



ANNEX-1

Terms of Reference

Mid Term Review (MTR) - UNDP GEF Addressing Invasive Alien Species Threats at Key Marine Biodiversity Areas Project in Turkey

1- INTRODUCTION

This is the Terms of Reference (ToR) for the UNDP-GEF Midterm Review (MTR) of the full-sized project titled Addressing Invasive Alien Species Threats at Key Marine Biodiversity Areas (PIMS 5733) implemented through the Turkish Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry – General Directorate of Nature Conservation and National Parks. The project started on 19 October 2018 and is in its third year of implementation. In line with the UNDP-GEF Guidance on MTRs, this MTR process was initiated before the submission of the second Project Implementation Report (PIR). This ToR sets out the expectations for this MTR. The MTR process must follow the guidance outlined in the document [Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects](#).

2- PROJECT BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Turkey's coastline stretches 8,592 km (excluding islands), bordering four different major seas: the Mediterranean, Aegean, Marmara and Black Seas. These extensive marine ecosystems support Turkey's overall high level of marine biodiversity. In total, nearly 5,000 plant and animal species have been identified in Turkey's marine waters. Invasive Alien Species (IAS) have been identified by the Ministry of Forestry and Water Affairs (MFWA) as one of the principal threats to Turkey's marine biodiversity. Approximately 450 IAS have been reported on the coasts of Turkey. There are two major pathways for IAS into Turkey's marine waters: The Suez Canal, and "ship-mediated transport" (e.g. ballast water). In the 2011 national review of IAS in marine waters it was found that 66% of the total IAS in Turkey's coastal waters arrived via the Suez Canal, while 30% arrived via ship transport.

The project strategy follows three-stage hierarchical approach for addressing IAS outlined by the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD): prevention, control, and mitigation. The long-term project goal is to minimize negative impacts of IAS in support of conservation Turkey's globally significant native marine biodiversity. The project objective is "To ensure resilience of marine and coastal ecosystems through strengthened capacities and investment in prevention, detection, control and management of Invasive Alien Species." The project is organized into three components:

- Component 1. Effective national policy framework on IAS
- Component 2. Capacity building, knowledge and information sharing systems to address the IAS threats
- Component 3. Investment in sustainable management, prevention, eradication, and control of IAS and restoration of IAS-degraded habitat at key marine and coastal areas

The project works at both the national level and at the site level at four proposed pilot sites. In the view of the above, the Consultant will serve for overall Mid-Term Evaluation of all components, outputs and activities of Addressing Invasive Alien Species Threats at Key Marine Biodiversity Areas Project in Turkey .

3- OBJECTIVES OF THE MIDTERM REVIEW (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, its risks to sustainability.

4- MTR APPROACH & METHODOLOGY

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

The IC is expected to follow a collaborative and participatory approach ensuring close engagement with the Project Team, government counterparts (the GEF Operational Focal Point), the UNDP Country Office(s), UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Advisers, and other key stakeholders.

Engagement of stakeholders is vital to a successful MTR. Stakeholder involvement should include interviews with stakeholders who have project responsibilities, including but not limited to (list); executing agencies, senior officials and task team/ component leaders, key experts and consultants in the subject area, Project Board, project stakeholders, academia, local government and CSOs, etc. Additionally, the IC is expected to conduct field missions to (location), including the following project sites (list).

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.

The mid-term review will be carried out by IC as MTR Expert. The IC will receive the support of UNDP Country Office and Project Management Unit and will be assisted by a facilitator assigned by UNDP (when needed).

5- DETAILED SCOPE OF THE MTR AND DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE IC

The IC 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.
- 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. Progress Towards Results Matrix (Achievement of outcomes against End-of-project Targets)

Project Strategy	Indicator ¹	Baseline Level ²	Level in 1 st PIR (self-reported)	Midterm Target ³	End-of-project Target	Midterm Level & Assessment ⁴	Achievement Rating ⁵	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 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.

¹ Populate with data from the Logframe and scorecards

² Populate with data from the Project Document

³ If available

⁴ Colour code this column only

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

iii. Project Implementation and Adaptive Management

Management Arrangements:

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

Work Planning:

- Review any delays in project start-up and implementation, identify the causes and examine if they have been resolved.
- Are work-planning processes results-based? If not, suggest ways to re-orientate work planning to focus on results?
- Examine the use of the project's results framework/ 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? How could they be made more participatory and inclusive?
- Examine the financial management of the project monitoring and evaluation budget. Are sufficient resources being allocated to monitoring and evaluation? Are these resources being allocated effectively?

Stakeholder Engagement:

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

Reporting:

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

Communications:

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

iv. Sustainability

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

Financial risks to sustainability:

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

Socio-economic risks to sustainability:

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

Institutional Framework and Governance risks to sustainability:

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

Environmental risks to sustainability:

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

Conclusions & Recommendations

The IC shall include a section of the report setting out the MTR’s evidence-based conclusions, in light of the findings.⁶

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 IC should make no more than 15 recommendations total.

Ratings

The IC shall 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 (Project Title)

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)	

⁶ Alternatively, MTR conclusions may be integrated into the body of the report.

6- EXPECTED OUTPUTS AND DELIVERABLES

The deliverables expected from the IC as MTR Expert are as follows:

#	Deliverable	Description	Estimated Number of Days (Indicative)*	Expected Delivery Date	Responsibilities
1	MTR Inception Report: Desk review, development of methodology, updating timetable, drafting mission programme. Incorporating comments received from UNDP Country Office (if necessary).	IC clarifies objectives and methods of Midterm Review	4 days	15 April 2021	IC submits to the UNDP
2	Presentation (After conducting in-country field visits, interviews, preliminary mission findings briefing(s), debriefings with project partners and providing aide memoire. Delivering a presentation on aide memoire (finding(s) and recommendation(s)) to Project Partners.)	Initial Findings	12 days	7 May 2021	IC submits to the UNDP
3	Draft Final Report	Full report (using guidelines on content outlined in Annex B) with annexes	7 days	25 May 2021	Submit to UNDP and reviewed by RTA
4	Final Report	Revised report with audit trail detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final MTR report	2 days	4 June 2021	Submit to UNDP

Each and every activity to be conducted by the IC is subject to UNDP approval. Each step shall be conducted upon approval of the previous step by UNDP.

* These estimated number of days for each deliverable are solely just provided to give the IC an idea on the assignment and deliverables to be undertaken. The payments will be made in line with the table given under section 11. PAYMENTS, irrespective of the number of days to be actually invested by the IC for the completion of each respective deliverable.

7- MTR ARRANGEMENTS

The principal responsibility for managing this MTR resides with UNDP. UNDP will contract the IC and ensure the timely provision of per diems and travel arrangements within Turkey for the IC. The Project Team will be responsible for liaising with the IC to provide all relevant documents, set up stakeholder interviews, and arrange field visits.

UNDP will provide the IC all relevant background documents. UNDP is not required to provide any physical facility for the work of the IC. However, depending to the availability of physical facilities (e.g. working space, computer, printer, telephone lines, internet connection etc.) and at the discretion of the UNDP and relevant stakeholders such facilities may be provided at the disposal of the IC.

The IC shall report to Climate Change and Environment Portfolio Manager. The IC shall conduct the MTR in collaboration with Monitoring & Evaluation Advisor of CCE Portfolio at UNDP.

The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation lies with UNDP. UNDP will assign a facilitator to set up the stakeholder interviews, arrange the field visits, coordinate with the GDF and provide translation (when necessary).

In preparation for the evaluation mission, which would last for 12 days (including travel days) travel mission, Project Manager, with assistance of UNDP, will arrange completion of the Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool (METT). Results of METT should be used by an international project evaluation consultant, who will provide his/her comments and track the progress in management effectiveness of project sites. Upon incorporation of the evaluator's comments the METT will be finalized and the results should be attached as a mandatory Annex to the MTR report.

These Terms of Reference follow the UNDP-GEF policies and procedures.

Duties and Responsibilities of the IC:

There will be only one IC conducting the Mid-term evaluation for this project. The IC shall 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 project's related activities. The generic duties and responsibilities of the IC is as follows:

- Desk review of documents, development of draft methodology, detailed work plan and MTR outline;
- Debriefing with UNDP and GDIP, agreement on the methodology, scope and outline of the MTR report;
- Interviews with PMU, UNDP Turkey, GDIP and project partners;
- Debriefing UNDP and project partners and will provide an *aide memoire*;
- Coordination with "strategy revision report" which shall be prepared by another expert in parallel with MTR report and to be annexed with.
- Development and submission of the first MTR report draft. The draft will be shared with the key project stakeholders for review and comment;
- Finalization and submission of the final MTR report through incorporating suggestions received on the draft report;

The IC shall avoid any kind of discriminatory behavior including gender discrimination and ensure that

- human rights and gender equality is prioritized as an ethical principle within all actions;
 - activities are designed and implemented in accordance with “Social and Environmental Standards of UNDP”;
 - any kind of diversities based on ethnicity, age, sexual orientation, disability, religion, class, gender are respected within all implementations including data production;
 - differentiated needs of women and men are considered;
 - inclusive approach is reflected within all actions and implementations, in that sense an enabling and accessible setup in various senses such as disability gender language barrier is created;
- necessary arrangements to provide gender parity within all committees, meetings, trainings etc. introduced.

UNDP will assist the IC with below services;

- Provide support in collection of background materials;
- Participation in debriefings with UNDP CO and GDIP representatives;
- Organize the mission program together with the Project Management Unit, arrange and facilitate meetings with key stakeholders;
- Assistance to the IC in conducting interviews with relevant stakeholders and provide translation during the interviews when necessary;
- Participation in debriefing with UNDP and project partners;
- Necessary support will be provided to IC in circulation of the draft MTR report among the key project stakeholders for review and commenting.

Reporting Line

The IC will be responsible to CCE Portfolio Manager for the completion of the tasks and duties assigned in Section 6 of this ToR. All of the reports are subject to approval from CCE Portfolio Manager in order to realize the payments to the IC.

Reporting Language

The reporting language shall be in English.

Title Rights

The title rights, copyrights and all other rights whatsoever nature in any material produced under the provisions of this TORs will be vested exclusively in UNDP.

8- REQUIRED QUALIFICATION

The following table demonstrates the required qualifications of the candidate to be recruited for this assignment.

	Minimum Requirements	Assets
General Qualifications	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bachelor's Degree in environmental studies/economics/Engineering/ natural resources/business administration. (5 Points) Fluency in English. (5 Points) Full computer literacy. (4 Points) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Asset: Masters or Higher Degree in natural resources/biology/forestry/ climate change/ environmental economics/ engineering/ business administration/ economics. (7 Points)
Professional Experience	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Minimum ten (10) years of relevant professional experience. (15 Points) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Asset: More than fifteen (15) years of relevant professional experience (7 Points)
Specific Experience	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 5 years of specific professional experience in environmental projects /forestry projects/ biodiversity/ monitoring and evaluation of projects. (20 Points) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Asset: Monitoring and evaluation experience in GEF funded projects. (7 Points)
<p>Notes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Internships (paid/unpaid) are not considered professional experience. Obligatory military service is not considered professional experience. Professional experience gained in an international setting is considered international experience. 		

UNDP is committed to achieving workforce diversity in terms of gender, race, ethnicity, indigenous identity, disability and culture. Individuals from all genders, minority groups, indigenous groups and persons with disabilities are equally encouraged to apply. All applications will be treated with utmost confidentiality.

9- TIMING AND DURATION

The Assignment is expected to start on **05.04.2021** and be completed on **30.06.2021**.

10- PLACE OF WORK

Place of work (duty station) for the assignment is home-based and due to the COVID-19 pandemic, the assignment will be performed remotely as long as the current health risk persists. The below information is provided on the condition that the health risk is eliminated.

There will be *missions to Ankara and selected project sites*. The mission shall be a minimum of 10 working days in Turkey, although this may be broken into two shorter missions with the mutual agreement of the consultant and UNDP Turkey, provided that the total number of days spent in Turkey is not less than 10 working days. The mission to Turkey will cover days spent in Ankara, as well as days spent to visit project sites and also possibly a day or days in Istanbul for relevant meetings. All travel related costs (cost items indicated below) of these missions out of the duty station (economy class flight ticket and accommodation in 3 or 4-star hotel) will be borne by UNDP. Approval of UNDP is needed prior to the missions is needed. The costs of these missions may either be;

- Arranged and covered by UNDP CO from the respective project budget without making any reimbursements to the consultant or
- Reimbursed to the consultant upon the submission of the receipts/invoices of the expenses by the consultant and approval of the UNDP. The reimbursement of each cost item subject to following constraints/conditions provided in below table;
- covered by the combination of both options

Cost item	Constraints	Conditions of Reimbursement
Travel (intercity transportation)	full-fare economy class tickets	1- Approval by UNDP of the cost items before the initiation of travel 2- Submission of the invoices/receipts, etc. by the consultant with the UNDP's F-10 Form 3- Acceptance and Approval by UNDP of the invoices and F-10 Form.
Accommodation	Up to 50% of the effective DSA rate of UNDP for the respective location	
Breakfast	Up to 6% of the effective DSA rate of UNDP for the respective location	
Lunch	Up to 12% of the effective DSA rate of UNDP for the respective location	
Dinner	Up to 12% of the effective DSA rate of UNDP for the respective location	
Other Expenses (intra city transportations, transfer cost from /to terminals, etc.)	Up to 20% of effective DSA rate of UNDP for the respective location	

11- PAYMENTS

Payments will be made within 30 days upon acceptance and approval of the corresponding deliverable by UNDP on the basis of payment terms indicated below table and the pertaining Certification of Payment document signed by the IC and approved by the CCE Portfolio Manager.

#	<u>Deliverable</u>	<u>Percentage of Payment</u>
1	MTR Inception Report	15% of Total Contract Amount
2	Presentation	35% of Total Contract Amount
3	Draft Final Report	50% of Total Contract Amount
4	Final Report	

The IC shall be paid in USD if he/she resides in a country different than Turkey. If he/she resides in Turkey, the payment shall be realized in TL through conversion of the USD amount by the official UN exchange rate valid on the date of money transfer.

If the deliverables are not produced and delivered by the IC to the satisfaction of UNDP, no payment will be made even if the IC has invest time to produce and delivere such deliverables. Expected delivery dates of the reports will be finalized by UNDP during the Briefing Meeting that will be conducted upon contract signature.

The amount paid to the IC shall be gross and inclusive of all associated costs such as social security, pension and income tax etc.

Tax Obligations: The IC is solely responsible for all taxation or other assessments on any income derived from UNDP. UNDP will not make any withholding from payments for the purposes of income tax. UNDP is exempt from any liabilities regarding taxation and will not reimburse any such taxation to the IC.

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

1. PIF
2. UNDP Initiation Plan
3. UNDP Project Document
4. UNDP Environmental and Social Screening results
5. Project Inception Report
6. All Project Implementation Reports (PIR's)
7. Quarterly progress reports and work plans of the various implementation task teams
8. Audit reports
9. Finalized GEF focal area Tracking Tools at CEO endorsement and midterm
10. Oversight mission reports
11. All monitoring reports prepared by the project
12. Financial and Administration guidelines used by Project Team

The following documents will also be available:

13. Project operational guidelines, manuals and systems
14. UNDP country/countries programme document(s)
15. Minutes of the Project Board Meetings and other meetings (i.e. Project Appraisal Committee meetings)
16. Project site location maps

ToR ANNEX B: Guidelines on Contents for the Midterm Review Report⁷

- 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

⁷ The Report length should not exceed ~~40~~ pages in total (not including annexes).

- Remaining barriers to achieving the project objective
- 4.3 Project Implementation and Adaptive Management**
- Management Arrangements
 - Work planning
 - Finance and co-finance
 - Project-level monitoring and evaluation systems
 - Stakeholder engagement
 - Reporting
 - Communications
- 4.4 Sustainability**
- Financial risks to sustainability
 - Socio-economic to sustainability
 - Institutional framework and governance risks to sustainability
 - Environmental risks to sustainability
- 5. Conclusions and Recommendations (4-6 pages)**
- 5.1 Conclusions**
- Comprehensive and balanced statements (that are evidence-based and connected to the MTR's findings) which highlight the strengths, weaknesses and results of the project
- 5.2 Recommendations**
- Corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project
 - Actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the project
 - Proposals for future directions underlining main objectives
- 6. Annexes**
- MTR ToR (excluding ToR annexes)
 - MTR evaluative matrix (evaluation criteria with key questions, indicators, sources of data, and methodology)
 - Example Questionnaire or Interview Guide used for data collection
 - Ratings Scales
 - MTR mission itinerary
 - List of persons interviewed
 - List of documents reviewed
 - Co-financing table (if not previously included in the body of the report)
 - Signed UNEG Code of Conduct form
 - Signed MTR final report clearance form
 - *Annexed in a separate file:* Audit trail from received comments on draft MTR report
 - *Annexed in a separate file:* Relevant midterm tracking tools (*METT, FSC, Capacity scorecard, etc.*)

ToR ANNEX C: Midterm Review Evaluative Matrix Template

Evaluative Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
Project Strategy: To what extent is the project strategy relevant to country priorities, country ownership, and the best route towards expected results?			
(include evaluative question(s))	(i.e. relationships established, level of coherence between project design and implementation approach, specific activities conducted, quality of risk mitigation strategies, etc.)	(i.e. project documents, national policies or strategies, websites, project staff, project partners, data collected throughout the MTR mission, etc.)	(i.e. document analysis, data analysis, interviews with project staff, interviews with stakeholders, etc.)
Progress Towards Results: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved thus far?			
Project Implementation and Adaptive Management: Has the project been implemented efficiently, cost-effectively, and been able to adapt to any changing conditions thus far? To what extent are project-level monitoring and evaluation systems, reporting, and project communications supporting the project's implementation?			
Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, socio-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?			

ToR ANNEX D: UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluators/Midterm Review Consultants⁸

Evaluators/Consultants:

1. Must present information that is complete and fair in its assessment of strengths and weaknesses so that decisions or actions taken are well founded.
2. Must disclose the full set of evaluation findings along with information on their limitations and have this accessible to all affected by the evaluation with expressed legal rights to receive results.
3. Should protect the anonymity and confidentiality of individual informants. They should provide maximum notice, minimize demands on time, and respect people's right not to engage. Evaluators must respect people's right to provide information in confidence, and must ensure that sensitive information cannot be traced to its source. Evaluators are not expected to evaluate individuals, and must balance an evaluation of management functions with this general principle.
4. Sometimes uncover evidence of wrongdoing while conducting evaluations. Such cases must be reported discreetly to the appropriate investigative body. Evaluators should consult with other relevant oversight entities when there is any doubt about if and how issues should be reported.
5. Should be sensitive to beliefs, manners and customs and act with integrity and honesty in their relations with all stakeholders. In line with the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights, evaluators must be sensitive to and address issues of discrimination and gender equality. They should avoid offending the dignity and self-respect of those persons with whom they come in contact in the course of the evaluation. Knowing that evaluation might negatively affect the interests of some stakeholders, evaluators should conduct the evaluation and communicate its purpose and results in a way that clearly respects the stakeholders' dignity and self-worth.
6. Are responsible for their performance and their product(s). They are responsible for the clear, accurate and fair written and/or oral presentation of study limitations, findings and recommendations.
7. Should reflect sound accounting procedures and be prudent in using the resources of the evaluation.

MTR Consultant Agreement Form

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

Name of Consultant: _____

Name of Consultancy Organization (where relevant): _____

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

Signed at _____ (Place) on _____ (Date)

Signature: _____

⁸ www.undp.org/uneqcodeofconduct

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

Midterm Review Report Reviewed and Cleared By:

Commissioning Unit

Name: _____

Signature: _____ Date: _____

UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Advisor

Name: _____

Signature: _____ Date: _____

ToR ANNEX G: Audit Trail Template

Note: The following is a template for the MTR Expert 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 track change comment number (“#” column):

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