator 3:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indicator 4:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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 analyze the GEF Tracking Tool indicator values at the Baseline with those achieved right before the Midterm Review.
• Identify remaining barriers to achieving the project objective in the remainder of the project, as well as barriers to the implementation of the project activities that could potentially affect the successful and timely completion of the project.
• By reviewing the aspects of the project that have already been successful, identify ways in which the project can further expand these benefits.

---

\(^3\) Populate with data from the Logframe and scorecards
\(^4\) Populate with data from the Project Document
\(^5\) If available
\(^6\) Color code this column only
\(^7\) Use the 6 point Progress Towards Results Rating Scale: HS, S, MS, MU, U, HU
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/log frame as a management tool and review any changes made to it since project start.

Finance and co-finance:
- Evaluate 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? Are the committed co-financing by the project partners/co-financers being realized?

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.

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)?

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, in light of the findings.8

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 an 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>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>MTR Rating</th>
<th>Achievement Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Strategy</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progress Towards Results</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective Achievement Rating:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(rate 6 pt. scale)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 1 Achievement Rating:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(rate 6 pt. scale)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 2 Achievement Rating:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(rate 6 pt. scale)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 3 Achievement Rating:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(rate 6 pt. scale)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Implementation &amp; Adaptive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>(rate 6 pt. scale)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability</td>
<td>(rate 4 pt. scale)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. TIMEFRAME

The total duration of the MTR will be approximately 25 over a time period of 18 weeks starting 4th May 2020 and shall not exceed five months from when the consultant(s) are hired. The tentative MTR timeframe is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIMEFRAME</th>
<th>ACTIVITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22nd May 2020</td>
<td>Application closes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th June 2020</td>
<td>Select MTR Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19th June 2020</td>
<td>Prep the MTR Team (handover of Project Documents)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26th June 2020: 4 working days</td>
<td>Document review and preparing MTR Inception Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd July 2020</td>
<td>Finalization and Validation of MTR Inception Report- latest start of</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8 Alternatively, MTR conclusions may be integrated into the body of the report.
### 7. MIDTERM REVIEW DELIVERABLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Deliverable</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Timing</th>
<th>Responsibilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>MTR Inception Report</td>
<td>MTR team clarifies objectives and methods of Midterm Review</td>
<td>No later than 2 weeks before the MTR mission: 26&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; June 2020</td>
<td>MTR team submits to the Commissioning Unit and project management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Presentation</td>
<td>Initial Findings</td>
<td>End of MTR mission: 14&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; August 2020</td>
<td>MTR Team presents to project management and the Commissioning Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Draft Final Report</td>
<td>Full report (using guidelines on content outlined in Annex B) with annexes</td>
<td>Within 3 weeks of the MTR mission: 4&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; September 2020</td>
<td>Sent to the Commissioning Unit, reviewed by RTA, Project Coordinating Unit, GEF OFP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Final Report*</td>
<td>Revised report with audit trail detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final MTR report</td>
<td>Within 2 weeks of receiving UNDP comments on draft: 30&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; September 2020</td>
<td>Sent to the Commissioning Unit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

### 8. MTR ARRANGEMENTS

The principal responsibility for managing this MTR resides with the Commissioning Unit. The Commissioning Unit for this project’s MTR is the UNDP Samoa Multi-country office for Cook Islands, Niue, Samoa and Tokelau based in Samoa.

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.

### 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 team expert, usually 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 selection of consultants will be aimed at maximizing the overall “team” qualities. In that regard, the following qualifications are required for the members of the “team”:

- At least a Post-graduate degree in the areas of Engineering, with focus on either Energy technologies, Renewable Energy technologies, and electric power systems.
- More than ten years of professional experience in Renewable Energy Systems, Energy Efficiency Applications, or Grid Stability Management, with substantive work undertaken in the electricity and energy sector, as well as a good understanding of mainstreaming gender and other cross-cutting priorities such as climate change;
- Minimum of 5 years’ experience in project evaluations, results-based monitoring, and/or evaluation methodologies
- Sound understanding of the UNDP-GEF Project Cycle Management, with demonstrated experience in designing and facilitating processes to enhance project implementation and its adaptive management through the application of M&E tools, including results-based management logical frameworks;
- Experience working in the Pacific region preferred
- Fluency in English (oral and written) is a requirement, with excellent written and presentation skills

10. PAYMENT MODALITIES AND SPECIFICATIONS

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

11. APPLICATION PROCESS

Recommended Presentation of Proposal:

a) Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability using the template\(^\text{10}\) provided by UNDP;

b) CV and a Personal History Form (P11 form\(^\text{11}\));

c) Brief description of approach to work/technical proposal of why the individual considers him/herself as the most suitable for the assignment, and a proposed methodology on how they will approach and complete the assignment; (max 1 page)

d) 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. 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

---

\(^9\) Engagement of the consultants should be done in line with guidelines for hiring consultants in the POPP: https://info.undp.org/global/popp/Pages/default.aspx

\(^10\) https://intranet.undp.org/unit/bom/psosupport%20documents%20on%20IC%20Guidelines/%20or%20Confir mation%20of%20Interest%20and%20Submission%20of%20Financial%20Proposal.docx

\(^11\) http://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/corporate/Careers/P11_Personal_history_form.doc
applicant must indicate at this point, and ensure that all such costs are duly incorporated in the financial proposal submitted to UNDP.

Criteria for Evaluation of Proposal: Only those applications which are responsive and compliant will be evaluated. Offers will be evaluated according to the Combined Scoring method – where the educational background and experience on similar assignments will be weighted at 70% and the price proposal will weigh as 30% of the total scoring. The applicant receiving the Highest Combined Score that has also accepted UNDP’s General Terms and Conditions will be awarded the contract.

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

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

ToR ANNEX B: Guidelines on Contents for the Midterm Review Report\(^\text{12}\)

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

\(^{12}\) The Report length should not exceed 40 pages in total (not including annexes).
• 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 (METT, FSC, Capacity scorecard, etc.)

ToR ANNEX C: Midterm Review Evaluative Matrix Template

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluative Questions</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>Methodology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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))</td>
<td>(i.e. relationships established, level of coherence between project design and implementation approach, specific activities conducted, quality of risk mitigation strategies, etc.)</td>
<td>(i.e. project documents, national policies or strategies, websites, project staff, project partners, data collected throughout the MTR mission, etc.)</td>
<td>(i.e. document analysis, data analysis, interviews with project staff, interviews with stakeholders, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progress Towards Results: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved thus far?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, socio-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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
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The objective/outcome is

---

### Ratings for Progress Towards Results: (one rating for each outcome and for the objective)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 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".

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 5        | Satisfactory (S)  

The objective/outcome is expected to achieve most of its end-of-project targets, with only minor shortcomings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 4        | Moderately Satisfactory (MS)  

The objective/outcome is expected to achieve most of its end-of-project targets but with significant shortcomings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 3        | Moderately Unsatisfactory (HU)  

The objective/outcome is expected to achieve its end-of-project targets with major shortcomings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 2        | Unsatisfactory (U)  

The objective/outcome is expected not to achieve most of its end-of-project targets.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 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)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 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".

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 2        | Unsatisfactory (U)  

Implementation of none of the seven components is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 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)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 2        | Moderately Unlikely (MU)  

Significant risk that key outcomes will not carry on after project closure, although some outputs and activities should carry on.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 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: ____________________________