**Annex 1: MTR ToR (excluding ToR annexes)**

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

**Services/Work Description:** UNDP-GEF Midterm Review (MTR) of the medium sized project

**Project/Programme Title:** *“*Enhancing financial sustainability of the Protected Area system in Georgia” (PIMS#6138)

**Consultancy Title:** Mid-term review consultant - evaluator

**Duty Station:** Home based with field visit to Tbilisi and, if possible, to the project sites in Georgia.

**Duration:** 22 working days within the 3 months period

**Expected start date:** August 1, 2021 (preparatory work). From September 6th - site visit to Georgia.

1. **BACKGROUND**

|  |
| --- |
| See attached UNDP-GEF Midterm Review Terms of Reference |

1. **SCOPE OF WORK, RESPONSIBILITIES AND DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSED WORK**

|  |
| --- |
| See attached UNDP-GEF Midterm Review Terms of Reference |

1. **Expected Outputs and deliverables**

|  |
| --- |
| See attached UNDP-GEF Midterm Review Terms of Reference |

1. **Institutional arrangements/reporting lines**

|  |
| --- |
| See attached UNDP-GEF Midterm Review Terms of Reference |

1. **Experience and qualifications**

|  |
| --- |
| I. Academic Qualifications:  At least Master’s degree or equivalent in Biodiversity Conservation, Natural Resource Management, Environmental Management, or other related areas.  II. Years of experience:   * At least 10 years of experience in providing consultancy or management services to the environmental projects preferably in biodiversity conservation, protected areas management or financing. * Experience in monitoring and evaluating UNDP/GEF or other international development agencies’ projects, preferably in protected areas and/or biodiversity conservation in the region/country. * Knowledge of the institutional arrangements and politics underpinning the protected areas of Georgia is a strong asset;   III. Language:  Fluency in English both written and spoken and technical writing skills in English  IV. Competencies:   * Strong analytical skills; * Excellent team working skills; * Ability to communicate effectively in order to communicate complex, technical information to both technical and general audiences; * Displays cultural, gender, religion, race, nationality and age sensitivity and adaptability; * Highest standards of integrity, discretion and loyalty |

1. **Payment Modality**

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

**UNDP-GEF Midterm Review**

**Terms of Reference**

1. **INTRODUCTION**

|  |
| --- |
| This is the Terms of Reference (ToR) for the UNDP-GEF Midterm Review (MTR) of the medium sized project titled *“*Enhancing financial sustainability of the Protected Area system in Georgia” (PIMS#6138) implemented through the UNDP, which is to be undertaken in 2021. The project started in December 2018 and is in its third year of implementation.. This ToR sets out the expectations for this MTR. The MTR process must follow the guidance outlined in the document *Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects.*  (<http://web.undp.org/evaluation/documents/guidance/GEF/mid-term/Guidance_Midterm%20Review%20_EN_2014.pdf>). |

**2. PROJECT BACKGROUND INFORMATION**

|  |
| --- |
| While in recent years significant progress was made on a broad specter of institutional and legislative reforms, including on environmental protection and nature conservation, and the area under formal protection was significantly expanded, three key barriers remain to establishing an effective and efficient PA system in Georgia: **Insufficient and insecure financing to sustainably address recurrent costs of maintaining the PA system;** w**eak capacity in efficient financial-administrative planning and effective operational management of the PA system** and **Lack of awareness and action amongst key sector institutions, communities, media and the public of risks from biodiversity and ecosystem losses.**  The project seeks to support the Government of Georgia in addressing the identified barriers by sustainably increasing available financing to an increasing number of Priority PAs, by improving capacities for effective financial-operational and efficient budgeting based on improved information and strengthening knowledge and awareness on the importance of biodiversity and PAs in maintaining important ecosystem services. The project will fulfill its objective by delivering project activities in 3 inter-related and mutually complementary components, focusing on (i) financial sustainability of sub-system of PAs representing KBAs; (ii) Improved management and financial effectiveness demonstrated for targeted large-scale PAs; and (iii) Knowledge Management and monitoring and evaluation,  Through increased financial resources, especially from domestic revenues, and improved management effectiveness of target PAs, the project will particularly contribute to reducing threats to, and improving the *in situ* conservation status of identified globally threatened biodiversity in target PAs that meet established criteria for Biodiversity Areas, including (i) recognized Important Bird and Biodiversity Areas (IBAs); (ii) approved and candidate Emerald Sites; (iii) the Caucasus Endemic Bird Area; and (iv) tentative World Heritage Sites, covering 431,872 ha of the ecologically representative PA network in Georgia. Dedicated Management Effectiveness Assessment plans will allow to better plan and implement targeted, on-the-ground conservation and threat reduction measures assuring maintaining populations of globally threatened species at least at their 2017 level, as well as valuable species endemic to Georgia and the Caucasus Ecoregion. |

***Impact of Covid 19***

***Georgia***

Stringent measures, including curfews, a ban on public transport, lockdowns, and border closures in early 2020 allowed the country to contain the pandemic’s spread. However, the easing of measures in the summer contributed to a significant second surge later in the year, and Georgia became one of the 20 most affected countries in the world in terms of reported cases per million population. The authorities enacted a second strict lockdown from end-November to early February 2021, leading to a reduction of COVID cases and permitting a gradual reopening of the economy starting in March 2021.

As of May 1st, 2021 the government-imposed night curfew (9.00 pm to 5 am) is in place. International flights are open to Georgian airports in Tbilisi, Kutaisi and Batumi. Further information about COVID related situation can be obtained from the website: <https://stopcov.ge/en>

As of May April 30th, the COVID statistics in Georgia are as follows:

- Total confirmed cases: 310 310

- Deaths: 4110

- Recovered: 290767

The project team will provide additional information and assistance in planning of travel if required.

***Project***

COVID pandemic and associated restrictions had medium impact on project. Most affected were the capacity building component and public awareness activities, as well as public consultations in relation to various studies, due to the safety considerations for events and gatherings. Where applicable the online meeting platforms were used. Other project activities involving the deskwork and field visits (e.g., design and implementation of tourism investment projects, biodiversity monitoring etc.) were least affected. Overall, project is on track and no serious delays have occurred.

**3. OBJECTIVES OF THE MTR**

The MTR will assess progress towards the achievement of the project objectives and outcomes as specified in the Project Document and assess early signs of project success or failure with the goal of identifying the necessary changes to be made in order to set the project on-track to achieve its intended results. It (MTR) will focus on the effectiveness, efficiency and timeliness of project implementation; will present initial lessons learned about project design, implementation and management. The MTR will also review the project’s strategy, its risks to sustainability. Findings of this MTR will be incorporated as recommendations for enhanced implementation during the final half of the project’s term.

**4. MTR APPROACH & METHODOLOGY**

The MTR must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The MTR team will review all relevant sources of information including documents prepared during the preparation phase (i.e. PIF, UNDP Initiation Plan, UNDP Social and Environmental Screening Procedure/SESP, the Project Document, project reports including annual 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 MTR team will review the baseline GEF focal area Tracking Tool/Core Indicators submitted to the GEF at CEO endorsement, and the midterm GEF focal area Tracking Tool/Core Indicators that must be completed before the MTR field mission begins.

The MTR team is expected to follow a collaborative and participatory approach[[1]](#footnote-1) ensuring close engagement with the Project Team, government counterparts (the GEF Operational Focal Point), the UNDP Country Office(s), UNDP Nature, Climate and Energy (NCE) Regional Technical Adviser (RTA), 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; executing agency, senior officials, key experts and consultants, Project Board, project stakeholders, relevant regional and local government and CSOs, etc. Additionally, the MTR team is expected to conduct field missions to several project sites located in different regions of Georgia (Kakheti – Lagodekhi PAs, Samtskhe-Javakheti – Borjomi-Kharagauli PA’s, Ajara – Mtirala, Mskheta-Mtianeti – Kazbegi PAs.) or via virtual means depending on the COVID-19 situation and travel restrictions that would apply at that time.

If all or part of the MTR is to be carried out virtually then consideration should be taken for stakeholder availability, ability or willingness to be interviewed remotely. In addition, their accessibility to the internet/computer may be an issue as many government and national counterparts may be working from home. These limitations must be reflected in the final MTR report.

A short validation mission may be considered if it is confirmed to be safe for staff, consultants, stakeholders and if such a mission is possible within the MTR schedule. Equally, qualified and independent national consultants can be hired to undertake the MTR and interviews in country as long as it is safe to do so.

The specific design and methodology for the MTR should emerge from consultations between the MTR team and the above-mentioned parties regarding what is appropriate and feasible for meeting the MTR purpose and objectives and answering the evaluation questions, given limitations of budget, time and data. The MTR team must use gender-responsive methodologies and tools and ensure that gender equality and women’s empowerment, as well as other cross-cutting issues and SDGs are incorporated into the MTR report.

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

The final MTR report 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. DETAILED SCOPE OF THE MTR**

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

**i. Project Strategy**

Project design:

* Review the problem addressed by the project and the underlying assumptions. Review the effect of any incorrect assumptions or changes to the context to achieving the project results as outlined in the Project Document.
* Review the relevance of the project strategy and assess whether it provides the most effective route towards expected/intended results. Were lessons from other relevant projects properly incorporated into the project design?
* Review how the project addresses country priorities. Review country ownership. Was the project concept in line with the national sector development priorities and plans of the country (or of participating countries in the case of multi-country projects)?
* Review decision-making processes: were perspectives of those who would be affected by project decisions, those who could affect the outcomes, and those who could contribute information or other resources to the process, taken into account during project design processes?
* Review the extent to which relevant gender issues were raised in the project design. See Annex 9 of *Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects* for further guidelines.
  + Were relevant gender issues (e.g. the impact of the project on gender equality in the programme country, involvement of women’s groups, engaging women in project activities) raised in the Project Document?
* If there are major areas of concern, recommend areas for improvement.

Results Framework/Logframe:

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

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

Work Planning:

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

Finance and co-finance:

* Consider the financial management of the project, with specific reference to the cost-effectiveness of interventions.
* Review the changes to fund allocations as a result of budget revisions and assess the appropriateness and relevance of such revisions.
* Does the project have the appropriate financial controls, including reporting and planning, that allow management to make informed decisions regarding the budget and allow for timely flow of funds?
* Informed by the co-financing monitoring table to be filled out, provide commentary on co-financing: is co-financing being used strategically to help the objectives of the project? Is the Project Team meeting with all co-financing partners regularly in order to align financing priorities and annual work plans?

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

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

Project-level Monitoring and Evaluation Systems:

* Review the monitoring tools currently being used: Do they provide the necessary information? Do they involve key partners? Are they aligned or mainstreamed with national systems? Do they use existing information? Are they efficient? Are they cost-effective? Are additional tools required? How could they be made more participatory and inclusive?
* Examine the financial management of the project monitoring and evaluation budget. Are sufficient resources being allocated to monitoring and evaluation? Are these resources being allocated effectively?
* Review the extent to which relevant gender issues were incorporated in monitoring systems. See Annex 9 of *Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects* for further guidelines.

Stakeholder Engagement:

* Project management: Has the project developed and leveraged the necessary and appropriate partnerships with direct and tangential stakeholders?
* Participation and country-driven processes: Do local and national government stakeholders support the objectives of the project? Do they continue to have an active role in project decision-making that supports efficient and effective project implementation?
* Participation and public awareness: To what extent has stakeholder involvement and public awareness contributed to the progress towards achievement of project objectives?
* How does the project engage women and girls? Is the project likely to have the same positive and/or negative effects on women and men, girls and boys? Identify, if possible, legal, cultural, or religious constraints on women’s participation in the project. What can the project do to enhance its gender benefits?

Social and Environmental Standards (Safeguards)

* Validate the risks identified in the project’s most current SESP, and those risks’ ratings; are any revisions needed?
* Summarize and assess the revisions made since CEO Endorsement/Approval (if any) to:
  + The project’s overall safeguards risk categorization.
  + The identified types of risks[[8]](#footnote-8) (in the SESP).
  + The individual risk ratings (in the SESP).
* Describe and assess progress made in the implementation of the project’s social and environmental management measures as outlined in the SESP submitted at CEO Endorsement/Approval (and prepared during implementation, if any), including any revisions to those measures. Such management measures might include Environmental and Social Management Plans (ESMPs) or other management plans, though can also include aspects of a project’s design; refer to Question 6 in the SESP template for a summary of the identified management measures.

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

Reporting:

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

Communications & Knowledge Management:

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

**iv. Sustainability**

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

Financial risks to sustainability:

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

Socio-economic risks to sustainability:

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

Institutional Framework and Governance risks to sustainability:

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

Environmental risks to sustainability:

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

**Conclusions & Recommendations**

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

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

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

**Ratings**

The MTR team will include its ratings of the project’s results and brief descriptions of the associated achievements in 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 (*Expansion and Improved Management of the Achara Region’s Protected Areas*)**

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

1. **TIMEFRAME**

The total duration of the MTR will be approximately 22 days over a period of 12 weeks (with up to 12 days for MTR mission in Georgia), starting approximately August 1st and shall not exceed five months from when the consultant(s) are hired. The tentative MTR timeframe is as follows:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **TIMEFRAME (with reco** | **ACTIVITY** |
| *1-06-2021* | Application closes |
| *1-07-2021* | Select MTR Team |
| *01-08-2021* | Prep the MTR Team (handover of Project Documents) |
| *01-08-2021 to 05-08-2021* | Document review and preparing MTR Inception Report |
| *06-08-2021 to 31-08-2021* | Finalization andValidation of MTR Inception Report- latest start of MTR mission |
| *06-09-2021 to 17-09-2021* | MTR mission (up to 12 days): stakeholder meetings, interviews, field visits[[9]](#footnote-9) |
| *17-09-2021* | Mission wrap-up meeting & presentation of initial findings- earliest end of MTR mission |
| *20-09-2021 to 01-10-2021* | Preparing draft report |
| *18-10-21 to 22-10-21* | Incorporating audit trail from feedback on draft report/Finalization of MTR report (note: accommodate time delay in dates for circulation and review of the draft report) |
| *1-11-21* | Preparation & Issue of Management Response |
| *12-11-21* | Expected date of full MTR completion |

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

1. **MIDTERM REVIEW DELIVERABLES**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **#** | **Deliverable** | **Description** | **Timing** | **Responsibilities** |
| **1** | **MTR Inception Report** | MTR team clarifies objectives and methods of Midterm Review | No later than 2 weeks before the MTR mission: (15-08-21) | MTR team submits to the Commissioning Unit and project management |
| **2** | **Presentation** | Initial Findings | End of MTR mission: (12-09-11) | MTR Team presents to project management and the Commissioning Unit |
| **3** | **Draft Final Report** | Full report (using guidelines on content outlined in Annex B) with annexes | Within 3 weeks of the MTR mission: (31-09-21) | Sent to the Commissioning Unit, reviewed by RTA, Project Coordinating Unit, GEF OFP |
| **4** | **Final Report\*** | Revised report with audit trail detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final MTR report | Within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft: (15-10-21) | Sent to the Commissioning Unit |

\*The final MTR report must be in English. If applicable, the Commissioning Unit may choose to arrange for a translation of the report into a language more widely shared by national stakeholders.

1. **MTR ARRANGEMENTS**

The principal responsibility for managing this MTR resides with the Commissioning Unit. The Commissioning Unit for this project’s MTR is UNDP Georgia.

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, including UNDP project coordinator and CNF Project Manager, will be responsible for liaising with the MTR team to provide all relevant documents, set up stakeholder interviews, and arrange field visits. If all or part of the MTR is to be carried out virtually the Commissioning Unit and Project Team in supporting the implementation of remote/ virtual meetings. An updated stakeholder list with contact details (phone and email) will be provided to the MTR team.

1. **TEAM COMPOSITION**

A team of two independent consultants will conduct the MTR - one team leader (with experience and exposure to projects and evaluations in other regions globally) and one team expert, usually from the country of the project. The consultants cannot have participated in the project preparation, formulation, and/or implementation (including the writing of the Project Document) and should not have a conflict of interest with project’s related activities.

1. **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’. 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.

1. **PAYMENT MODALITIES AND SPECIFICATIONS**

10% of payment upon satisfactory delivery of the final MTR Inception Report and approval by the Commissioning Unit

40% upon satisfactory delivery of draft MTR report to the Commissioning Unit

50% upon satisfactory delivery of the final MTR report and approval by the Commissioning Unit and RTA (via signatures on the MTR Report Clearance Form) and delivery of completed MTR Audit Trail

Criteria for issuing the final payment of 50%[[10]](#footnote-10):

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

1. **APPLICATION PROCESS**

The project uses the GPN/ExpRes ONE ROSTER selection process with applicable recruitment rules and procedures in relation to hiring a consultant on IC contract.

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. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Populate with data from the Logframe 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. If the MTR will be carried out virtually, the “MTR mission” period can be extended by a week or two, however the number of working days will be remaining the same. [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. 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-10)