



Empowered lives.  
Resilient nations.

## Terms of Reference for ICs and RLAs through /GPN ExpRes

**Services/Work Description: Project Midterm Review/Evaluation**

**Project/Programme Title: Promotion of Low Carbon Urban Transport Systems in the Philippines**

**Consultancy Title: International Consultant for the Midterm Review of the Low Carbon Urban Transport Systems Project in the Philippines**

**Duty Station: Philippines (assignment to be done remotely)**

**Duration: 15 September 2020 to 31 December 2020**

**Expected start date: 15 September 2020**

### 1. BACKGROUND

The project was designed to create an enabling environment for the commercialization of low carbon urban transport systems (e.g., electric and hybrid vehicles) in the Philippines. The project aims to do this through 1) effective enforcement of policies and support provided for the promotion of low carbon modes of transport; 2) adopting and implementing low carbon transport plans and/or programs in major cities; 3) increasing private sector participation in the widespread deployment and commercialization of low carbon transport systems; and 4) increasing private sector investment in low carbon transport systems. The project is being implemented through the Department of Transportation under a National Implementation Modality.

### 2. SCOPE OF WORK, RESPONSIBILITIES AND DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSED WORK

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 findings shall be acted upon by UNDP, DoTr, and other government agencies and stakeholders. The findings and any other relevant lessons and recommendations is expected to contribute to the internal programming of UNDP and to existing and emerging national policy considerations, including but not limited to the enhancement and eventual implementation of the Nationally Determined Contributions (NDCs) and emerging considerations for greening the recovery of the Philippines from COVID-19.

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

The MTR team will review all relevant sources of information including documents prepared during the preparation phase (i.e. PIF, UNDP Initiation Plan, UNDP Social and Environmental Screening Procedure/SESP), the Project Document, project reports including annual 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 team will review the baseline GEF focal area Core Indicators/Tracking Tools submitted to the GEF at CEO endorsement, and the midterm GEF focal area Core Indicators/Tracking Tools that must be completed before the data collection begins.

The MTR team is expected to follow a collaborative and participatory approach ensuring close engagement with the Project Team, government counterparts (the GEF Operational Focal Point), the UNDP Country Office(s), the Nature, Climate and Energy (NCE) Regional Technical Advisor, direct beneficiaries, and other key stakeholders.

Engagement of stakeholders is vital to a successful MTR. Stakeholder involvement should include interviews with stakeholders who have project responsibilities, including but not limited to the Project Management Unit, key officials



Empowered lives.  
Resilient nations.

from the Department of Transportation, programme staff from UNDP, executing agencies, senior officials and task team/component leaders, key experts and consultants in the subject area, Project Board, project stakeholders, academia, local government and CSOs, etc. Given travel restrictions and the general situation under the pandemic, travels are discouraged and data collection methods should be replaced by appropriate means to do it remotely. The UNDP Independent Evaluation Office (IEO) has released [a decentralized evaluation guidance note](#) highlighting the challenges confronting evaluations at this time and potential ways to overcome them, which can be considered for this MTR.

The specific design and methodology for the MTR should emerge from consultations between the MTR team 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 MTR team must use gender-responsive methodologies and tools and ensure that gender equality and women's empowerment, as well as other cross-cutting issues and SDGs are incorporated into the MTR report.

The final methodological approach including interview schedule, respondents, and data sources, among others, to be used in the MTR must be clearly outlined in the Inception Report and be fully discussed and agreed between UNDP, stakeholders and the MTR team.

The final MTR report must 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.

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

#### **i. Project Strategy**

##### Project design:

- Review the problem addressed by the project and the underlying assumptions. Review the effect of any incorrect assumptions or changes to the context to achieving the project results as outlined in the Project Document.
- Review the relevance of the project strategy and assess whether it provides the most effective route towards expected/intended results. Were lessons from other relevant projects properly incorporated into the project design?
- Review how the project addresses country priorities. Review country ownership. Was the project concept in line with the national sector development priorities and plans of the country (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 Annex 9 of [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.



Empowered lives.  
Resilient nations.

- Ensure broader development and gender aspects of the project are being monitored effectively. Develop and recommend SMART 'development' indicators, including sex-disaggregated indicators and indicators that capture development benefits.

## ii. Progress Towards Results

### Progress Towards Outcomes Analysis:

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

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

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

### 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.

## iii. Project Implementation and Adaptive Management

### Management Arrangements:

- Review overall effectiveness of project management as outlined in the Project Document. Have changes been made and are they effective? Are responsibilities and reporting lines clear? Is decision-making transparent and undertaken in a timely manner? Recommend areas for improvement.

<sup>1</sup> Populate with data from the Logframe and scorecards

<sup>2</sup> Populate with data from the Project Document

<sup>3</sup> If available

<sup>4</sup> Colour code this column only

<sup>5</sup> Use the 6 point Progress Towards Results Rating Scale: HS, S, MS, MU, U, HU



Empowered lives.  
Resilient nations.

- 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?

#### Work Planning:

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

#### Finance and co-finance:

- Consider the financial management of the project, with specific reference to the cost-effectiveness of interventions.
- Review the changes to fund allocations as a result of budget revisions and assess the appropriateness and relevance of such revisions.
- Does the project have the appropriate financial controls, including reporting and planning, that allow management to make informed decisions regarding the budget and allow for timely flow of funds?
- Informed by the co-financing monitoring table to be filled out by the Commissioning Unit 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?

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
•	•	•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•	•	•
•	•	• <b>TOTAL</b>	•	•	•

- Include the separate GEF Co-Financing template (filled out by the Commissioning Unit and project team) which categorizes each co-financing amount as 'investment mobilized' or 'recurrent expenditures'. (This template will be annexed as a separate file.)

#### 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?



Empowered lives.  
Resilient nations.

- 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 Annex 9 of [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:
  - The project's overall safeguards risk categorization.
  - The identified types of risks<sup>6</sup> (in the SESP).
  - 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?

<sup>6</sup> 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.



Empowered lives.  
Resilient nations.

- 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 Register are the most important and whether the risk ratings applied are appropriate and up to date. If not, explain why.
- In addition, assess the following risks to sustainability:

##### Financial risks to sustainability:

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

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

- Are there any social or political risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project outcomes? What is the risk that the level of stakeholder ownership (including ownership by governments and other key stakeholders) will be insufficient to allow for the project outcomes/benefits to be sustained? Do the various key stakeholders see that it is in their interest that the project benefits continue to flow? Is there sufficient public / stakeholder awareness in support of the long-term objectives of the project? Are lessons learned being documented by the Project Team on a continual basis and shared/ transferred to appropriate parties who could learn from the project and potentially replicate and/or scale it in the future?

##### Institutional Framework and Governance risks to sustainability:

- Do the legal frameworks, policies, governance structures and processes pose risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project benefits? While assessing this parameter, also consider if the required systems/ mechanisms for accountability, transparency, and technical knowledge transfer are in place.

##### Environmental risks to sustainability:

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

#### Evaluative Questions

Following the above assessment's outline (i.e. Project Strategy, Progress Towards Results, Project Implementation & Adaptive Management, and Sustainability), the MTR should also be able to answer the following evaluative questions<sup>7</sup>:

##### Project Strategy

- To what extent is the project aligned with and responsive to national development needs and priorities, emerging conditions such as COVID-19, and international development goals such as the SDGs or the Paris Agreement, among others? How should it adapt to better position itself in support of these priorities?

<sup>7</sup> These evaluative questions are also conveniently aligned with the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development – Development Assistance Committee (OECD-DAC) criteria (Relevance, Effectiveness, Efficiency, and Sustainability). Note that the questions are not exhaustive and may change. The set of evaluation questions shall be finalized through the inception report.



Empowered lives.  
Resilient nations.

- To what extent is the project responsive to the needs of its target beneficiaries?

#### Progress Towards Results

- To what extent is the project on track to achieve planned results (intended and unintended, positive and negative)?
- To what extent is low carbon, climate action, and sustainable development mainstreamed in the design, implementation, and monitoring and evaluation of the project? How about emerging needs such as COVID-19?

#### Project Implementation & Adaptive Management

- To what extent has the project mobilized and used its structure and resources in support of achieving its intended results? How sufficient are current systems in supporting effective coordination and implementation among agencies and other stakeholders to deliver intended results?
- To what extent has the project utilized the comparative advantages of partner and agency capacities in its activities?

#### Sustainability

- Are there social or political risks that may jeopardize the sustainability of the project's results?
- Is there adequate ownership of project results by key stakeholders (e.g. government agencies, LGUs, private sector, etc.)?
- How likely are the current strategies and outputs to be continued and adopted in the succeeding years of the project? Is a well-designed continuity strategy in place to ensure the smooth transition of the project in a new normal?

#### **Conclusions & Recommendations**

The MTR team will include a section in the MTR report for evidence-based conclusions, in light of the findings.

Additionally, the MTR consultant/team is expected to make recommendations to the Project Team. Recommendations should be succinct suggestions for critical intervention that are specific, measurable, achievable, and relevant. A recommendation table should be put in the report's executive summary. See the [Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects](#) for guidance on a recommendation table.

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

#### **Ratings**

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

**Table. MTR Ratings & Achievement Summary Table for Promotion of Low Carbon Urban Transport Systems in the Philippines**

• Measure	• MTR Rating	• Achievement Description
• Project Strategy	• N/A	•
• Progress Towards Results	• Objective Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale)	•
	• Outcome 1	•



Empowered lives.  
Resilient nations.

	Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale)	
	• Outcome 2 Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale)	•
	• Outcome 3 Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale)	•
	• Etc.	•
• <b>Project Implementation &amp; Adaptive Management</b>	• (rate 6 pt. scale)	•
• <b>Sustainability</b>	• (rate 4 pt. scale)	•

### 3. Expected Outputs and deliverables

The total duration of the MTR will be approximately 40 working days over a time period of 9 weeks and shall not exceed five months from when the consultant(s) are hired. Assuming a start date of 15 September 2020, 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)	4 days (recommended: 2-4 days)	28 September 2020
MTR mission: stakeholder meetings, interviews, data collection	15 days (recommended: 7-15 days)	6 November 2020
Presentation of initial findings- last day of the MTR mission	1 day	6 November 2020
Preparing draft report (due within 3 weeks of the MTR mission)	10 days (recommended: 5-10 days)	20 November 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 days (recommended: 3-4 days)	10 December 2020





Empowered lives.  
Resilient nations.

The deliverables are:

#	Deliverable	Description	Timing	Responsibilities
1	<b>MTR Inception Report</b>	MTR team clarifies objectives and methods of Midterm Review	No later than 2 weeks before the MTR mission	MTR team submits to the Commissioning Unit and project management
2	<b>Presentation</b>	Initial Findings	End of MTR mission	MTR Team presents to project management and the Commissioning Unit
3	<b>Draft MTR Report</b>	Full draft report (using guidelines on content outlined in Annex B) with annexes	Within 3 weeks of the MTR mission	Sent to the Commissioning Unit, reviewed by RTA, Project Coordinating Unit, GEF OFP
4	<b>Final Report*</b>	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

\*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.

#### 4. Institutional arrangements/reporting lines

The principal responsibility for managing this MTR resides with the Commissioning Unit, which is the UNDP Philippines Country Office. The MTR shall be managed by the M&E Focal of the Country Office together with the Climate Action Programme Team.

An Evaluation Reference Group (ERG) shall be formed composed of principal representatives from project stakeholders (government partners, donor, representatives from the Project Board) that will perform an advisory role throughout the process, ensure that evaluation standards as provided by the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) are adhered to, including safeguarding transparency and independence, advise on the relevance and appropriateness of questions, and support and provide input into the development of the management responses and key actions.

The Commissioning Unit will contract the consultants and ensure appropriate management of obligations for the MTR team and will provide an updated stakeholder list with contact details (phone and email). The Project Team will be responsible for liaising with the MTR team to provide all relevant documents, set up stakeholder interviews, and arrange other activities related to the MTR process.

A team of two independent consultants will conduct the MTR – **one international consultant to function as review lead/coordinator** (with experience and exposure to projects and evaluations in other regions globally) and one national consultant to function as technical expert.

- The review lead/coordinator (international consultant) will mainly be responsible for initiating and managing the MTR process and leading the overall design and writing of the MTR, maintaining the integrity and independence of the process, and ensuring that the MTR translates into a relevant and actionable product for organizational and national results-based management and development.**



Empowered lives.  
Resilient nations.

2. The technical expert (national consultant) will provide support to the review lead/coordinator and serve as the subject matter expert at the national level. S/he should have a strong background on the subject and will mainly be responsible for studying the dynamics among stakeholders and how it affects project performance, progress and results achievement, and potential development pathways for the country, highlighting gains, uncovering gaps, and proposing appropriate corrective measures that the project can take.

The consultants cannot have participated in the project preparation, formulation, and/or implementation (including the writing of the Project Document) and should not have a conflict of interest with project's related activities.

## 5. Experience and qualifications

The selection of consultants will be aimed at maximizing the overall "team" qualities in the following areas. Credentials are given corresponding points to be considered in the technical evaluation of interested candidates (the maximum obtainable points are 100, passing score is 70).

### Academic Qualifications:

At least a master's degree in economics, statistics, social sciences, development studies, engineering, management, or other closely related field (Master's degree – 14 points; Doctorate degree – 20 points)

### II. Years of experience:

At least 12 years of relevant experience with results-based management evaluation methodologies; application of SMART indicators and reconstruction or validation of baseline scenarios; remote evaluation and project evaluation/review experiences within the United Nations system will be considered an asset (12 years – 14 points; 13-14 years – 16 points; 15-17 years – 18 points; 18 years and above - 20 points)

At least 5 years of specific experience in conducting gender-sensitive evaluations and analyses (5 years – 14 points; 6-7 years – 16 points; 8-9 years – 18 points; 10 years and above - 20 points)

At least 10 years of relevant experience and demonstrated competence in adaptive management, as applied to Climate Change, Energy, Infrastructure, Transport, and/or Technology (i.e. climate change mitigation, decarbonization/emissions reduction, technology incubation and transfer, commercialization, market development, and sustainability in relation to the transportation sector); (10 years – 14 points; 11-12 years – 16 points; 13-14 years – 18 points; 15 years and above - 20 points)

Experience working in at least 7 evaluations within the Asia-Pacific region; (7 evaluations – 7 points; 8-9 evaluations – 8.5 points; 10 evaluations and above - 10 points)

### III. Language:

Fluency in written and spoken English. (10 points)

## 6. Payment Modality

Payment to the individual contractor will be made based on the actual number of days worked, deliverables accepted and upon certification of satisfactory completion by the manager.

- 20% payment upon satisfactory delivery of the final MTR Inception Report and approval by the Commissioning Unit



Empowered lives.  
Resilient nations.

- 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 delivery of completed TE Audit Trail

Criteria for issuing the final payment of 40%<sup>8</sup>:

- The final MTR report includes all requirements outlined in the MTR TOR and is in accordance with the MTR guidance.
- The final MTR report is clearly written, logically organized, and is specific for this project (i.e. text has not been cut & pasted from other MTR reports).
- The Audit Trail includes responses to and justification for each comment listed.

In line with the UNDP's financial regulations, when determined by the Country Office 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.

Due to the current COVID-19 situation and its implications, a partial payment may be considered if the consultant invested time towards the deliverable but was unable to complete to circumstances beyond his/her control.

This TOR is approved by:

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Floradema C. Eleazar'.

Ms. Floradema Eleazar  
Team Leader, Climate Action Programme Team

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'MTCO'.

Ms. Marian Theresia Valera-Co  
RBM Analyst, Results and Quality Team

<sup>8</sup> The Commissioning Unit is obligated to issue payments to the MTR team as soon as the terms under the ToR are fulfilled. If there is an ongoing discussion regarding the quality and completeness of the final deliverables that cannot be resolved between the Commissioning Unit and the MTR team, the Regional M&E Advisor and Vertical Fund Directorate will be consulted. If needed, the Commissioning Unit's senior management, Procurement Services Unit and Legal Support Office will be notified as well so that a decision can be made about whether or not to withhold payment of any amounts that may be due to the evaluator(s), suspend or terminate the contract and/or remove the individual contractor from any applicable rosters. See the UNDP Individual Contract Policy for further details:

[https://popp.undp.org/\\_layouts/15/WopiFrame.aspx?sourcedoc=/UNDP\\_POPP\\_DOCUMENT\\_LIBRARY/Public/PSU\\_Individual%20Contract\\_Individual%20Contract%20Policy.docx&action=default](https://popp.undp.org/_layouts/15/WopiFrame.aspx?sourcedoc=/UNDP_POPP_DOCUMENT_LIBRARY/Public/PSU_Individual%20Contract_Individual%20Contract%20Policy.docx&action=default)