##### MTR ToR

##### TERMS OF REFERENCE UNDP - CROSS BORDER PROJECT MIDTERM REVIEW

**Project title:** Cross – border cooperation between Ethiopia and Kenya for Conflict Prevention and Peace building in Marsabit-Moyale Cluster

##### INTRODUCTION

This is the Terms of Reference (ToR) for the Cross border project Midterm Review (MTR) of the full-sized project titled Cross border cooperation between Ethiopia and Kenya for Conflict Prevention and Peace building in Marsabit-Moyale Cluster implemented in close collaboration with Ministry of Devolution and County Government of Marsabit and the Ministry of Peace, Oromia Regional Government and Somali Regional Government of the Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia. The project which is in its second year of implementation started February 2018. This ToR sets out the expectations for this MTR. The MTR process follows the guidance outlined in the document *Guidance for Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Ethiopia and UNDP- Kenya Supported projects.*

##### PROJECT BACKGROUND INFORMATION

The United Nation Development Programme (UNDP) in collaboration with the Governments of Ethiopia and Kenya, and the Intergovernmental Authority on Development (IGAD), started implementation of this Cross-border cooperation project between Ethiopia and Kenya for conflict prevention and peacebuilding in Marsabit-Moyale cluster. In Kenya, the objectives of the project are in line with the Government of Kenya’s policy under the Third Medium-Term Plan (2018- 2022) of the Sector Working group of Security, Peace Building and Conflict Resolution that emphasizes the importance of addressing cross-border conflicts and regional instabilities as well as strengthening early warning systems. In Ethiopia, the objectives of the project are well-aligned with Growth and Transformation Plan II and other subsequent national and regional plans. The three-year project is a response to the Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) signed by the Governments of Ethiopia and Kenya to promote sustainable peace and socio-economic development in the border region of both countries. It will focus on supporting the implementation of peace building and prevention of violent conflict initiatives aimed at reducing vulnerability and increasing resilience of communities affected by conflict in the border areas of Marsabit County, Kenya and the Borana and Dawa Zones, Ethiopia. This project is part of the Cross-Border Integrated Programme for Sustainable Peace and Socio-economic Transformation: Marsabit County, Kenya; and Borana and Dawa Zones, Ethiopia. The project is well linked to the Regional Project: Support for Effective Cooperation and Coordination of Cross-border Initiatives (SECCCI Project) implemented and undertaken by the Regional Service Center for Africa.

The key result areas of the project include:

1. *Improved capacity of local governments for preventing conflict and promoting sustainable peace;*
2. *Enhanced peace and strengthen community resilience to prevent conflict and withstand shocks*
3. *Efficiency and effective delivery of outputs and activities on conflict prevention and peace*

*building enhanced.*

The project is expected to run from February 2018 to February 2021 with a total budget of USD 2,037,338 funded by European Union.

##### OBJECTIVES OF THE MTR

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

The mid-term review will have the specific objectives of:

* + Review and reconstruct the theory of change of the project to map the results pathways and also assess cause - effect relationships.
  + Assess the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability of the project interventions;
  + Identify implementation issues and challenges/bottlenecks which constrain project and financial delivery;
  + Provide evidence whether the project implementation is on track or off-track during the mid-year period and propose measures to rectify;
  + Identify lessons learned and recommendations, based on evidence, so as to improve relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability of project results, and also document knowledge basis from the programme design and implementation;
  + Identify strengths and weaknesses of the project in the application of right-based approach, participation and inclusion and possible recommendations to apply in the remaining period of the project;

##### 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, project reports, activity reports and any other materials that the team considers useful for this evidence-based review. The MTR team will review the result framework which was developed during the initiation stage.

The mid-term review is an opportunity to examine, as systematically and objectively as possible, the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, appropriateness and sustainability of the Cross Border Project in supporting the implementation of peace building and prevention of violent conflict initiatives and in reducing vulnerability and increasing resilience of the targeted communities.

The MTR team is expected to follow a collaborative and participatory approach16 ensuring close engagement with the Project Team, government counterparts (Ministry of Devolution and ASALs County Governments in Kenya, and Ministry of Peace and Regional Governments of Oromia/Somalia), the UNDP Country Office(s), UNDP-Chief Technical Advisers, and other key stakeholders.

Engagement of stakeholders is vital to a successful MTR17. Stakeholder involvement should include interviews with stakeholders who have project responsibilities, including but not limited to County Government of Marsabit, 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 the County of Marsabit and Borana/Dawa Zones. 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.

##### DETAILED SCOPE OF THE MTR

The MTR team will assess the following four categories of project progress.

##### 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 on the achievement of 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/County and regional governments’ priorities. Review ownership. Was the project concept in line with the national sector development priorities and plans and County priorities as outlined in County Integrated Development Plan?
  + 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, considered during project design processes?
  + Review the extent to which relevant gender issues are included in the project design and implementation.
  + If there are major areas of concern, recommend areas for improvement. Results Framework/Log frame:
  + Undertake a critical analysis of the project’s logframe indicators and targets, assess how “SMART” the midterm and end-of-project targets are (Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Relevant, Time-bound), and suggest specific amendments/revisions to the targets and indicators as necessary.
  + Are the project’s objectives and outcomes or components clear, practical, and feasible within 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.
  + Analyse whether broader development and gender aspects of the project are being monitored effectively. If not, recommend SMART ‘development’ indicators, including sex- disaggregated indicators and indicators that capture development benefits.

##### 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*; 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** | **Indicator18** | **Baseline Level19** | **Level in 1st PIR (self- reported)** | **Midterm Target20** | **End of project Target** | **Midterm Level & Assessment21** | **Achievement Rating22** | **Justification for Rating** |
| **Objective:** | Indicator  (if applicable): |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Outcome 1:** | Indicator 1: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Indicator 2: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Outcome 2:** | Indicator 3: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Indicator 4: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 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:

* Identify remaining barriers to and challenges in achieving the project objective in the remainder of the project implementation period.
* By reviewing the aspects of the project that have already been successful, identify ways in which the project can further expand these benefits.

##### 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
* Review the quality of execution of the Executing Agency/Implementing Partner(s) and recommend areas for improvement.
* Review the quality of support provided by 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?
* Is the sequencing of the action the most effective one to reach the intended project objectives?
* 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? If the need is identified, 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?
* Coordination: is there sufficient coordination among the different actors and stakeholders involved in the project to maximize positive project results, including whether there is sufficient awareness and capacity among the various stakeholder groups for them to benefit as intended

**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 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 key stakeholders left out of communication? Does communication with stakeholders contribute to raise 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.
* Review the extent to which the project has contributed to increased income from sustainable use of natural resources (with respect to Outcome 3), and to assess the magnitude, distribution and sustainability of any such increased income.

In addition, assess the following risks to sustainability:

**Financial risks to sustainability:**

* Are the financial and economic resources likely to be available once the funding ends (consider potential resources from multiple sources, such as the public and private sectors, income generating activities, and other funding that is likely to be available 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?

**Process-related risks to sustainability:**

* Are lessons learned 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 shall include a section of the report setting out the MTR’s evidence-based conclusions, in light of the findings.23

Recommendations shall be succinct suggestions for critical intervention that are specific, measurable, achievable, and relevant. A recommendation table should be put in the report’s Executive Summary.

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

##### Ratings

The MTR team 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 the Project: *Cross border cooperation between Ethiopia and Kenya for conflict prevention and peacebuilding in Marsabit-Moyale Cluster***

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **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) |  |

**TIME FRAME**

The total duration of the MTR will be approximately 30 working days spread over a period of three months from when the consultant is hired. The tentative flow of activities is as follows:

|  |
| --- |
| **ACTIVITY** |
| Application closes |
| Select MTR Consultant |
| Prep the MTR Team (handover of Project Documents) |
| Document review and preparing MTR Inception Report |
| Finalization and Validation of MTR Inception Report- latest start of MTR mission |
| MTR mission: stakeholder meetings, interviews, field visits |
| Mission wrap-up meeting & presentation of initial findings- earliest end of MTR mission |
| Preparing draft report |
| Incorporating audit trail from feedback on draft report/Finalization of MTR report |
| Preparation & Issue of Management Response |
| (optional) Concluding Stakeholder Workshop (not mandatory for MTR consultant) |
| Expected date of full MTR completion |

Please note the contract duration is 30 working days. Please see below proposed field visit days and locations to assist you in preparing the financial proposal (offerors letter to UNDP).

* + 5 days in Nairobi to undertake desk review and also interview project staff in Nairobi.
  + 2 days in Marsabit town to interview the County Government and other stakeholders.
  + 2 days in Moyale Kenyan side.
  + 2 days in Moyale Ethiopian side.
  + 4 days in Yabello, Borana Zone.
  + 4 days in Dawa Zone.

##### MIDTERM REVIEW DELIVERABLES

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **#** | **Deliverable** | **Description** | **Timing** | **Responsibilities** |
| **1** | **MTR Inception Report** | MTR consultant clarifies  objectives and methods of Midterm Review | No later than 1 weeks  before the MTR mission: | MTR Consultant submits to the  Commissioning Unit and project management |
| **2** | **Presentation** | Initial Findings | End of MTR mission: | MTR Consultant presents to project  management and the Commissioning Unit |
| **3** | **Draft Final Report** | Full report (using guidelines on  content outlined in Annex B) with annexes | Within 3 weeks of the MTR mission: | MTR Consultant submits 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 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft: | MTR Consultant submits 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.

##### MTR ARRANGEMENTS

**Duty Station –** This assignment is home based with field travel as per schedule shared under timeframe. The consultant will not be required to work from UN Giriri and will be expected to provide his/her own equipment (laptop etc.) and working space. The principal responsibility for managing this MTR resides with the Commissioning Unit. The Commissioning Unit for this project’s MTR is the UNDP Country Office. The commissioning unit will contract the consultant 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.

##### CONSULTANT QUALIFICATIONS

An independent consultant with the regional experience and exposure to projects and evaluations of natural resource management interventions will conduct the MTR. The consultant will not 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 any project-related activities.

##### Qualifications and evaluation criteria

* Postgraduate (PhD or master’s degree) in a relevant field such as project planning and

management; development studies, peace building and conflict management (15 marks)

* Knowledge/work experience on peace building and conflict management. (15 marks)
* Recent experience with result-based management evaluation methodologies; (15 marks)
* Experience applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios; (10 marks)
* Work experience in relevant technical areas for at least 10 years; (10 marks)
* Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender and peace building; experience in gender sensitive evaluation and analysis; (5 marks)
* Excellent communication skills; excellent mastery of drafting in the English language (10 marks)
* Demonstrable analytical skills; (10 marks)
* Project evaluation/review experiences within United Nations system will be considered an asset; (10 marks)

**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. Only candidates obtaining a minimum of 49 points (70%) on technical evaluation will be considered for the Financial Evaluation.

##### Financial evaluation (maximum 30 points):

The following formula will be used to evaluate financial proposal:

p = y (μ/z), where

p = points for the financial proposal being evaluated

y = maximum number of points for the financial proposal

μ = price of the lowest priced proposal

z = price of the proposal being evaluated

##### 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

Transport for field work and DSA will be provided to the consultant while in the field at the UN applicable rates.

##### APPLICATION PROCESS

Interested and qualified candidates should submit their applications which should include the following:

1. Proposal for implementing the assignment - template provided

3. Offerors letter to UNDP- template provided

##### Note: Email attachments must not exceed 5MB. Please split files if they exceed this size. Applications should be sent to [undp.kenya.procurement@undp.org](mailto:undp.kenya.procurement@undp.org) to reach us not later than 11.59

##### p.m. on Sunday, 03 April 2020 (Kenyan time - GMT+ 3.00)

Please quote **“KEN/IC/2019/009 – MTR for the Kenya- Ethiopia Cross Boarder Project”** on the subject line.

##### DO NOT COPY ANY OTHER RECIPIENT

## MTR evaluative matrix

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Scope** | **MTR Questions** | **Populations / Data Sources** | **Methods** |
| ***A. Project Strategy***  **i) Relevance** | ***1.Project design:***   1. What is the problem addressed by the project? 2. What are the underlying assumptions? 3. Are there any incorrect assumptions or changes to the context? 4. What have been the effects of the incorrect assumptions or changes to the context on the achievement of the project results as outlined in the Project Document. 5. Is the project strategy relevant? 6. Does it provide the most effective route towards expected/intended results? 7. Were lessons from other relevant projects properly incorporated into the project design? 8. How does the project address Country/County and regional governments’ priorities? 9. Do the beneficiaries feel they own it? 10. Was the project concept in line with the national sector development priorities and plans and County priorities as outlined in County Integrated Development Plan? 11. Were perspectives of those who would be affected by the project decisions (those who could affect the outcomes, and those who could contribute information or other resources to the process, considered during project design processes? (decision-making processes) 12. To what extent are relevant gender issues included in the project design and implementation? 13. What are the major areas of concern? (Recommend areas for improvement). | Executive Government CSOs in the region | Documents / literature review, Meetings/KIIs |
| ***2.Results Framework/Log frame***:   1. How “SMART” are the midterm and end-of-project targets? 2. What specific amendments/revisions should be made to the targets and indicators? 3. Are the project’s objectives and outcomes or components clear, practical, and feasible within its time frame? 4. Has the 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, improve governance etc...) that should be included in the project results framework and monitored on an annual basis? 5. Are the broader development and gender aspects of the project being monitored effectively? If not,   recommend SMART ‘development’ indicators, including sex disaggregated indicators and indicators that  capture development benefits. | Executive Government |
| ***B. Progress Towards Results***   1. **Effectiveness** 2. **Impact** | **1. *Progress Towards Outcomes Analysis:***   1. What progress, based on / against the log frame indicators, has been made towards the end-of- project targets? 2. What are the remaining barriers to and challenges in achieving the project objective in the remainder of the project implementation period? 3. What are the ways in which the project can further expand these benefits (the aspects of the project that have already been successful)? | Executive Government Peace Committees  Local Communities Religious Leaders | KIIs,  Documents / literature review |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Scope** | **MTR Questions** | **Populations / Data Sources** | **Methods** |
| ***C. Project Implementation and Adaptive Management***   1. **Effectiveness** 2. **Efficiency** | ***1. Management Arrangements:***   1. What is the overall project management effectiveness as outlined in the Project Document? 2. Have changes been made and are they effective? 3. Are responsibilities and reporting lines clear? 4. Is decision-making transparent and undertaken in a timely manner? 5. What is the quality of execution of the Executing Agency/Implementing Partner(s)? What areas are recommend for improvement? 6. What is the quality of support provided by UNDP? What areas are recommended for improvement? | Executive Government | Documents / literature review, KIIs |
| **2. *Work Planning:***   1. Have there been any delays in project start-up and implementation? What are the causes? Have these been resolved? 2. Are work-planning processes results-based? If not, by what ways can work planning be re-orientate to focus on results? 3. Is the sequencing of the action the most effective one to reach the intended project objectives? 4. Is the project’s results framework/ logframe used as a management tool and how? Have any changes been made to it since project start? | Executive Government Peace Committees  Local Communities Religious Leaders CSOs in the region | Documents / literature review KIIs, |
| **3. *Finance and co-finance:***   1. What financial management does the project have especially with specific reference to the cost- effectiveness of interventions? 2. What changes have been made to fund allocations as a result of budget revisions? 3. How appropriateness and relevant are such revisions? 4. 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? 5. Is co-financing being used strategically to help the objectives of the project? (Informed by the co- financing monitoring table to be filled out, provide commentary on co-financing? 6. Is the Project Team meeting with all co-financing partners regularly in order to align financing priorities and annual work plans? | Executive Government | KIIs/Meetings, Documents / literature review |
| ***4. Project-level Monitoring and Evaluation Systems:***   1. Do the monitoring tools currently being used provide the necessary information? 2. Do they involve key partners? 3. Are they aligned or mainstreamed with national systems? 4. Do they use existing information? 5. Are they efficient? Are they cost-effective? 6. Are additional tools required? If the need is identified, how could they be made more participatory and inclusive? 7. Is the financial management of the project monitoring and evaluation budget efficient? 8. Are sufficient resources being allocated to monitoring and evaluation? Are these resources being allocated effectively? | Executive Government CSOs in the region | KIIs/Meetings, Documents / literature review |
| **5. *Stakeholder Engagement:*** | Executive | KIIs/Discussions, |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Scope** | **MTR Questions** | **Populations / Data Sources** | **Methods** |
|  | 1. *Project management*: Has the project developed and leveraged the necessary and appropriate partnerships with direct and tangential stakeholders? 2. *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? 3. *Participation and public awareness*: To what extent has stakeholder involvement and public awareness contributed to the progress towards achievement of project objectives? 4. *Coordination*: Is there sufficient coordination among the different actors and stakeholders involved in the project to maximize positive project results, including? Is there sufficient awareness and capacity among the various stakeholder groups for them to benefit as   intended? | Government Peace Committees  Local Communities Religious Leaders CSOs in the region | Documents / literature review |
| **6. *Reporting:***   1. How adaptive have management changes been reported by the project management and shared with the Project Board? 2. How well do the Project Team and partners undertake and fulfil reporting requirements (i.e. how have they addressed poorly rated PIRs, if applicable?) 3. How have lessons derived from the adaptive management process been documented, shared   with key partners and internalized by partners? | Executive Government Peace Committees  Local Communities Religious Leaders CSOs in the region | KIIs/Discussions, Documents / literature review |
| **7. *Communications:***   1. Is *internal project communication* with stakeholders regular and effective? 2. Are key stakeholders left out of communication? 3. Does communication with stakeholders contribute to raise their awareness of project outcomes and activities and investment in the sustainability of project results? 4. 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?) (*external project communication*) 5. What is the project’s progress towards results in terms of contribution to sustainable   development benefits, as well as global environmental benefits? | Executive Government Peace Committees  Local Communities Religious Leaders CSOs in the region | KIIs/Discussions, Documents / literature review |
| ***D. Sustainability*** | 1. Are the risks identified in the Project Document, Annual Project Review/PIRs and the ATLAS Risk Management Module the most important? Are the risk ratings applied appropriate and up to date? If not, explain why? 2. To what extent has the project contributed to increased income from sustainable use of natural resources (with respect to Outcome 3). What is the magnitude, distribution and   sustainability of any such increased income? | Executive Government Peace Committees  Local Communities Religious Leaders CSOs in the region | KIIs/Discussions, Documents / literature review |
| **3. *Financial risks to sustainability:*** | Executive  Government |  |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Scope** | **MTR Questions** | **Populations / Data Sources** | **Methods** |
|  | a) Are the financial and economic resources likely to be available once the funding ends? (Consider potential resources from multiple sources, such as the public and private sectors, income generating activities, and other funding that is likely to be available for sustaining  project’s outcomes)? | CSOs in the region |  |
| **4. *Socio-economic risks to sustainability:***   1. Are there any social or political risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project outcomes? 2. 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? 3. Do the various key stakeholders see that it is in their interest that the project benefits continue to flow? 4. Is there sufficient public / stakeholder awareness in support of the long-term objectives of the project? | Executive Government Peace Committees  Local Communities Religious Leaders CSOs in the region | KIIs,  Documents / literature review |
| ***5. Process-related risks to sustainability:***  a) Are lessons learned 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? | Executive Government Peace Committees  Local Communities Religious Leaders  CSOs in the region | KIIs,  Documents / literature review |
| **6. *Institutional Framework and Governance risks to sustainability:***   1. Do the legal frameworks, policies, governance structures and processes pose risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project benefits? 2. Are the required systems/ mechanisms for accountability, transparency, and technical   knowledge transfer in place? | Executive Government CSOs in the region | KIIs,  Documents / literature review |
| **7. *Environmental risks to sustainability:***  a) Are there any environmental risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project outcomes? | Executive Government Peace Committees  Local Communities Religious Leaders  CSOs in the region | KIIs,  Documents / literature review |

## **1.2 Example Questionnaire or Interview Guide used for data collection**

**UNDP - CROSS BORDER PROJECT MIDTERM REVIEW**

**Project title:** Cross-border Cooperation between Ethiopia and Kenya for Conflict Prevention and Peace Building in Marsabit-Moyale Cluster

**Interview Guide:** Executive (Project Board and IGAD/ CEWARN) and UNDP project staff (UNDP ET and KEN project staff, UNDP, Service Centre, ADD staff, PMU in Moyale)

**Time:** 1 to 11/2 hours

1. **Project Strategy**

#### Project design:

* 1. What is the problem addressed by the project?
     1. What are the underlying assumptions of the project Theory of Change?
     2. Are there any incorrect assumptions?
     3. Have there been changes to the context?
     4. What have been the effects of the incorrect assumptions or changes to the context on the achievement of the project results as outlined in the Project Document.
  2. Is the project strategy relevant?
     1. What are the critical trends/ developments in peace building and prevention of violent conflict in the project area that have had, or could have implications for UNDP’s work?
     2. In your view, how relevant is UNDP’s program portfolio to: i) beneficiaries’

needs/priorities; ii) National/regional and devolved development priorities/policies

* + 1. In your view, which products and services should UNDP offer to the communities in order to meet their needs?
  1. Does the project strategy provide the most effective route towards expected/intended results?
     1. Were lessons from other relevant projects properly incorporated into the project design?
     2. How does the project address Country/County and regional governments’ priorities?
     3. Was the project concept in line with the national sector development priorities and plans and County priorities as outlined in County Integrated Development Plan?
     4. Were perspectives of those who would be affected by the project decisions considered during project design processes?
  2. To what extent are relevant gender issues included in the project design and implementation?
  3. How would you rate UNDP’s responsiveness to the peace building and prevention of violent conflict needs in the project area?
  4. What are the key lessons that are worth taking forward?
     1. What are the major areas of concern?
     2. What recommendations can be made for the remaining project period with regard to focus, relevance/ value adding, strategy, policies, approaches etc.?

#### Results Framework/Log frame:

* 1. Do you regard the midterm and end-of-project targets “SMART”?
     1. What specific amendments/revisions should be made to the targets and indicators?

1. Are the project’s objectives and outcomes or components clear, practical, and feasible

within its time frame?

1. What SMART ‘development’ indicators, including sex disaggregated indicators and indicators that capture development benefits would you recommend?
   1. Has the progress so far led to or could in the future catalyze beneficial development effects?
      1. To what extent has income generation been enhanced?
      2. To what extent has gender equality and women’s empowerment been enhance?
      3. To what extent has governance improved?
   2. Are the broader development and gender aspects of the project being monitored effectively?
2. **Progress Towards Results**

#### **Progress Towards Outcomes:**

1. What progress, based on / against the log frame indicators, has been made towards the end-of-project targets?
   1. What significant program results (outcomes) has UNDP interventions brought about or contribute to?
   2. What are the most significant changes that UNDP supported work has contributed to?
   3. On what program areas has UNDP performed particularly well and why?
   4. Overall, what are the significant success stories?
   5. What elements of the programs have not worked well or should be done differently for the remaining period?
   6. Is there, or would there have been, a more effective way of addressing the problem(s) and satisfying the needs?
2. What are the remaining barriers to and challenges in achieving the project objective in the remainder of the project implementation period?
3. What are the ways in which the project can further expand these benefits (the aspects of the project that have already been successful)?
4. **Project Implementation and Adaptive Management**

#### **Management Arrangements:**

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

#### **Work Planning:**

1. Have there been any delays in project start-up and implementation?
   1. What are the causes? Have these been resolved?
2. Are work-planning processes results-based?
   1. If not, by what ways can work planning be re-orientate to focus on results?
3. Is the sequencing of the action the most effective one to reach the intended project objectives?
4. Is the project’s results framework/ logframe used as a management tool and how?
   1. Have any changes been made to it since project start?

#### **Finance and co-finance:**

1. What financial management does the project have especially with specific reference to the cost-effectiveness of interventions?
2. What changes have been made to fund allocations as a result of budget revisions?
   1. How appropriate and relevant are such revisions?
3. 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?
4. Is co-financing being used strategically to help the objectives of the project?
   1. 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:**

1. Are the monitoring tools currently being used providing the necessary information?
   1. Do they involve key partners?
   2. Are they aligned or mainstreamed with national systems?
   3. Do they use existing information?
   4. Are they efficient? Are they cost-effective?
   5. Are additional tools required? If the need is identified, how could they be made more participatory and inclusive?
2. Is the financial management of the project monitoring and evaluation budget efficient?
   1. Are sufficient resources being allocated to monitoring and evaluation?
   2. Are these resources being allocated effectively?
   3. Are these resources being utilized efficiently?

#### **Stakeholder Engagement:**

#### Project management:

1. Has the project developed and leveraged the necessary and appropriate partnerships with direct and tangential stakeholders?

#### Participation and country-driven processes:

1. Do local and national government stakeholders support the objectives of the project?
   1. Do they continue to have an active role in project decision-making that supports efficient and effective project implementation?

#### **Participation and public awareness:**

1. To what extent has stakeholder involvement and public awareness contributed to the progress towards achievement of project objectives?

#### Coordination:

1. Is there sufficient coordination among the different actors and stakeholders involved in the project to maximize positive project results?
   1. Is there sufficient awareness and capacity among the various stakeholder groups for them to benefit as intended?

#### **Reporting:**

1. How adaptive have management changes been reported by the project management and shared with the Project Board?
   1. How well do the Project Team and partners undertake and fulfil reporting requirements?
   2. How have they addressed poorly rated PIRs, if applicable?
2. How have lessons derived from the adaptive management process been documented, shared with key partners and internalized by partners?

#### **Communications:**

1. Is project communication with stakeholders regular and effective?
   1. Are key stakeholders left out of communication?
2. Does communication with stakeholders contribute to raise their awareness of project outcomes and activities and investment in the sustainability of project results?
3. Are proper means of communication established or being established to express the project progress and intended impact to the public? (External project communication).
   1. Is there a web presence, for example?
   2. Did the project implement appropriate outreach and public awareness campaigns?
4. **Sustainability**

#### Development and Global Environmental benefits Sustainability

1. To what extent is the project contributing to sustainable development benefits?
   1. To what extent has the project contributed to increased income from sustainable use of natural resources?
   2. What is the magnitude, distribution and sustainability of any such increased income?
   3. What could be done to improve sustainability?
2. To what extent is the project contributing to sustainable global environmental benefits?
3. Are the risks identified in the Project Document, Annual Project Review/PIRs and the ATLAS Risk Management Module the most important?
   1. Are the risk ratings applied appropriate and up to date?
   2. If not, explain why?

#### **Financial risks to sustainability:**

1. Are the financial and economic resources likely to be available once the funding ends?
   1. Are there potential resources from multiple sources, such as the public and private sectors, income generating activities?
   2. Are there other funding that is likely to be available for sustaining project’s outcomes?

#### **Socio-economic risks to sustainability:**

1. Are there any social or political risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project outcomes?
2. 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?
   1. Do the various key stakeholders see that it is in their interest that the project benefits continue to flow?
   2. Is there sufficient public / stakeholder awareness in support of the long-term objectives of the project?
   3. What is the possibility that beneficiaries can sustain the benefits beyond UNDP support?
   4. Have exit strategies been developed and discussed with the beneficiaries? Are these implemented? Which ones and how?

#### **Process-related risks to sustainability:**

1. Are lessons learned documented by the Project Team on a continual basis?
   1. Are these 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:**

1. Do the legal frameworks, policies, governance structures and processes pose risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project benefits?
2. Are the required systems/ mechanisms for accountability, transparency, and technical knowledge transfer in place?

#### **Environmental risks to sustainability:**

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

Ratings Scales

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 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 |