

**BUILDING RESILIENT COMMUNITIES, WETLAND ECOSYSTEMS AND ASSOCIATED CATCHMENTS IN UGANDA**

**TERMS OF REFERENCE (TOR)**

**For the procurement of Local Consultant to conduct Midterm Evaluation**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Project Title:** | **BUILDING RESILIENT COMMUNITIES, WETLAND ECOSYSTEMS AND ASSOCIATED CATCHMENTS IN UGANDA PROJECT** |
| **Scope of Advertisement:** | Local |
| **Type of Contract:** | Individual Consultant |
| **Post Type:** | Local Consultant |
| **Duty Station:** | Home-based (with mission travel if possible) |
| **Expected Areas of Travel:** | A representative sample of the 24 project districts in Eastern and South Western Uganda. |
| **Languages:** | English |
| **Duration of Contract:** | 20 working days spread over a period of two calendar months |
| **Start Date** | Immediately after Concluding Contract Agreement |

1. **INTRODUCTION**

This is the Terms of Reference (ToR) for the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and Green Climate Fund (GCF) Mid Term Evaluation (MTE) of the full-sized project entitled “*Building Resilient Communities, Wetland Ecosystems And Associated Catchments In Uganda Project*” implemented through the Ministry of Water and Environment (MWE) in partnership with the Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries (MAAIF) and Uganda National Meteorological Authority (UNMA). The project is implemented in 24 districts including Kabale, Kisoro, Kanungu, Ntungamo, Bushenyi, Buhweju, Mitooma, Rubirizi, Sheema, Rukungiri, Rubanda, Rukiga, Budaka, Pallisa, Ngora, Bukedea, Mbale, Kaliro, Namutumba, Kibuku, Butebo, Tororo, Butaleja and Kumi;. The project is supported by GCF, UNDP and Government of Uganda (GoU). The project was signed in June 2017, though full implementation commenced in November 2017 and is currently in its fourth year of implementation. In line with the UNDP-GCF Guidance on MTEs, this ToR sets out the expectations and its process will follow the guidance outlined on .[http://web.undp.org/review/documents/guidance/GEF/mid-term/Guidance MidtermReview\_EN\_2014.pdf](http://web.undp.org/review/documents/guidance/GEF/mid-term/Guidance%20MidtermReview_EN_2014.pdf)

1. **BACKGROUND**

The impact of climate change, coupled with other human and environmental stressors, is increasing degradation of wetlands and their associated ecosystem services in Uganda. This is negatively affecting the livelihoods of approximately 4 million people living in and around wetland areas. In fact, over 80% of the people living adjacent to wetland areas in Uganda directly use wetland resources for their household food security needs. Given that wetlands are highly vulnerable to changes in the quantity and quality of their water supply, climate change will most likely substantially alter ecologically important attributes of wetlands and will exacerbate the impacts from human activity. The loss of wetlands could exacerbate the impact of climate change as they provide fundamental services that contribute to mitigation of such impacts. This project seeks to support the Government of Uganda to take climate change issues into account when managing critical wetland areas. Project activities were developed to specifically respond to and take into account specific climate-related impacts and vulnerabilities of wetland ecosystems.

This project is restoring wetlands and their eco-system services, based on wise-use principles and guidelines as outlined by the Ramsar Convention on Wetlands, with sustainable land management practices and reforestation, is supporting resilient agricultural practices and alternative livelihoods for communities living in these areas to reduce the pressures on the wetlands, and finally is strengthening the climate information and early warning systems to support these communities to make climate-resilient decisions. The project targets two regions – 12 districts in South Western Uganda including; Kabale, Kisoro, Kanungu, Ntungamo, Bushenyi, Buhweju, Mitooma, Rubirizi, Sheema, Rukungiri, Rubanda and Rukiga and 12 districts in Eastern Uganda including; Budaka, Pallisa, Ngora, Bukedea, Mbale, Kaliro, Namutumba, Kibuku, Butebo, Tororo, Butaleja and Kumi;. With a total population of 3,946,366 people and land areas of 13,000Km2

At least 800,000 people in and around the wetlands will directly benefit from this investment. This initiative will improve the lives of some of the most vulnerable people in Uganda, dependent on subsistence agriculture and wetlands for their livelihoods. The project set out to achieve its intended Outcome of ‘*Restore and sustainably mange wetlands and support target communities in wetland areas of Uganda to reduce the risks of climate change posed to agricultural based livelihoods’* through three outputs . Output 1 focuses on restoration and management of wetland hydrology and associated forests. Output 2 focuses on Improved agricultural practices and alternative livelihood options in the wetland catchment. Finally Output 3 focuses on strengthening access to climate and early warning information to farmers and other targets communities to support wetland management.

Since November 2017, the Government of Uganda through MWE in close collaboration with Ministry of Agriculture Animal Industry and Fisheries (MAAIF) and Uganda National Meteorological Authority (UNMA) with support from UNDP/GCF has implemented the project demonstrating the direct link between the benefits of wetland conservation and people’s livelihood with a specific focus on climate change risks and adaptation opportunities of these restored wetlands. Being half –way the project life, this MTR will help to document the progress made so far, recommend strategies that will enhance delivery of intended project results commensurate with the investments made. According to the GCF guidance notes, MTEs are a monitoring tool to assess project status and challenges, identify corrective actions to ensure that projects are on track to achieve planned outcomes. As such, MTEs are required for full-sized UNDP supported projects with GCF financing such as this one.

**3.0 OBJECTIVES OF THE MID-TERM REVIEW**

The MTR will assess will review the project design and strategy, assess progress towards the achievement of the project objectives and outcomes as specified in the Project Document, early signs of project success, or failure including risks to sustainability. The goal will be to identify and recommend the changes necessary to set the project on-track to achieve its intended results.

**4.0 APPROACH AND METHODOLOGY**

The MTR must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable, and useful. The National Consultant will work with a counterpart International Consultant; the former to provide the local content while the former will be the Lead Consultant to ensure the deliverables are realized. The MTR team will review all relevant sources of information including documents prepared during the preparation phase (i.e. PIF, UNDP Initiation Plan. Project Document, project reports including Annual Project Review/PIRs, UNDP Environmental & Social Safeguard Policy, 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 GCF focal Area Tracking Tool (AMAT) submitted to the GCF at CEO endorsement, and the midterm GCF focal area Tracking Tool that must be completed before the MTR field mission begins. The MTR is expected to follow a collaborative and participatory approach[[1]](#footnote-1) ensuring close engagement with the Project Team, government counterparts (the GCF Operational Focal Point), the UNDP Country Office(s), UNDP-GCF Regional Technical Advisers, and other key stakeholders. Engagement of stakeholders is vital to a successful MTR[[2]](#footnote-2) . Stakeholder involvement should include , interviews with stakeholders who have project responsibilities, including but not limited to: MWE, MAAIF, UNMA, UNDP, project coordinators from the 24 District Local Governments and CSOs supporting implementation of the project. If possible (given the COVID restrictions) the MTR team is expected to conduct field missions to selected 24 districts ( Pallisa, Kibuku, Bukedea, Namutumba, Butaleja, Budaka, Tororo, Kaliro, Ngora, Butebo, Kumi and Mbale in Eastern Uganda  and Kabale Kisoro, Rukungiri, Kanungu, Bushenyi, Buhweju, Mitooma, Sheema, Rubirizi, Rubanda, Rukiga and Ntungamo in South Western Uganda*)* where the MTR team should be able to meet the project responsible parties and conduct site verification. The final MTR report should describe the full MTR approach taken and the rationale for the approach making explicit the underlying assumptions, challenges, strengths and weaknesses about the methods and approach of the review.

**5.0 DETAILED SCOPE OF THE INTERIM EVALUATION**

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

**5.1 Project Strategy**

5.1.1 Project design:

1. 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.
2. 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?
3. 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)?
4. 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?
5. Review the extent to which relevant gender issues were raised in the project design.
6. If there are major areas of concern, recommend areas for improvement.

5.1.2 Results Framework/Log frame:

1. Undertake a critical analysis of the project’s log frame 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.
2. Are the project’s objectives and outcomes or components clear, practical, and feasible within its time frame?
3. 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.
4. 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.

**5.2 Progress Towards Results**

5.2.1 Progress Towards Outcomes and Outputs Analysis:

1. Review the log frame indicators against progress made towards the end-of-project targets using the Progress Towards Results Matrix and 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”

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

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Project Strategy** | **Indicator[[3]](#footnote-3)** | **Baseline Level[[4]](#footnote-4)** | **Level in 1st PIR (self- reported)** | **Midterm Target[[5]](#footnote-5)** | **End-of-project Target** | **Midterm Level & Assessment[[6]](#footnote-6)** | **Achievement Rating[[7]](#footnote-7)** | **Justification for Rating (triangulated with evidence and data)** |
| **Fund Level Impact 1 :** | Indicator 1: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Indicator 2: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Fund Level Impact 2 :** | Indicator 1: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Indicator 2: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Outcome** | Indicator 1: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Indicator 2: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Output 1:** | Indicator 1: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Indicator 2: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Output 2:** | Indicator 1: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Indicator 2: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Output 3:** | Indicator 1: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Indicator 2: |  |  |  |  |  |
| **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 and outputs analysis:

1. Compare and analyse the GCF Tracking Tool at the Baseline with the one completed right before MTR.
2. Identify remaining barriers to achieving the project objective in the remainder of the project.
3. By reviewing the aspects of the project that have already been successful, identify ways in which the project can further expand these benefits.

**5.3 Project Implementation and Adaptive Management**

5.3.1Management Arrangements:

1. 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.
2. Review the quality of execution of the Executing Agency/Implementing Partner(s) and recommend areas for improvement.
3. Review the quality of support provided by the GCF Partner Agency (UNDP) and recommend areas for improvement.
4. 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?
5. What is the gender balance of project staff? What steps have been taken to ensure gender balance in project staff?
6. What is the gender balance of the Project Board? What steps have been taken to ensure gender balance in the Project Board?

5.3.2 Work Planning:

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

5.3.3 Finance and co-finance:

1. Consider the financial management of the project, with specific reference to the cost-effectiveness of interventions.
2. Review the changes to fund allocations as a result of of budget revisions and assess the appropriateness and relevance of such revisions.
3. Does the project have the appropriate financial controls, including reporting and planning, that allow management to make informed decisions regarding the budget and allow for timely flow of funds?
4. 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 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** |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | **TOTAL** |  |  |  |

1. Include the separate GCF 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).

5.3.4 Project-level Monitoring and Evaluation Systems:

1. 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?
2. 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?
3. Review the extent to which relevant gender issues were incorporated in monitoring systems.

5.3.5 Stakeholder Engagement:

1. Project management: Has the project developed and leveraged the necessary and appropriate partnerships with direct and tangential stakeholders?
2. Participation and country-driven processes: Do local and national government stakeholders support the objectives of the project? Do they continue to have an active role in project decision-making that supports efficient and effective project implementation?
3. Participation and public awareness: To what extent has stakeholder involvement and public awareness contributed to the progress towards achievement of project objectives?
4. 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?

5.3.6 Social and Environmental Standards (Safeguards)

1. Validate the risks identified in the project’s most current SESP, and those risks’ ratings; are any revisions needed?
2. Summarize and assess the revisions made since CEO Endorsement/Approval (if any) to:
   1. The project’s overall safeguards risk categorization.
   2. The identified types of risks[[8]](#footnote-8) (in the SESP).
   3. The individual risk ratings (in the SESP).
3. 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.

5.3.7 Reporting:

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

5.3.8 Communications:

1. 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?
2. 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?)
3. 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.
4. List knowledge activities/products developed (based on knowledge management approach approved at CEO Endorsement/Approval).
   1. **Sustainability**

Validate whether the risks identified in the Project Document, Annual Project Review/PIRs s 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:

5.4.1 Financial risks to sustainability:

What is the likelihood of financial and economic resources not being available once the GCF 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)?

5.4.2 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?

5.4.3 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.

* + 1. 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 MTE’s evidence-based conclusions, in light of the findings[[9]](#footnote-9).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. 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 the *MTR* *Ratings & Achievement Summary Table* in the Executive Summary of the MTR report. No rating on Project Strategy and no overall project rating is required.

Table. MTR Ratings & Achievement Summary Table for (The Building Resilient Communities, Wetland Ecosystems and Associated Catchments Project).

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Measure** | **MTR Rating[[10]](#footnote-10)** | **Achievement Description** |
| **Project Strategy** | N/A |  |
| **Progress Towards Results** | Objective Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale) |  |
| Output 1 Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale) |  |
| Output 2 Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale) |  |
| Output 3 Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale) |  |
| Etc. |  |
| **Project Implementation & Adaptive Management** | (rate 6 pt. scale) |  |
| **Sustainability** | (rate 4 pt. scale) |  |

1. **TIMEFRAME (DURATION OF WORK)**

The total duration of the Interim Evaluation will be approximately 25 working daysover a period of 6 weeks. A National Consultant will complement the Lead/International Consultant for a period of 20 working days over the 6 weeks period. The tentative Interim Evaluation 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) | # days (recommended: 2-4 days) | By 28 August 2021 |
| MTR mission: stakeholder meetings, interviews, field visits | # days (recommended: 7 – 15 days) | By 18th September 2021 |
| Presentation of initial findings- last day of the MTR mission | *1 day* | 22nd September 2021 |
| Preparing draft report (due within 3 weeks of the MTR mission) | # days (recommended 5 – 10 days) | 30th September ,2021. |
| Finalization of MTR report/ Incorporating audit trail from feedback on draft report (due within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on the draft) | # days (recommended 3 – 4 days) | this date shall be 2-3 weeks after the draft report is presented.  By 16th October 2021 |

1. **MTR DELIVERABLES**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **#** | **Deliverable** | **Description** | **Timing** | **Responsibilities** |
| 1 | MTR Inception Report | MTR team clarifies objectives and methods of Midterm Review | By 30th August, 2021 | MTR team submits inception report UNDP CO |
| 2 | Presentation | Initial Findings | End of MTR mission | MTR Team presents to Project Management and the UNDP CO |
| 3 | Presentation of Draft Report | Draft report | By 30th September,2021 | MTE team presents to UNDP internal Review Committee Project Coordinating Unit, and is reviewed by RTA and GCF Operational Focal Point |
| 4 | Presentation of Final Report | Full report (using guidelines on content outlined in Annex B) with annexes and addressing comments of internal review committee | By 16th October 2021 | MTR lead consultant presentation to stakeholders including Project Board, Technical Committee and Responsible Parties |
| **5** | Final Report[[11]](#footnote-11) | Revised report with audit trail detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final MTR report | By 20th Oct,2021 | Final report sent to UNDP CO and UNDP CO will send to MWE |

**8.0 MTR ARRANGEMENTS**

The principal responsibility for managing this MTR resides with the Commissioning Unit. The Commissioning Unit for this project’s MTR is UNDP Country Office. The commissioning unit will contract the consultants and ensure the timely provision of per diems and travel arrangements within the country for the MTR team. The Project Team will be responsible for liaising with the MTR team to provide all relevant documents, set up stakeholder interviews, and arrange field visits.

1. **INSTITUTIONAL ARRANGEMENT/REPORTING RELATIONSHIP**

The consultant will work under the daily supervision of the National Project Coordinator and the overall guidance of the Practice Specialist at UNDP Country Office. Overall, the Consultant will report to the UNDP Resident Representative, with regular working relationship with the National Project Coordinator at MWE. The National Consultant will report to MWE on technical obligations and to UNDP on all contractual obligations.

1. **LOGISTICS AND ADMINISTRATION SUPPORT** 
   * 1. The UNDP Uganda and MWE through the Project Management Unit will make available all the transport and ensure that the consultant has access to resources, key partners and sites as planned. The Project Management Unit will facilitate the MTR team to meet with interact with the stakeholders at the national level and in the Districts/communities.
     2. UNDP will support the Consultant in the following areas:

* Access to required information (copy of project document, Annual Work plans, Progress reports and other project related reports).
* Access to UNDP Office and its infrastructure (e.g. conference room and internet while at UNDP).
* Support and assistance to gain access to relevant stakeholders for consultations;
  + 1. UNDP Kampala and the Project Office will coordinate the study and keep abreast of the Mission’s activities during the Consultant’s stay.

1. **TEAM COMPOSITION**

A team of two independent consultants will conduct the MTR - one Team Leader (International with experience and exposure to projects and evaluations in other regions globally) and one National team expert, usually from the country of the project. The selection of consultants will be aimed at maximizing the overall “team” qualities in the following areas: The weight to all preferred qualifications apart from the minimum academic qualifications and experience are shown in the Technical Evaluation Criteria below.

**12.0 QUALIFICATIONS**

**12.1 Academic Qualifications:**

Advanced University Degree (Masters or equivalent) in natural sciences; with a specialization in environment, biodiversity, climate change or any other closely related field

**12.2 Experience:**

1. Minimum 7 years of relevant professional experience in relevant technical areas.
2. Minimum of 4 years proven track record of application of results-based approaches to evaluation of projects focusing on Conservation Science, Natural Resource Management and Climate Change.
3. Highly knowledgeable of participatory monitoring and evaluation processes.
4. Familiarity with Uganda’s development, environment, climate change and other relevant policy frameworks.

**12.3 Competencies:**

1. Recent experience with result-based management evaluation methodologies: (10%)
2. Experience applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios; (10%)
3. Competence in adaptive management, as applied to GCF CC focal areas, (10%)
4. Experience working with GCF-GEF evaluations; (10%).
5. Experience working in East Africa; (5%)
6. Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender and Climate change, environment conservation, biodiversity, Livelihood, ecosystem management or food security experience in gender sensitive evaluation and analysis. (5%)
7. Excellent communication skills; (5%)
8. Demonstrable analytical skills; (5%)

**12.4 Language and other skills:**

Proficiency in both spoken and written English

**12.5 Compliance of the UN Core Values:**

1. Demonstrates integrity by modelling the UN’s values and ethical standards,
2. Promotes the vision, mission, and strategic goals of UNDP,
3. Displays cultural, gender, religion, race, nationality and age sensitivity and adaptability,
4. Treats all people fairly without favouritism,
5. Fulfils all obligations to gender sensitivity and zero tolerance for sexual harassment.

**13.0 ETHICS**

The MTR team will be held to the highest ethical standards and is required to sign a code of conduct upon acceptance of the assignment. This MTR will be conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG ‘[Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation](http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/2866)’. The MTR team 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 team 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.

13.1 Evaluator ethics

Evaluation consultants will be held to the highest ethical standards and are required to sign a Code of Conduct upon acceptance of the assignment. UNDP evaluations are conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluations'.

**This TOR is approved by:**

**Signature:** \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**Name and Designation:** ­­­­­­­­­­­­­\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**Date of Signing:**  ­­­­­­­­\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**14.0 SELECTION CRITERIA**

Qualified Individual Consultant is expected to submit both the Technical and Financial Proposals. Individual Consultants will be evaluated based on Cumulative Analysis as per the following scenario:

1. Responsive/compliant/acceptable, and
2. Having received the highest score out of a pre-determined set of weighted technical and financial criteria specific to the solicitation. In this regard, the respective weight of the proposals are:
   * Technical Criteria weight is 70%
   * Financial Criteria weight is 30%

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Evaluation Criteria** | | **Weight** | **Max. Point** |
| **Technical Competence (based on CV, Proposal and interview (if required)** | | **70%** | 100 |
| Understanding the Scope of Work; comprehensiveness of the methodology/approach; and organization & completeness of the proposal | |  | 30 |
| Minimum educational background | |  | 15 |
| Minimum years of experience | |  | 30 |
| Additional competences (agriculture and Environment /M&E) | |  | 25 |
| **Financial (Lower Offer/Offer X100)** | | **30%** | 30 |
| **Total Score** | **Technical Score \* 70% + Financial Score \*30%** | | |

*\* It is a mandatory criterion and shall have a minimum of 50%*

**15.0 PAYMENT MILESTONES**

| **Instalment of Payment/ Period** | **Deliverables or Documents to be Delivered** | **Approval should be obtained** | **Percentage of Payment** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1st Instalment | upon approval of the final MTR Inception Report | UNDP and MWE | 20% |
| 2nd Instalment | upon satisfactory delivery of the draft MTR report | UNDP and MWE | 40% |
| 3rd Instalment | upon satisfactory delivery and approval of the Final MTR report by the RTA | UNDP and MWE | 40% |

Criteria for issuing the final payment of 40%[[12]](#footnote-12):

1. The final MTR report includes all requirements outlined in the MTR TOR and is in accordance with the MTR guidance.
2. 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).
3. The Audit Trail includes responses to and justification for each comment listed.
4. RTA approvals are via signatures on the TE Report Clearance Form)
5. **RECOMMENDED PRESENTATION OF TECHNICAL AND FINANCIAL PROPOSALS**

For purposes of generating proposals whose contents are uniformly presented and to facilitate their comparative review, you are hereby given a template of the Table of Content. Accordingly, your Technical Proposal document must have at least the preferred content as outlined in the IC Standard Bid Document (SBD). The financial proposals should be ALL inclusive.

1. **CONFIDENTIALITY**

The Individual Consultant shall not either during the term or after termination of the assignment, disclose any proprietary or confidential information related to the consultancy service without prior written consent. Proprietary interests on all materials and documents prepared by the consultants under the assignment shall become and remain properties of UNDP.

**18.0 ANNEXES**

Existing literature and documents that will help Offerors gain a better understanding of the project situation and the work required are provided as annexes to the TOR, including:

1. *Guidance for Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects* (2014)
2. List of documents to be reviewed by the MTR Team
3. Guidelines on Contents for the Midterm Review Report
4. MTR Evaluative Matrix template
5. UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluators/Midterm Review Consultants
6. MTR Required Ratings & Achievement Summary Table and Ratings Scales
7. MTR Report Clearance Form
8. MTR Audit Trail template
9. Progress Towards Results Matrix template

19.0 APPLICATION PROCESS

Applicants are requested to apply online at <http://jobs.undp.org> by **20 July, 2021**. Individual consultants are invited to submit technical and financial proposals as applications together with their CV for these positions. UNDP applies a fair and transparent selection process that will take into account the competencies/skills of the applicants as well as their financial proposals. Qualified women and members of social minorities are encouraged to apply.

**20.0 DOCUMENTS TO BE INCLUDED WHEN SUBMITTING THE PROPOSALS.**

|  |
| --- |
| Interested individual consultants must submit the following documents/information to demonstrate their qualifications **in one single PDF document:**   1. Duly accomplished **Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability** 2. **Personal CV or P11**, indicating all past experience from similar projects, as well as the contact details (email and telephone number) of the Candidate and at least three (3) professional references. 3. **Technical proposal:**    1. Brief description of why the individual considers him/herself as the most suitable for the assignment    2. A methodology, on how they will approach and complete the assignment. 4. **Financial proposal** that indicates the all-inclusive fixed total contract price, supported by a breakdown of costs. 5. Interested applicants should send an email to: [Moses.Lutwama@undp.org and copy Janet.Anyango@undp.org](mailto:Moses.Lutwama@undp.org%20%20and%20copy%20Janet.Anyango@undp.org) for a detailed copy of the Terms of Reference. |

**ANNEX A. LIST OF DOCUMENTS TO BE REVIEWED**

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 GCF focal area Tracking Tools at CEO endorsement and midterm (*LD, and Biodiversity)*
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:

1. Project operational guidelines, manuals and systems
2. UNDP country/countries programme document(s)
3. Minutes of the Building Resilient Wetland Ecosystems and Associated Catchments in Uganda Project Board Meetings and other meetings (i.e. Project Appraisal Committee meetings)
4. Project site location maps

**ANNEX B: Guidelines on Contents for the Midterm Review Report**[[13]](#footnote-13)

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| i. | Basic Report Information *(for opening page or title page)*   * Title of UNDP supported GCF financed project * UNDP PIMS# and GCF project ID# * MTR time frame and date of MTR report * Region and countries included in the project * GCF 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 MTE, MTR approach and data collection methods, limitations to the MTR * Structure of the MTR report | | |
| 3. | Project Description and Background Context *(3-5 pages)*   * Development context: environmental, socio-economic, institutional, and policy factors relevant to the project objective and scope * Problems that the project sought to address: threats and barriers targeted * Project Description and Strategy: objective, outcomes and expected results, description of field sites (if any) * Project Implementation Arrangements: short description of the Project Board, key implementing partner arrangements, etc. * Project timing and milestones * Main stakeholders: summary list | | |
| 4. | Findings *(12-14 pages)* | | |
| 4.1 | Project Strategy   * Project Design * Results Framework/Logframe | |
| 4.2 | Progress Towards Results   * Progress towards outcomes analysis * Remaining barriers to achieving the project objective | |
| 4.3 | Project Implementation and Adaptive Management   * Management Arrangements * Work planning * Finance and co-finance * Project-level monitoring and evaluation systems * Stakeholder engagement * Reporting * Communications | |
| 4.4 | Sustainability   * Financial risks to sustainability * Socio-economic to sustainability * Institutional framework and governance risks to sustainability * Environmental risks to sustainability | |
| 5. | Conclusions and Recommendations *(4-6 pages)* | | |
|  | 5.1 | | Conclusions   * Comprehensive and balanced statements (that are evidence-based and connected to the MTE’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*,* | | |

**ANNEX C: MTR EVALUATIVE MATRIX (EVALUATION CRITERIA WITH KEY QUESTIONS, INDICATORS, SOURCES OF DATA, AND METHODOLOGY)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Evaluative Questions** | | **Indicators** | | | | | | **Sources** | | **Methodology** | |
| Relevance: Project Strategy: To what extent is the project strategy relevant to country priorities, country ownership, and the best route towards expected results? | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Do the project activities address the gaps in the policy, regulatory and capacity framework at the national level?  To what extent is the project suited to local and national development priorities and policies? | | Degree to which the project supports national environmental objectives.    Addressing gaps and/or inconsistency with the national and local policies and priorities    Addressing gaps in capacity framework. | | | | | | National policies,  Project Document | | Document analysis | |
| How relevant the project’s intended outcomes?  How relevant is the involvement of different partners in the Project implementation given the institutional and policy framework for environment and food security sectors in Uganda? | | Degree to which the project supports national environmental and development objectives | | | | | | Project documents and evaluations | | Document analysis | |
| Were the project’s objectives and components relevant, according to the social and political context? | | Degree of coherence between the project and national priorities, policies and strategies | | | | | | Government of Uganda, UNDP, Project  Management | | Interviews | |
| A r e counterpart resources (funding, staff, and facilities), enabling legislation, and adequate project management arrangements in place at project entry?  Are the stated assumptions and risks logical and robust?  And did they help to determine activities and planned outputs? Is the project coherent with UNDP programming strategy for Uganda?  To what extent is the project in line with GCF operational programs | | Appreciation from national stakeholders with respect to adequacy of project design and implementation to national realities and existing capacities  Coherence UNDP and GCF operational programming | | | | | | Project partners and relevant stakeholders  UNDAF, UNDP/GCF  Programming statements | | Interviews  Document analysis | |
| Effectiveness: Progress Towards Results: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved thus far? | | | | | | | | | | | |
| What expected outputs have been achieved thus far? | | Degree of achievement vis a vis expected outcome indicators | | | | | | PIR 2017 Interviews | | Document analysis  Site Visits  Interviews | |
| To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved thus far?  What have the products, such as studies, policy recommendations, dissemination campaigns, etc., affected [keeping in mind that this is a midterm review and several if not many products are still in the implementation or  planning process] |  | | | | | |  | | |  | |
| Was the project effective in acquiring a policy guidance for future developments in the field of livelihoods, Climate Change and sustainable environment management in the project districts?  How is the Project addressing fragmentation of environment management policies, and institutional scattering considering this fragmentation?  How is the Project contributing to avoiding fragmentation across policies and cross-cutting mandates?  What other partners can be involved in the Project in a meaningful way to  streamline the issue and by-  pass or address the institutional and policy fragmentation of the environment and climate change in the project districts? |  | |  |  |  |  | Project outcomes    Norms, policies debated, adopted | |  | Document analysis    Stakeholders interviews |  |
| How well has the project involved and empowered communities to implement management strategies as they relate to environment and climate change in the project districts?  How has the project incorporated gender issues as the relate to environment and climate change in the project districts? | Involvement of (direct and indirect) beneficiaries in project development and implementation  Incorporation of gender dimension    Analysis of participation by stakeholders (communities, civil society, direct and indirect beneficiaries, etc.).    Effect of project aspects implemented at sites | | | | | | Project outputs and outcomes | | | Interviews    Site visits |  |
| What is causing delays in implementation and delivery of outputs of the Project? | Discrepancies between expected outputs/outcome by the time of mid-term and actual achievements | | | | | | Findings in project documents, achievement  indicators | | | Document analysis (minutes of meetings specially)  Site visits observation | |
| In what outputs?  Where are the  implementation ‘bottlenecks’?  How can these issues be solved?  What changes need to be implemented? |  | | | | | |  | | | Stakeholder interviews | |
| Partnerships for  implementation | Working relationship between PMU,  UNDP, and other strategic partners as well as donors    Board functions | | | | | | Findings in project documents (PIRs, minutes of meetings)    Indications in interviews | | | Document analysis    Stakeholder interviews | |
| In what ways are long-term emerging effects to the project foreseen? | Level of coherence between project expected results and project design internal logic | | | | | | Government of Uganda, Project team, UNDP | | | Interviews | |
| Were the relevant representatives from government and civil society involved in project implementation, including  as part of the project | Level of coherence between project design and project implementation approach  Role of committees in guidance  Harness effectiveness by analysing how project’s results were met vis-à-vis  intended outcomes or objectives    Draw lessons learned/good practices from the implementation and achievement of results | | | | | | Project partners and relevant stakeholders | | | Document analysis | |
| Efficiency: Project Implementation and Adaptive Management: Has the project been implemented efficiently, cost-effectively, and could 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? | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Was the project  implemented efficiently, inline with international and national norms and standards? | Policies adopted / enacted  Policies implemented  Budgetary / financial means to implement policies drawn | | | | | | Policy documents contain sustainability factors  (policy adopted,  implemented)      Budget arrangements  (allocations, etc.) made to sustain project outputs and outcomes | | | Documentation analysis    Stakeholder  interviews | |
|  | Was adaptive management used thus far and if so, how did these modifications to the project contribute to obtaining the objectives? Has the project 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? | | | | | | Quality of existing information systems in place to identify emerging risks and other issues | | | Project documents | |
|  | How did institutional arrangements influence the project’s achievement of results? | | | | | | Quality of risk mitigations strategies developed and followed | | | Government of  Uganda, Project team,  UNDP | |
| Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, socio-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long term project results? | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Sustainability possibilities  Does the Project have an exit strategy?  What components should an exit strategy have for this project? | In what way, may the benefits from the project are likely to be maintained or increased in the future? | | | | | | See indicators in project document results  framework and log frame | | | Project documents and reports | |
| Social sustainability factors | Is there sufficient public/stakeholder awareness in support of the project’ s longterm objectives? | | | | | | Evidence that particular partnerships/linkages will be sustained | | | Government of  Uganda, Project team,  UNDP | |
| Political/financial sustainability | Do the legal frameworks, policies, and governance structures and processes within which the project operates pose risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project benefits? | | | | | | Evidence that particular practices will be  sustained | | | Government of  Uganda, Project team, UNDP; tourism (safari) endeavours | |
| Replicability | Which of the project’s aspects deserve to be replicated in future initiatives? | | | | | | Evidence that particular practices will be  sustained | | | Government of  Uganda, Project team,  UNDP | |

**ANNEX D: UNEG CODE OF CONDUCT FORM FOR CONSULTANT**

**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\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

Signed at \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ *Date\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_*

**ANNEX E MTR RATING SCALE**

**Rating scale for performance**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Rating** | **Explanation** |
| Highly Satisfactory (HS) | No shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives in terms of relevance, effectiveness and efficiency |
| Satisfactory (S) | Minor shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives in terms of relevance, effectiveness and efficiency |
| Moderately Satisfactory (MS) | Moderate shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives in terms of relevance, effectiveness and efficiency |
| Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU) | Significant shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives in terms of relevance, effectiveness and efficiency |
| Unsatisfactory (U) | Major shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives in terms of relevance, effectiveness and efficiency |
| Highly Unsatisfactory (HU) | Severe shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives in terms of relevance, effectiveness and efficiency |

**Rating Scale for Sustainability**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Rating** | **Explanation** |
| Likely (L) | Negligible risks to sustainability, with key outcomes expected to continue into the foreseeable future |
| Moderately Likely (ML) | Moderate risks, but expectations that at least some outcomes will be sustained |
| Moderately Unlikely (MU) | Substantial risk that key outcomes will not carry on after project closure, although some outputs and activities should carry on |
| Unlikely (U) | Severe risk that project outcomes as well as key outputs will not be sustained |
| Highly Unlikely (HU) | Expectation that few if any outputs or activities will continue after project closure |

**Progress Towards Results Rating Scale**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 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”. |
| Satisfactory (S) | The objective/outcome is expected to achieve most of its end-of-project targets, with only minor shortcomings. |
| Moderately Satisfactory (MS) | The objective/outcome is expected to achieve most of its end-of-project targets but with significant shortcomings. |
| Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU) | The objective/outcome is expected to achieve its end-of-project targets with major shortcomings. |
| Unsatisfactory (U) | The objective/outcome is expected not to achieve most of its end-of-project targets. |
| 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) | |
| 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”. |
| 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. |
| 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. |
| 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. |
| Unsatisfactory (U) | Implementation of most of the seven components is not leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management. |
| Highly Unsatisfactory (HU) | Implementation of none of the seven components is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management. |

**ANNEX F: MTR Report Clearance Form**

*(to be completed by the Commissioning Unit and UNDP- GCF RTA and included in the final document)*

**Midterm Review Report Reviewed and Cleared By:**

**Commissioning Unit**

Name: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**UNDP-GCF Regional Technical Advisor**

Name: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**ANNEX G: Audit Trail Template**

*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 Interim Evaluation of *The Building Resilient Communities, Wetland Ecosystems and Associated Catchments Project****”***) (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** |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

**ANNEX H: Progress Towards Results Matrix**

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

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Project Strategy** | **Indicator[[14]](#footnote-14)** | **Baseline Level[[15]](#footnote-15)** | **Level in 1st PIR (self- reported)** | **Midterm Target[[16]](#footnote-16)** | **End-of-project Target** | **Midterm Level & Assessment[[17]](#footnote-17)** | **Achievement Rating[[18]](#footnote-18)** | **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 |

**ToR ANNEX I: GCF Co-Financing Template (provided as a separate file)**

1. For ideas on innovative and participatory Monitoring and Evaluation strategies and techniques, see [UNDP Discussion Paper: Innovations in Monitoring & Evaluating Results](http://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/librarypage/capacity-building/discussion-paper--innovations-in-monitoring---evaluating-results/), 05 Nov 2013. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. For more stakeholder engagement in the M&E process, see the [UNDP Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results](http://www.undg.org/docs/11653/UNDP-PME-Handbook-(2009).pdf), Chapter 3, pg. 93. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Populate with data from the Log frame and scorecards [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. Populate with data from the Project Document [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. If available [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. Colour code this column only [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. Use the 6-point Progress Towards Results Rating Scale: HS, S, MS, MU, U, HU [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
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. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. Alternatively, MTR conclusions may be integrated into the body of the report. [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. Ratings for Objective/Outcome Achievement and Project Implementation & Adaptive Management: 6 = Highly Satisfactory (HS): exceeds expectations and/or no shortcomings; 5 = Satisfactory (S): meets expectations and/or no or minor shortcomings; 4 = Moderately Satisfactory (MS): more or less meets expectations and/or some shortcomings; 3 = Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): somewhat below expectations and/or significant shortcomings; 2 = Unsatisfactory (U): substantially below expectations and/or major shortcomings; 1 = Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): severe shortcomings, Unable to Assess (U/A): available information does not allow an assessment

    Ratings for Sustainability: 4 = Likely (L): negligible risks to sustainability; 3 = Moderately Likely (ML): moderate risks to sustainability; 2 = Moderately Unlikely (MU): significant risks to sustainability; 1 = Unlikely (U): severe risks to sustainability; Unable to Assess (U/A): Unable to assess the expected incidence and magnitude of risks to sustainability [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
11. 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 stakeholder [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
12. 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> [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
13. The Report length should not exceed *40* pages in total (not including annexes). [↑](#footnote-ref-13)
14. Populate with data from the Logframe and scorecards [↑](#footnote-ref-14)
15. Populate with data from the Project Document [↑](#footnote-ref-15)
16. If available [↑](#footnote-ref-16)
17. Colour code this column only [↑](#footnote-ref-17)
18. Use the 6 point Progress Towards Results Rating Scale: HS, S, MS, MU, U, HU [↑](#footnote-ref-18)