## Midterm Review Terms of Reference

**BASIC CONTRACT INFORMATION**

**Location:** Home-based

**Application Deadline:** 15 March 2021

**Type of Contract:** Individual Contract

**Post Level:** International Consultant

**Languages Required:** English

**Starting Date:** 6 April 2021

**Duration of Initial Contract:** 40 days over 16 weeks

**Expected Duration of Assignment:** 16 weeks

**BACKGROUND**

**A. Project Title** **Building Resilience of Health Systems in Asian LDCs to Climate Change (PIMS#5400)**

##### **B. Project Description**

This is the Terms of Reference for the UNDP-GEF Midterm Review (MTR) of the full-sized project titled Building Resilience of Health Systems in Asian LDCs to Climate Change (PIMS#5400) implemented by United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and the World Health Organization (WHO), which is to be undertaken in 2021. The project started on the 22 February 2019 and is in its second 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*.

Climate change and climate change impacts have serious impacts on health, including but not limited to dehydration, increased incidence of water and vector-borne diseases, malnutrition related to reduced crop yields, and physical and psychological effects of extreme events. In vulnerable countries where health systems are not able to plan, prepare for or respond to these challenges, the impacts can be particularly devasting.

Asian least developed countries (LDCs), namely, Bangladesh, Cambodia, Lao PDR, Myanmar, Nepal, and Timor-Leste, have limited technical capacity of health care systems and personnel to effectively integrate climate-related risks into policy, planning, and regulatory frames, and into interventions to control the burden of climate-sensitive health outcomes. Existing climate early warning systems managed by national meteorological organizations lack systematic coverage of observational data from regions and areas of the countries with high risks of climate-sensitive health outcomes. Climate information services are not adequately tailored to the needs of public health professionals. And primary health care facilities are ill-equipped to prepare for and respond to extreme weather and climate events, lacking information and cost-effective methods and technologies to provide adequate water and sanitation services during extreme events.

Recognizing these challenges, the National Adaptation Programmes of Action (NAPAs) of the abovementioned countries prioritize adaptation to the health risks of climate variability and change. In

consultation with stakeholders, this project was designed to increase the adaptive capacity of national health systems and institutions, and sub-level actors, to respond to and manage long-term climate-sensitive health risks, through the following complementary outcomes:

* Outcome 1: Institutional capacities are strengthened to effectively integrate climate risks and adaptation options in health sector planning and implementation
* Outcome 2: Effective decision-making for health interventions is enabled through generation of information and improved surveillance and/or early warning systems
* Outcome 3: Climate resilience is enhanced in health service delivery
* Outcome 4.1: Enhanced regional cooperation and knowledge exchange for promoting scale-up and replication of interventions
* Outcome 4.2: HNAP are effectively integrated into ongoing NAP processes

The regional approach of the project will ensure that catalytic partnerships across countries are developed and the regional-level systematization of lessons and best practices are documented and assessed to develop technical guidelines, manuals and tool-kits, thereby ensuring that these can be replicated and scaled-up across the region.

This project will be implemented from 22 February 2019 to 21 February 2023. The total budget is USD9,000,000 and 27,061,600 of co-financing from the six countries. The project is implemented following UNDP’s Direct Implementation Modality (DIM). UNDP is responsible for Outcome 4.2. WHO is assigned as Responsible Partner through UN Agency to UN Agency Contribution Agreement for Outcomes 1 - 4.1. WHO is responsible for managing the project, including the monitoring and evaluation of project interventions, and achieving project outcomes. Other stakeholders and partners include the Project Board, National Technical Advisory Groups, and Ministries of Health in each country.

All countries have been affected by the COVID-19 pandemic and all project countries experienced impacts on project implementation due to COVID-19. COVID-19-related impacts, including delays in activity implementation, are particularly pertinent to this project because the Ministry of Health are the key country Government counterpart for the project but are also the lead agency for COVID-19 response and recovery.

Table COVID-19 cases and deaths in project countries (as at 10 December 2020)[[1]](#footnote-1)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Country** | **Cumulative cases** | **Deaths** |
| Bangladesh | 484,104 | 6,930 |
| Cambodia | 356 | 0 |
| Lao PDR | 41 | 0 |
| Myanmar | 103,166 | 2,174 |
| Nepal | 244,433 | 1,651 |
| Timor-Leste | 31 | 0 |

**C. MTR Purpose**

The MTR will assess progress towards the achievement of the project objectives and outcomes as specified in the Project Document, and assess early signs of project success or failure with the goal of identifying the necessary changes to be made in order to set the project on-track to achieve its intended results. The MTR will also review the project’s strategy and its risks to sustainability.

**DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES**

##### **D. MTR Approach & Methodology**

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

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

The MTR team is expected to follow a collaborative and participatory approach[[2]](#footnote-2) ensuring close engagement with the Project Team, government counterparts (the GEF Operational Focal Point), the WHO Country Office(s), UNDP Country Offices, the Nature, Climate and Energy (NCE) Regional Technical Advisor, PMU, direct beneficiaries, and other key stakeholders.

Engagement of stakeholders is vital to a successful MTR.[[3]](#footnote-3) Stakeholder involvement should include interviews with stakeholders who have project responsibilities, including but not limited to ; PMU, WHO Country Offices, UNDP Country Offices, senior officials and task team/ component leaders, key experts and consultants in the subject area, Project Board, project stakeholders, academia, local government and CSOs, etc.

As of 11 March 2020, the World Health Organization (WHO) declared COVID-19 a global pandemic as the new coronavirus rapidly spread to all regions of the world. Travel to the region, and within project countries, has been restricted since March 2020. As such, the MTR team should develop a methodology to conduct the MTR virtually and remotely, including the use of remote interview methods and extended desk reviews, data analysis, surveys and evaluation questionnaires. 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.

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, however, 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 and data to be used in the MTR should be clearly outlined in the Inception Report and be fully discussed and agreed between WHO, stakeholders and the MTR team.

The final MTR report must describe the full MTR approach taken and the rationale for the approach making explicit the underlying assumptions, challenges, strengths and weaknesses about the methods and approach of the review.

##### **E. 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.

1. **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.

1. **Progress Towards Results**

* Review the logframe indicators against progress made towards the end-of-project targets; populate the Progress Towards Results Matrix, as described in 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 the project objective and each outcome; make recommendations from the areas marked as “not on target to be achieved” (red).
* Review the effects of COVID-19 on project implementation and progress towards targets.
* Compare and analyse the GEF Tracking Tool/Core Indicators at the Baseline with the one completed right before the Midterm Review.
* Identify remaining barriers to achieving the project objective in the remainder of the project.
* By reviewing the aspects of the project that have already been successful, identify ways in which the project can further expand these benefits.

1. **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 by the Commissioning Unit and project team, provide commentary on co-financing: is co-financing being used strategically to help the objectives of the project? Is the Project Team meeting with all co-financing partners regularly in order to align financing priorities and annual work plans?

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

* Include the separate GEF Co-Financing template (filled out by the Commissioning Unit and project team) which categorizes co-financing amounts by source 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[[4]](#footnote-4) (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).

1. **Sustainability**

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

Financial risks to sustainability:

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

Socio-economic risks to sustainability:

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

Institutional Framework and Governance risks to sustainability:

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

Environmental risks to sustainability:

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

**Conclusions & Recommendations**

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

Additionally, the MTR consultant/team is expected to make **recommendations** to the Project Team. Recommendations should be succinct suggestions for critical intervention that are specific, measurable, achievable, and relevant. A recommendation table should be put in the report’s executive summary. The MTR consultant/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 the TOR Annexes for the Rating Table and ratings scales.

##### **F. Expected Outputs and Deliverables**

The MTR team shall prepare and submit:

* MTR Inception Report: MTR team clarifies objectives and methods of the Midterm Review no later than 2 weeks before the MTR virtual data collection. To be sent to the Commissioning Unit and project management. Completion date: (16 April 2021)
* Presentation: MTR team presents initial findings to project management and the Commissioning Unit at the end of the MTR virtual data collection. Completion date: (26 May 2021)
* Draft MTR Report: MTR team submits the draft full report with annexes within 2 weeks of the virtual data collection. Completion date: (11 June 2021)
* Final Report\*: MTR team submits the revised report with annexed and completed Audit Trail detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final MTR report. To be sent to the Commissioning Unit within 1 week of receiving WHO comments on draft. Completion date: (July 23, 2021)

\*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.

**G. Institutional Arrangements**

The principal responsibility for managing this MTR resides with the Commissioning Unit. The Commissioning Unit for this project’s MTR is the World Health Organization Headquarters, Climate Change and Health Unit.

The Commissioning Unit will contract the consultants. The Project Team will be responsible for liaising with the MTR team to provide all relevant documents and set up stakeholder interviews.

**H. Duration of the Work**

The total duration of the MTR will be approximately *(40 of days)* over a period of *(16 of weeks)* starting *(6 April 2021),* and shall not exceed five months from when the consultant(s) are hired. The tentative MTR timeframe is as follows:

* *15 March 2021:* Application closes
* *17 March 2021:* Selection of MTR Team
* *6 April 2021:* Prep the MTR Team (handover of project documents)
* *6 – 9 April 2021 4 days:* Document review and preparing MTR Inception Report
* *12 - 16 April 2021, 2 days:* Finalization andValidation of MTR Inception Report- latest start of MTR mission
* *19 April – 14 May 2021, 15 days:* MTR data collection: virtual stakeholder meetings, interviews
* *17 - 21 May 2021, 5 days:* Contingency for possible COVID-19 delays (re-scheduled meetings and interviews, internet connection issues etc.)
* *24 - 26 May 2021, 1 days:* Data collection wrap-up meeting & presentation of initial findings- earliest end of MTR mission
* *27 May – 11 June 2021, 10 days:* Preparing draft report
* *28 - 30 June 2021, 2 days:* Incorporating audit trail on draft report/Finalization of MTR report (note: accommodate time delay in dates for circulation and review of the draft report to PMU, RTA etc.)
* *1 July – 15 July 2021:* Preparation & Issue of PMU Response
* *19 - 23 July 2021, 1 day*: Concluding stakeholder virtual workshop
* *23 July 2021:* Expected date of full MTR completion

The date start of contract is (6 April 2021).

**I. Duty Station**

* All work on this consultancy contract will be home-based and no travel will be required.

**REQUIRED SKILLS AND EXPERIENCE**

**J. Qualifications of the Successful Applicants**

A team of one to 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/region 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.

The selection of consultants will be aimed at maximizing the overall “team” qualities in the following areas: *.*

Education

* A Master’s degree in epidemiology or public health, or other closely related field

Experience

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

Language

* Fluency in written and spoken English.

**K. 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.

**L. Schedule of Payments**

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

Criteria for issuing the final payment of 40%

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

In line with the UNDP’s and WHO’s financial regulations, when determined by the Commissioning Unit and/or the consultant that a deliverable or service cannot be satisfactorily completed due to the impact of COVID-19 and limitations to the MTR, that deliverable or service will not be paid.

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

**APPLICATION PROCESS**

**M. Specific requirements**

Qualifications required:

*Essential:* University degree in public health, environmental health, epidemiology or equivalent

Fields

*Desirable:* advanced University degree (Masters level) in public health, environmental health,

epidemiology or equivalent fields. Studies on climate change and health.

Experience required:

*Essential*

• A minimum of 5 years of professional experience working in environmental health

• Professional experience working on climate change and health project evaluations

*Desirable*

• Experience in project evaluations of large multi-country climate change and health projects.

Skills / Technical skills and knowledge:

• Excellent interpersonal and communication skills

• Ability to work in international settings with staff from various geographical regions

• Ability to work effectively in virtual settings

Language requirements:

Excellent written and spoken English. Advanced knowledge of French or other UN language an asset.

**N. Recommended presentation of Offer**

Please send an **Expression of Interest** letter including: a brief description of approach to work/technical proposal of why the individual considers him/herself as the most suitable for the assignment, and a proposed methodology on how they will approach and complete the assignment (max 1 page); CV(s) of lead consultant and team members (if applicable); and proposed daily rate to [villalobose@who.int](mailto:villalobose@who.int) and [savagea@who.int](mailto:savagea@who.int)

**O. Annexes to the MTR ToR**

Include *Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects* and other existing literature or documents that will help candidates gain a better understanding of the project situation and the work required.

Annexes include: (reference ToR Annexes in Annex 3 of *Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects*)

* List of documents to be reviewed by the MTR Team
* Guidelines on Contents for the Midterm Review Report
* Midterm Review Evaluative Matrix Template
* UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluators/Midterm Review Consultants
* MTR Required Ratings Table and Ratings Scales
* MTR Report Clearance Form
* Audit Trail Template
* Progress Towards Results Matrix and MTR Ratings & Achievement Summary Tables (in Word)
* GEF Co-Financing Template (in Word)

1. Johns Hopkins University (2020) <https://coronavirus.jhu.edu/map.html> Retrieved 10 December 2020 [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. 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-2)
3. 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-3)
4. 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-4)