Terms of References

Country: Jordan

Post Title:	International consultant- Mid-Term Review of FSP UNDP- supported GEF- Financed project
Starting Date:	Sept. 1st, 2020
Duration:	25 working days over the period of two months
Location:	Home-based
Project:	Reduction and elimination of POPs and other chemical releases through implementation of environmentally sound management of E-Waste, healthcare waste and priority U-POPs release sources associated with general waste management activities.

1. INTRODUCTION

This is the Terms of Reference (ToR) for -the Midterm Review (MTR) of the *full*-sized UNDP-supported GEF-financed project titled "***Reduction and elimination of POPs and other chemical releases through implementation of environmentally sound management of E-Waste, healthcare waste and priority U-POPs release sources associated with general waste management activities***" (PIMS *5667*) implemented through the *Ministry of Environment*, which is to be undertaken in *2020.* The project started on the *30 May 2018* and is in its *third* year of implementation. 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

The project, through the implementation of a highly sustainable and replicable approach for the integrated and sound management of electronic (e-waste), hazardous, health-care and municipal solid waste categories, will achieve the avoidance of releases of U-POPs, PBDEs and CO_2, contributing at the same time to the development of the waste circular economy elements based on the 3R (Reduce, Re-use, Recycle) approach principles. The project is designed with the three (3) components:

- Project Component 1: Development of an environmentally sound management (ESM) system for E-waste, which has the objective to improve and enforce the E-waste regulation in the country, and to develop capacity for the collection and disposal of POPs contaminated E-waste products and end-of-life articles;

- Project Component 2: Achievement of environmentally sound healthcare waste management (HCW), which has the objective to build on the existing potential of the country to further improve and extend the current HCW practices, including training, certification and procurement of HCW waste treatment technology;

- Project Component 3: Development of waste diversion/resource recovery capacity for reduction in U-POPs emissions, accompanied by GHG related improvements, with the objective to demonstrate minimization in the amount of municipal waste (containing potentially hazardous fractions such as plastic etc) improperly dumped or disposed of through recycling techniques and application of reverse-derived fuel (RDF) principles in modern qualified cement kiln industry, including improved management of hazardous waste through establishing of a public/private partnership.

The project will bring not only environmental benefits, but also substantial social protection benefits through the implementation of a dedicated gender mainstreaming plan and involvement of local communities in the activities related to the circular recycling economy.

The **COVID-19 pandemic in Jordan** is part of the worldwide pandemic of coronavirus disease. On March 2nd 2020, the Ministry of Health confirmed the first case in Jordan . As soon as reports about a novel coronavirus in China emerged in early 2020, Jordan's National Epidemics Committee and Health Ministry designated certain hospitals to treat infections and established several protocols to deal with the arrival of the coronavirus to the country. Despite the fact that Jordan had only one confirmed coronavirus case on 14 March, the government suspended schools, banned public gatherings and closed the borders and airports in response to the rapid spread of the virus in countries surrounding Jordan and around the world and implemented a plan to quarantine arrivals in the country before the borders and the airport were completely shut down on 17 March.

On 30 April, the Jordanian government moved to ease the lockdown and re-open the economy after confirming only 451 cases. As of 6 July, new daily infections were mostly limited to quarantined arrivals to the country, with very few cases of community transmission. Most restrictions on daily life were lifted but with social distancing rules still in place .

During the curfew, the project assumed its activities virtually and sought multiple solutions to respond to COVID-19 crisis needs and ways in which it can support the Jordanian government to strengthen Jordan`s waste management including medical waste treatment and disposal. Despite the limited movement, the project supported the Government to replace healthcare waste incineration with environmentally friendly autoclaving devices to reduce to amount of POPs emissions and provide a healthy environment for healthcare workers.

3. MTR PURPOSE

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.

4. MTR APPROACH & METHODOLOGY

The MTR must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful.

The MTR consultant will review all relevant sources of information including documents prepared during the preparation phase (i.e. PIF, UNDP Initiation Plan, UNDP Social and Environmental Screening Procedure (SESP), the Project Document, project reports including Annual Project Review/PIRs, project budget revisions, national strategic and legal documents, and any other materials that the team considers useful for this evidence-based review). The MTR consultant will review the baseline GEF focal area Tracking Tool/Core Indicators submitted to the GEF at CEO endorsement, and the midterm GEF focal area Tracking Tool/Core Indicators.

The MTR consultant is expected to follow a collaborative and participatory approach[1] ensuring close engagement with the Project Team, government counterparts (the GEF Operational Focal Point), the UNDP Country Office(s), the Chemicals Regional Technical Adviser, direct beneficiaries, and other key stakeholders.

Engagement of stakeholders is vital to a successful MTR.[2] Stakeholder involvement should include interviews with stakeholders who have project responsibilities, including but not limited to Ministry of Environment, Ministry of Health, Royal Medical Services, senior officials and task team/ component leaders, key experts and consultants in the subject area, Project Board, project stakeholders, academia, local government and CSOs, etc.

The specific design and methodology for the MTR should emerge from consultations between the consultant and the above-mentioned parties regarding what is appropriate and feasible for meeting the MTR purpose and objectives and answering the evaluation questions, given limitations of budget, time and data.

The final methodological approach including interview schedule, field visits and data to be used in the MTR should be clearly outlined in the Inception Report and be fully discussed and agreed between UNDP, stakeholders and the MTR team.

---

[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.

[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.

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.

As of 11 March 2020, The World Health Organization (WHO) declared COVID-19 a global pandemic as the new coronavirus rapidly spread to all regions of the world. As travel to Jordan is currently limited due to COVID-19 crisis, the tasks and responsibilities are expected to be performed remotely. The MTR consultant should develop a methodology and approach that takes this into account. This may require the use of remote interview methods, extended desk reviews, data analysis, surveys and evaluation questionnaires. These approaches and methodologies should be detailed in the Inception Report and agreed with the UNDP Country Office in Jordan.

A short validation mission may be considered if it is confirmed to be safe for staff, consultants, stakeholders and communities, and if such a mission is possible within the MTR schedule, UNDP will cover the cost of travel and allowances as per the remuneration polices of UNDP.

5. DETAILED SCOPE OF THE MTR

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

i. Project Strategy

Project design:
- Review the problem addressed by the project and the underlying assumptions. Review the effect of any incorrect assumptions or changes to the context to achieving the project results as outlined in the Project Document.
- Review the relevance of the project strategy and assess whether it provides the most effective route towards expected/intended results. Were lessons from other relevant projects properly incorporated into the project design?
- Review how the project addresses country priorities. Review country ownership. Was the project concept in line with the national sector development priorities and plans of the country (or of participating countries in the case of multi-country projects)?
- Review decision-making processes: were perspectives of those who would be affected by project decisions, those who could affect the outcomes, and those who could contribute information or other resources to the process, taken into account during project design processes?
- Review the extent to which relevant gender issues were raised in the project design. See *Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects* for further guidelines.
  - Were relevant gender issues (e.g. the impact of the project on gender equality in the programme country, involvement of women's groups, engaging women in project activities) raised in the Project Document?
- If there are major areas of concern, recommend areas for improvement.

Results Framework/Logframe:

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

ii. Progress Towards Results

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

Table 1. Progress Towards Results Matrix (Achievement of outcomes against End-of-project Targets)

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

Indicator Assessment Key

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

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

---

[3] Populate with data from the Logframe and scorecards
[4] Populate with data from the Project Document
[5] If available
[6] Colour 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

<u>Management Arrangements:</u>
- 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.
- Do the Executing Agency/Implementing Partner and/or UNDP and other partners have the capacity to deliver benefits to or involve women? If yes, how?
- What is the gender balance of project staff? What steps have been taken to ensure gender balance in project staff?
- What is the gender balance of the Project Board? What steps have been taken to ensure gender balance in the Project Board?

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

<u>Finance and co-finance:</u>
- 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 table2 to be filled out by the UNDP Country Office in Jordan and project team, 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?

Table 2: co-financing monitoring of project " Reduction and Elimination of POPs and other chemical releases through implementation of environmentally sound management of E-waste,

healthcare waste and priority U-POPs release sources associated with general waste management activities"

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financer	Type of Co-financing	Co-financing amount confirmed at CEO Endorsement (US$)	Actual Amount Contributed at stage of Midterm Review (US$)	Actual % of Expected Amount
		TOTAL			

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?
- Review the extent to which relevant gender issues were incorporated in monitoring systems. See *Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects* for further guidelines.

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?
- How does the project engage women and girls? Is the project likely to have the same positive and/or negative effects on women and men, girls and boys? Identify, if possible, legal, cultural, or religious constraints on women's participation in the project. What can the project do to enhance its gender benefits?

Social and Environmental Standards (Safeguards)

- Validate the risks identified in the project's most current SESP, and those risks' ratings; are any revisions needed?
- Summarize and assess the revisions made since CEO Endorsement/Approval (if any) to:
  o The project's overall safeguards risk categorization.

- o The identified types of risks[8] (in the SESP).
- o The individual risk ratings (in the SESP) .
- Describe and assess progress made in the implementation of the project's social and environmental management measures as outlined in the SESP submitted at CEO Endorsement/Approval (and prepared during implementation, if any), including any revisions to those measures. Such management measures might include Environmental and Social Management Plans (ESMPs) or other management plans, though can also include aspects of a project's design; refer to Question 6 in the SESP template for a summary of the identified management measures.

A given project should be assessed against the version of UNDP's safeguards policy that was in effect at the time of the project's approval.

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 & Knowledge Management:
- 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.
- List knowledge activities/products developed (based on knowledge management approach approved at CEO Endorsement/Approval).

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:

---

[8] Risks are to be labeled with both the UNDP SES Principles and Standards, and the GEF's "types of risks and potential impacts": Climate Change and Disaster; Disadvantaged or Vulnerable Individuals or Groups; Disability Inclusion; Adverse Gender-Related impact, including Gender-based Violence and Sexual Exploitation; Biodiversity Conservation and the Sustainable Management of Living Natural Resources; Restrictions on Land Use and Involuntary Resettlement; Indigenous Peoples; Cultural Heritage; Resource Efficiency and Pollution Prevention; Labor and Working Conditions; Community Health, Safety and Security.

- 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.

Recommendations should be succinct suggestions for critical intervention that are specific, measurable, achievable, and relevant. A recommendation table should be put in the report's executive summary. See the *Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects* for guidance on a recommendation table.

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

Ratings

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

Table3. MTR Ratings & Achievement Summary Table for the project "Reduction and Elimination of POPs and other chemical releases through implementation of environmentally sound management of E-waste, healthcare waste and priority U-POPs release sources associated with general waste management activities"

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

6. TIMEFRAME

The total duration of the MTR will be approximately *25* working days over a time period of two months, The tentative MTR timeframe is as follows:

ACTIVITY	NUMBER OF WORKING DAYS	COMPLETION DATE
Document review and preparing MTR Inception Report (MTR Inception Report due no later than 2 weeks before the MTR mission)	*2 days*	*05 Sept, 2020*
MTR virtual mission: stakeholder meetings, interviews, field visits	*8 days*	*15 Sept, 2020*
Presentation of initial findings- last day of the MTR mission	*1 day*	*22 Sept, 2020*
Preparing draft report (due within 3 weeks of the MTR mission)	*10*	*30 Sept. 2020*
Finalization of MTR report/ Incorporating audit trail from feedback on draft report (due within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on the draft	*4*	*15 Oct. 2020*

Options for site visits should be provided in the Inception Report.

7. MIDTERM REVIEW DELIVERABLES

#	Deliverable	Description	Timing	Responsibilities
1	**MTR Inception Report**	MTR consultant clarifies objectives and methods of Midterm Review	No later than a week before the MTR virtual mission	MTR consultant submits to the Commissioning Unit at UNDP JOR CO and project management
2	**Presentation**	Initial Findings	End of MTR mission	MTR consultant presents to project management and the Commissioning Unit at UNDP JOR CO
3	**Draft Final Report**	Full report (using guidelines on content outlined in Annex B) with annexes	Within 4 weeks of the MTR virtual mission	Sent to the Commissioning Unit at UNDP JOR CO, 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)	Sent to the Commissioning Unit at UNDP JOR CO

*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 UNDP Jordan Country Office, The CO will contract the consultant and provide an updated stakeholder list with contact details (phone and email). The Project team will be responsible for liaising with the MTR consultant to provide all relevant documents, set up stakeholder interviews, and arrange field visits.

9. TEAM COMPOSITION

A team of one independent consultant will conduct the MTR. The consultant cannot have participated in the project preparation, formulation, and/or implementation (including the writing of the Project Document) and should not have a conflict of interest with project's related activities.

Due to travel restrictions to Jordan, the consultant is expected to work remotely. All needed logistical arrangements will be provided and supported by the commissioning unit at UNDP JOR CO and the project team.

Education

- A Master's degree in Chemistry, environmental sustainability or other closely related field

<u>Experience</u>

- Relevant experience with result-based management evaluation methodologies;
- Experience applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios;
- Competence in adaptive management, as applied to Chemicals.
- Experience in evaluating projects;
- Experience working in Jordan.
- Work experience in relevant technical areas for at least 10 years;)
- Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender and Chemicals; experience in gender sensitive evaluation and analysis.
- Excellent communication skills;
- Demonstrable analytical skills; (
- Project evaluation/review experiences within United Nations system will be considered an asset
- Experience with implementing evaluations remotely will be considered an asset.

<u>Language</u>

- Fluency in written and spoken English

10.ETHICS

This MTR will be conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation'. The MTR consultant must safeguard the rights and confidentiality of information providers, interviewees and stakeholders through measures to ensure compliance with legal and other relevant codes governing collection of data and reporting on data. The MTR consultant must also ensure security of collected information before and after the MTR and protocols to ensure anonymity and confidentiality of sources of information where that is expected. The information, knowledge and data gathered in the MTR process must also be solely used for the MTR and not for other uses without the express authorization of UNDP and partners.

11.PAYMENT MODALITIES AND SPECIFICATIONS

- 20% payment upon satisfactory delivery of the final MTR Inception Report and approval by the Commissioning Unit
- 40% payment upon satisfactory delivery of the draft MTR report to the Commissioning Unit
- 40% payment upon satisfactory delivery of the final MTR report and approval by the Commissioning Unit and RTA (via signatures on the TE Report Clearance Form) and completed TE Audit Trail

❖ *Note:*

In line with the UNDP's financial regulations, should it be determined by the UNDP and/or the consultant that a deliverable or service cannot be satisfactorily completed due to the impact of

COVID-19 and limitations to the evaluation, that deliverable or service will not be paid or will be partially paid.

12. APPLICATION PROCESS[9]

Recommended Presentation of Proposal:

a) **Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability** using the [template][10] provided by UNDP;
b) **CV** and a **Personal History Form** ([P11 form][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 applicant must indicate at this point, and ensure that all such costs are duly incorporated in the financial proposal submitted to UNDP.

All application materials should by email at the following address ic.jo@undp.org and rana.saleh@undp.org. Incomplete applications will be excluded from further consideration.

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 Social and Environmental Screening Procedure (SESP)
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/Core Indicators 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

---

[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/pso/Support%20documents%20on%20IC%20Guidelines/Template%20for%20Confirmation%20of%20Interest%20and%20Submission%20of%20Financial%20Proposal.docx

[11] http://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/corporate/Careers/P11_Personal_history_form.doc

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 Project Board Meetings and other meetings (i.e. Project Appraisal Committee meetings)
16. Project site location maps
17. Any additional documents, as relevant.

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

---

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

  4.3 Project Implementation and Adaptive Management
- Management Arrangements
- Work planning
- Finance and co-finance
- Project-level monitoring and evaluation systems
- Stakeholder engagement
- Social and Environmental Standards (Safeguards)
- Reporting
- Communications & Knowledge Management

 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.) or Core Indicators*
- *Annexed in a separate file: GEF Co-financing template (categorizing each co-financing amount as 'investment mobilized' or 'recurrent expenditure')*

ToR ANNEX C: Midterm Review Evaluative Matrix Template

This Midterm Review Evaluative Matrix must be fully completed/amended by the consultant and included in the MTR inception report and as an Annex to the MTR report.

ANNEX C: EVALUATION QUESTIONS

Evaluative Criteria Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
Relevance: How does the project relate to the main objectives of the GEF focal area, and to the environment and development priorities at the local, regional and national levels?			
• How and why have project outcomes and strategies contributed to the achievement of the expected results? Have the project outcomes contributed to national development priorities and plans?	• tbd[13]	• tbd	• tbd
• Are the project's objectives and components clear, practicable and feasible within the project's timeframe?	• tbd	• tbd	• tbd
• Were the capacities of executing institutions and counterparts properly considered when the project was designed?	• tbd	• tbd	• tbd
• Were counterpart resources (funding, staff, and facilities), enabling legislation, and adequate project management arrangements in place at project entry?	• tbd	• tbd	• tbd

---

[13] tbd – to be determined by consultant in consultations with the project team

• What are the underlying factors beyond the project's immediate control and to what extent they have influenced outcomes and results? How appropriate and effective were the project's management strategies for these factors.	• tbd	• tbd	• tbd

Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved?

• To what extent have the project objectives and outcomes, as set out in the Project Document, project's Logical Framework and other related documents, have been achieved?	• tbd	• tbd	• tbd
• Review planned strategies and plans for achieving the overall objective of the project within the timeframe.	• tbd	• tbd	• tbd
• Were the assumptions made by the project right and what new assumptions that should be made could be identified?	• tbd	• tbd	• tbd
• Were the project budget and duration planned in a cost-effective way?	• tbd	• tbd	• tbd
• How and to what extent have implementing agencies contributed and national counterparts (public, private) assisted the project?	• tbd	• tbd	• tbd
• Has COVID 19 crisis affected the implementation of the project`s activities	•	•	•

Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards?

• How useful was the logical framework as a management tool during implementation and any changes made to it?	• tbd	• tbd	• tbd
• Were the risks identified in the project document and PIRs the most important and the risk ratings applied appropriately?	• tbd	• tbd	• tbd

• How and to what extent have project implementation process, coordination with participating stakeholders and important aspects affected the timely project start-up, implementation and closure?	• tbd	• tbd	• tbd
• Do the outcomes developed during the project formulation still represent the best project strategy for achieving the project objectives?	• tbd	• tbd	• tbd
• How have local stakeholders participated in project management and decision-making? What are the strengths and weaknesses of the approach adopted by the project? What could be improved?	• tbd	• tbd	• tbd
• Does the project consult and make use of skills, experience and knowledge of the appropriate government entities, NGOs, community groups, private sector, local governments and academic institutions in the implementation and evaluation of project activities?	• tbd	• tbd	• tbd
Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, social-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?			
• Was project sustainability strategy developed during the project design?	• tbd	• tbd	• tbd
• How relevant was the project sustainability strategy?	• tbd	• tbd	• tbd
• Are there any financial risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project outcomes? What is the likelihood of financial and economic resources not being available once the GEF assistance ends (resources can be from multiple sources, such as the public and private sectors, income generating activities, and trends that may indicate that it is likely that in future there will be adequate financial resources for sustaining project's outcomes)?	• tbd	• tbd	• tbd

• Are there any social or political risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project outcomes? What is the risk that the level of stakeholder ownership will be insufficient to allow for the project outcomes/benefits be sustained? Do the various key stakeholders see that it is in their interest that the project benefits continue to flow? Is there a sufficient public/ stakeholder awareness in support of the long term objectives of the project?	• tbd	• tbd	• tbd
Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward, reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status?			
• How has the project contributed to the reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status?	• tbd	• tbd	• tbd
• Are the project outcomes contributing to national development priorities and plans?	• tbd	• tbd	• tbd

ToR ANNEX D: UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluators/Midterm Review Consultants[14]

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.
8. Must ensure that independence of judgement is maintained and that evaluation findings and recommendations are independently presented.
9. Must confirm that they have not been involved in designing, executing or advising on the project being evaluated.

MTR Consultant Agreement Form

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

Name of Consultant: _____

Name of Consultancy Organization (where relevant): _____

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

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

Signature: _____

ToR ANNEX E: MTR Ratings

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

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

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

ToR ANNEX F: MTR Report Clearance Form
(to be completed by the Commissioning Unit and RTA and included in the final document)

Midterm Review Report Reviewed and Cleared By:

Commissioning Unit (M&E Focal Point)

Name: _____

Signature: _____   Date: _____

Regional Technical Advisor (Nature, Climate and Energy)

Name: _____

Signature: _____   Date: _____

Note: The following is a template for the MTR Team to show how the received comments on the draft MTR report have (or have not) been incorporated into the final MTR report. This audit trail should be included as an annex in the final MTR report.

To the comments received on (*date*) from the Midterm Review of (*project name*) (UNDP Project ID-*PIMS #)*

The following comments were provided in track changes to the draft Midterm Review report; they are referenced by institution ("Author" column) and not by the person's name, and track change comment number ("#" column):

Author	#	Para No./ comment location	Comment/Feedback on the draft MTR report	MTR team response and actions taken

Management arrangement:

The consultant is expected to work with project management unit with a full guidance and supervision from the UNDP Team leader of the Environment, climate change and DRR portfolio.

UNDP Signature	IC Signature