UNDP-GEF Mid-Term Review Terms of Reference

San Salvador Low-emission Urban Development Path.

1. INTRODUCTION

This is the Terms of Reference (ToR) for -the Midterm Review (MTR) of the full -sized UNDP-supported GEF-financed project titled San Salvador Low-emission Urban Development Path (UNDP 00107731/00107946 , PIMS#5462) implemented through the National Energy Council (CNE), which is to be undertaken in 2022. The project started on the July 31, 2020, 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*.

2. PROJECT BACKGROUND INFORMATION

The "San Salvador Low-emission Urban Development Path" project is a five-year collaborative project which aims to introduce low-emission urban mobility concepts and energy efficiency management strategies among the municipalities composing the San Salvador Metropolitan Area (AMSS), thereby reducing national dependency on imported oil derivatives, and combating energy sector GHG emissions.

The immediate (development) objective is: "To enhance national competences in the field of low-emission urban planning by addressing regulatory voids for urban mobility and public lighting, by fostering in-country capacities and skills, improving coordination between Government stakeholders and lower authorities in the AMSS, and developing a first batch of pilot projects for learning and demonstration of benefits and upscaling potential."

The project responds to the barriers that hamper the transition towards a low-emission development path in the San Salvador Metropolitan Area (AMSS), characterized by the weak regulatory and institutional framework for urban planning, insufficient or obsolete data for urban planning, a lack of proven, transparent business models for public services (including public transport), and the constrained technical and financial capacities of municipalities.

The project was designed under previous government to respond to the Development policy and the national obligations with the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC). Also responded to the National Plan on Climate Change and its mitigation or clean development agenda. The project contributes directly to the following Sustainable Development Goal (s): SDG 7 (Affordable and Clean Energy); SDG 9 (Industry, Innovation, and Infrastructure). It is aligned with the UNDP priority 2.6 Measures have been taken for reliable, sustainable, and efficient energy use (CPD 2016-2021) and 3.3. Targeted municipalities have incorporated energy efficiency actions (CPD 2022-2026).

The Project strategy is based on the creation of conditions for SITRAMSS to function as designed -a Bus Rapid Transit (BRT), a mass transport modality- specifically by pursuing a SITRAMSS Law and strengthening the business model; the transfer of know-how through international partners (GEF Global Platform for Sustainable Cities -GPSC, mobility experts, technical standards for lighting),for sustainable urban planning, specifically low-emission mobility concepts and standards for public lighting systems; and the demonstration of the impact of low-emission solutions through a number of representative pilots in four selected municipalities. These pilots include pedestrian routes and zones, bicycle lanes with bike rental services, traffic management (including one-way roads, traffic signs and lights, traffic access regulation, and adjustments to road design and capacity). It is envisioned that all pilots will facilitate access to the BRT and

as a result, increase its utilization rate and achieve associated GHG emission reductions (per passenger-km) compared to the current baseline. Energy efficiency in municipal buildings and street lighting will be promoted by facilitating access to finance and by technical assistance for developing a project portfolio. The envisaged Project outcomes are:

Component 1. Enabling framework for low-emission urban development.
Outcome 1.1. The policy, legal and institutional framework for integrated low-emission planning in the AMSS has been strengthened.
Outcome 1.2. Information and monitoring systems for low-emission development in the AMSS have been strengthened and public awareness increased.
Component 2. Promoting energy efficiency measures for mobility in the AMSS.
Outcome 2.1. Sustainable urban mobility plans and pilots have been designed in selected AMSS municipalities.
Outcome 2.2. Low-emission mobility solutions have been implemented along the SITRAMSS Corridor.
Component 3. Enabling an energy efficient development path in AMSS municipalities.
Outcome 3.1: Selected AMSS municipalities have adopted an energy-efficient development path.
Outcome 3.2: Energy efficiency measures are being implemented by selected AMSS municipalities.
Component 4. Monitoring and Evaluation.
Outcome 4.1: The Project monitoring & evaluation plan has been implemented.

An indicative Gender Analysis and an indicative Gender Action Plan was undertaken, foreseeing its expansion during the Project's inception phase, with a more detailed assessment of parallel (baseline) programs and activities to promote gender equality in relation to urban mobility. The project document accounts on public transportation overcrowding as a cause of insecurity for women who are a main group of users of public transport, and recognizes that the use of elevators, kitchens, bath and washing rooms is also different according to gender and age. Also points out that public (street) lighting is particularly relevant for security in public spaces especially in residential areas and spaces with large numbers of commuters such as bus terminals, large parking lots, etc. The gender plan will be one of the instruments under the mandatory Management Plan for securing Social and Environmental Safeguards given the high-risk profile of the Project that resulted from the Social and Environmental Screening Procedure (SESP).

The Project covers the Metropolitan Area of San Salvador with focus on the municipalities Santa Tecla, Antiguo Cuscatlan, San Salvador, and Soyapango (from west to east). The length of the current SITRAMSS bus route is 7.8km, from the roundabout Divino Salvador del Mundo (in San Salvador Municipality) to the Shopping Center Soyapango (in Soyapango Municipality).

The total cost of the project is USD 37,022,452. This is financed through a GEF grant of USD2,420,548, and USD 34,601,904 in confirmed co-financing, which will be funded by Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources (MARN); National Energy council (CNE); Ministry of Public Works, Transport, Housing and Urban Development (MOPTVDU); Planning Office of the AMSS (OPAMS); Municipality of Santa Tecla and UNDP.

The Project is implemented by the National Energy Council (CNE) as it is mandated for electricity and fuel efficiency. CNE hosts the Project Management Unit which consists of a Project Manager, a Procurement Officer and a Technical Advisor dedicated to mobility. The Project Board, responsible for taking corrective action as needed to ensure the project achieves the desired results is composed by representatives from the Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources (MARN), the Ministry of Finance (MF) and UNDP.

The Project work closely with the central government entities MARN, CNE, Vice Ministry of Transportation (VMT) and other relevant entities within the MOPTVDU, and with OPAMSS. Also, the Project envisions to reach agreements with universities and partnerships with international peer organizations and cities and selected municipalities.

The project was approved by GEF in November 2019, while the actual date of the Project Document signature was in July 2020, the Inception Workshop was finished in May 2021; the expected date of operational closure is July 2025. As of July 20, 2022, the total expenditures are $ 143,615.60

Main recent changes in context.

The COVID-19 pandemic had a significant negative impact on people's lives and families' incomes. Although El Salvador was quick to adopt strong containment measures against the outbreak and the Government rolled out a robust fiscal response to limit the pandemic's impact on households and businesses, the pandemic dealt a major blow to growth as GDP declined by 8 percent in 2020. The COVID-19 national vaccination campaign is well positioned, with 66 percent of Salvadoran population being fully vaccinated by March 2022.

In 2021, economic growth rebounded to 10.7 percent, supported by remittance-fueled consumption and exports. El Salvador's economy is expected to grow by 2.9 percent in 2022 and 1.9 percent in 2023, as policy stimulus in the US wanes and Ukraine war. Persistent budget deficits and continuous expansionary fiscal policies—despite the strong economy—have resulted in a rapidly growing public debt-to-GDP ratio (about 85 percent of GDP by end-2021). The growing public debt crowds out private investment, and limits resources for social and infrastructure spending.

In November 2021, and after 30 years of the Law for the Creation of the Fund for the Economic and Social Development of Municipalities (FODES), the Legislative Assembly approved amendments to the Law. The amendments seek to provide greater liquidity to the municipalities and optimize the use of resources. To this end, the municipal debt is transferred to the Ministry of Finance while the organization of execution is maintained: 25% represents freely available funds destined to general expenses of the municipalities; and 75% is destined to infrastructure works but whose administration is transferred to the National Directorate of Municipal Works of the MOPTVDU.

In October 2021, the Legislative Assembly approved the decree repealing the Law creating the CNE and creating the new Directorate of Energy, Hydrocarbons and Mines. According to the new law, the CNE will transfer to the new Directorate and to the Ministry of Economy all its attributions and competences. The law will become effective in November 2022. By then, the implementing regulations for the new law should be issued. As no substantive implications of this change is foreseen, the project will continue to be implemented by the new Directorate.

To incorporate sustainability criteria into the country's development model, the Ministry of the Environment launched the National Environmental Policy in June 2022. One of the specific objectives of the policy is to achieve a society that is resilient and adapted to the effects of climate change. To this end, the Policy seeks to move towards a low-carbon economy, with actions aimed at harmonizing national action with global climate change objectives through renewed legal frameworks and improvements in the capacity of public institutions on climate change. It also seeks to integrate climate change adaptation and mitigation measures into development policies, by establishing national and sectoral GHG mitigation targets and developing instruments such as a national climate-resilient and low-carbon development strategy, as well as actions to promote the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions.

3. 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.

The MTR is expected to review project's progress, monitoring of implementation, adaptative management and risks to sustainability and provide supportive recommendations using a participatory and collaborative approach that involves the main stakeholders, partners and beneficiaries in all stages of the evaluation process to open discussions on challenges and to outline midterm corrective actions in project as needed.

As outlined in the GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy, the MTR is a mandatory requirement for the Full-sized Projects. The project, with a total duration of 5 years, is officially completing its second year of implementation, which is the critical point for the mid-term review. The MTR report is expected to be available for submission with the third progress project report to the GEF Secretariat.

The MTR is included in evaluation plan that accompanies the Country Programme Document, which aims to help UNDP to check the progress towards agreed development goals and results, to support course correction, gather knowledge to inform UNDP work and to support accountability.

4. 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 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 field mission begins.

The MTR consultant is expected to follow a collaborative and participatory approach[1] ensuring close engagement with the Project Team, government counterparts (the GEF Operational Focal Point), the UNDP Country Office, the Energy, Infrastructure, Transport and Technology Regional Technical Advisor, direct beneficiaries, and other key stakeholders.

Engagement of stakeholders is vital to a successful MTR. Stakeholder involvement should include interviews with stakeholders who have project responsibilities, including but not limited to executing agency (CNE), UNDP senior officials and task team, key experts and consultants in the subject area, Project Board, project team, central government partner entities, project stakeholders, academia and educational entities, local government, sector organizations and NGOs, local CSO representatives (of informal merchants, women organizations, bikers associations), private sector, among others. Additionally, the MTR team is expected to conduct field missions to the Metropolitan Area of San Salvador including the following project sites Santa Tecla, Antiguo Cuscatlan, San Salvador and Soyapango where the project seeks to pilot low-emission solutions.

---

[1] For ideas on innovative and participatory Monitoring and Evaluation strategies and techniques, see UNDP Discussion Paper: Innovations in Monitoring & Evaluating Results, 05 Nov 2013.

Table 1. Key stakeholders of the San Salvador Low-emission Urban Development Path project.

Stakeholders	Interviews will be held with following stakeholders at a minimum	Rol in the project
UNDP Country Office (CO) and Regional Hub San Salvador/Panama	Rafael Pleitez, Auxiliary Representative -Programme. Ryna Avila, Sustainable Development Programme Officer Adriana Sol, Programme Associate Lucia Cortina, GEF-Regional Technical Advisor Ernesto Kraus, GEF-Regional Programme Associate	GEF Agency
National Council of Energy. Executing Agency San Salvador	Salvador Handal, Director salvador.handal@cne.gob.sv Mario Cáceres, Energy Efficiency Director mcaceres@cne.gob.sv	Implementing Partner
Project Team San Salvador	Project manager: Emerson Roque email: eroque@cne.gob.sv Project technical advisor: Antonio Sanda email: asanda@cne.gob.sv Project finance advisor: Johamy Melendez email: jmelendez@cne.gob.sv	Project's team
Ministry of Environment San Salvador	Fernado Lòpez Larreynaga Focal Point: Julia María Pérez Mena, email: jmperez@marn.gob.sv Julia Carolina Moterrosa, email: jmonterrosa@marn.gob.sv	GEF partner Agency Member of the Project Board as Project Executive. Project Co-financer Member of the working group under Component 1 for reviewing and preparing technical standards and business models.
Ministry of Finance San Salvador	Alejandro Zelaya	Member of the Project Board as Beneficiary Representative. Key stakeholder for long-term sustainable development including the analysis of costs and benefits of investment in transport infrastructure.
Ministry of Public Works, Transport, Housing and Urban Development San Salvador	Edgar Romeo Rodríguez Herrera Focal Point: Nelson Reyes; email: nelson.reyes@mop.gob.sv ; cel: (503)77494101 Alberto Mena; email: manuel.mena@mop.gob.sv ; cel: (503) 61002580	Target group and Co-financer. Member of the working group under Component 1 for reviewing and preparing technical standards and business models. MOPTVDU along with MINEC, assume the leadership for the Expertise Center through agreement with universities.

OPAMSS San Salvador	Yolanda Bichara, Directora; email: Yolanda.bichara@opamss.org.sv Carlos Calderón, email: carlos.calderon@opamss.org.sv; cel: (503) 76818677	Co-financer Member of the working group under Component 1 for reviewing and preparing technical standards and business models. Under component 3 work with selected municipalities, the ViceMinistry of Transport of MOPTVDU to develop municipal mobility plans and prepare and evaluate low-emission pilots. Hosts one project Technical Advisor
Ministry of Economy San Salvador	María Luisa Hayem Brevé Focal Point: Eliù Avendaño	MOPTVDU, along with MINEC, assume the leadership for the Expertise Center through agreement with universities.
San Salvador Mayor's Office San Salvador	Mario Edgardo Durán Gavidia Focal Point: Manuel Rodriguez majoachin@sansalvador.gob.sv; cel: (503) 77865660	Host Project pilot
Santa Tecla Mayor's Office Santa Tecla	Henry Esmildo Flores Cerón Focal Point: Susana Beatriz Alarcón de Cubías, Directora de Desarrollo Territorial; email: desarrolloterritorial@amst.gob.sv; Cel: (503) 79197247	Co-financer Host project pilot
Antiguo Cuscatlán Mayor's Office Antiguo Cuscatlán	Zoila Milagro Navas Quintanilla Focal Point: Ing. Mario Monroy, Gerente de Planificación; email: monroy705@gmail.com; Tel: (503) 25110154; Cel: (503) 70391908;	Host Project pilot
Soyapango Mayor's Office Soyapango	Nercy Patricia Montano de Martínez Focal Point: Hector Reina; Gerente; email: hwareina@gmail.com cel: (503) 74518273	Host Project pilot
University of El Salvador	Focal Point: Roger Armando Arias Alvarado	Partner. Beneficiary of the elements of academic and professional curricula

San Salvador	Edgar Armando Peña cel: (503) 70710251	
University "José Simeón Cañas"-UCA Antiguo Cuscatlán	Focal Point: Father Andreu Oliva SJ, rector Carlos Mario Flores; email: cmflores@uca.edu.sv ; cel: (503) 78715826 Carlos Grande; email: cgrande@uca.edu.sv ; cel:(503) 77279431	Stakeholder with existing capacities on energy efficiency, resource efficiency and low emission mobility.
University Don Bosco	Focal Point: Mario Argueta Olmos Argueta, rector Lic. Carlos Roberto Pacas; email: carlos.pacas@udb.edu.sv Ing. Francisco Adonay Molina; email: francisco.molina@udb.edu.sv	Stakeholder with existing capacities on energy efficiency, resource efficiency and low emission mobility.
FECOATRANS San Salvador	Catalino Miranda William Cáceres **Cl Delgado No 713, San Salvador,** **2222-2541**	Stakeholder. Sectoral organization. Association of public transport entrepreneurs
AEAS San Salvador	Genaro Ramírez Col Layco 27 Cl Pte No 1132, San Salvador, El Salvador **22262729**	Stakeholder. Sectoral organization. Association of public transport entrepreneurs
Federación Salvadoreña de Ciclismo San Salvador	Oscar Rene Hidalgo Cañada	Stakeholder. National institution, cycling reference in the country.
Women organization	ORMUSA- Sandra Carranza, Coordinadora General 7ª calle poniente bis #5265, colonia Escalón. San Salvador. 2556-0032; 7989-1839	Stakeholder. Women organization.
Persons with disabilities organization	C ONAIPD- Licda. María Cristina Herrera de Cazares, Directora Ejecutiva Polígono Industrial Plan de La Laguna, Calle Circunvalación. Lote número 20, Antiguo Cuscatlán 2511-6711	Stakeholder. National council, persons with disabilities reference in the country.
Interamerican Development Bank San Salvador	Rodrigo Rendón, email: josere@iadb.org; tel: (503) 22338938	Stakeholder. IADB finances loan-operation programme "Energy Efficiency in Small and Medium Enterprises" which aims at supporting efforts in El Salvador to reduce energy

		consumption by small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) and thereby bring down greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions by making suitable financing more readily available in the financial system in order to enable greater investment in energy efficiency.
European Commision San Salvador	François Roudie, Ambassador francois.roudie@eeas.europa.eu Miguel Angel Varela, Jefe de Cooperación miguel-angel.varela-sanchez@eeas.europa.eu	Stakeholder. European Union finances EUROCLIMA, a joint strategy with the Government of El Salvador to reduce the impact of climate change and its effects in El Salvador, with an investment plan of EUR1.1 million for 2022-2023
Comisión Presidencial de Proyectos Estratégicos de la Presidencia de la República	Ricardo Doñan email: rdonan@presidencia.gob.sv; cel: (503) 78542329	Strategic partner identified at the Inception Workshop

Data collection and analysis methods should be rigorously selected to produce reasonable empirical evidence to ensure credibility, relevance, and validity of the MTR. It is expected to include a mix of methods to gather information. Suggested methodological tools and approaches may include Semi-structured interviews with key stakeholders, focus groups discussion as well non-participant observation.

The final specific design and methodology for the MTR should emerge from consultations between the MTR consultant 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 consultant 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 Inception Report should outline how various forms of evidence will be employed vis-à-vis each other to triangulate the information collected.

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.

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?
- 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.
  - o 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?
  - o Were gender issues triggered during the mandatory UNDP Environmental and Social project screening? If so, were mitigation measures built into the project document? What other steps were taken to address these issues?
  - o Does the project budget include funding for gender-relevant outcomes, outputs and activities?

      o   Were gender specialists and representatives of women at different levels consulted throughout the project design and preparation process?

- Review the extend to wich relevant human rights issues were raised in the project design. Were the impact of the project in individual and collective rights as claims towards legal and moral duty bearers raised in the Project Document? To what extent has the project ensured that the various needs of marginalized and excluded populations, including persons with disabilities, been taken into account in the preparation process?
- If there are major areas of concern, recommend areas for improvement.

Results Framework/Log frame:
- 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.
- 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 social, legal and policy frameworks that determine the relationship between rights holders and duty bearers, 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. Are the project's results framework indicators disaggregated by sex and wherever possible by age and by socio-economic group (or any other socially significant category in society, including persons with disabilities)? 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 log frame 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 1. Progress Towards Results Matrix (Achievement of outcomes against End-of-project Targets)

Project Strategy	Indicator[2]	Baseline Level[3]	Level in 1st PIR (self-reported)	Midterm Target[4]	End-of-project Target	Midterm Level & Assessment[5]	Achievement Rating[6]	Justification for Rating
Objective:	Indicator (if applicable):							
Outcome 1:	Indicator 1:							
	Indicator 2:							
Outcome 2:	Indicator 3:							
	Indicator 4:							
	Etc.							
Etc.								

---

[2] Populate with data from the Log frame and scorecards

[3] Populate with data from the Project Document

[4] If available

[5] Color code this column only

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

Indicator Assessment Key

Green= Achieved	Yellow= On target to be achieved	Red= Not on target to be achieved

In addition to the progress towards outcomes analysis:

- Compare and analyse the GEF Tracking Tool/Core Indicators at the Baseline with the one completed right before the Midterm Review.
- Identify remaining barriers to achieving the project objective in the remainder of the project.
- By reviewing the aspects of the project that have already been successful, identify ways in which the project can further expand these benefits.

iii. Project Implementation and Adaptive Management

Management Arrangements:
- Review overall effectiveness of project management as outlined in the Project Document. Have changes been made and are they effective? Are responsibilities and reporting lines clear? Is decision-making transparent and undertaken in a timely manner? Recommend areas for improvement.
- 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 and other vulnerable populations, including persons with disabilities? 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/ log frame 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. Does the project have adequate resources for integrating HR & GE in the intervention as an investment in short-term and medium-term benefits?
- 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? Is there sufficient clarity in the reported co-financing to substantiate in-kind and cash co-financing from all listed sources?
- 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 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.
- Is the responsibility for ensuring adherence to Human Rights and gender objectives well-articulated in the performance monitoring framework and implementation plans?

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?
- How does the project engage with the rights-holders to enjoy their rights and duty bearers can comply with their obligations?

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:
  o The project's overall safeguards risk categorization.

- o The identified types of risks[7] (in the SESP).
- o 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 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)?

---

[7] 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.

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.
- Is the project conducive to an institutional change to systematically addressing Human Rights and Gender concerns?

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

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

Ratings

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

Table. MTR Ratings & Achievement Summary Table for (*Project Title*)

Measure	MTR Rating	Achievement Description
Project Strategy	N/A	
Progress Towards Results	Objective Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale)	
	Outcome 1 Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale)	
	Outcome 2 Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale)	
	Outcome 3 Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale)	
	Etc.	
Project Implementation &	(rate 6 pt. scale)	

Adaptive Management		
Sustainability	(rate 4 pt. scale)	

6. TIMEFRAME

The total duration of the MTR will be approximately 30 working days over a time period of 10 of weeks and shall not exceed four months from when the consultant is hired. The tentative MTR timeframe is as follows:

ACTIVITY	NUMBER OF WORKING DAYS	COMPLETION DATE
Preparation Phase		
Application closes	*N/A*	August 20, 2022
Contract and initiation order issuig	*N/A*	September 30, 2022
Meeting briefing with UNDP	*1 day*	September 30, 2022
Implementation Phase		
Document review and preparing MTR Inception Report (MTR Inception Report due no later than 2 weeks before the MTR mission)	*4 days*	*October 3, 2022*
Comments and approval of inception report	*N/A*	*October 10, 2022*
Finalization of the inception report	*1 day*	*October 11, 2022*
Kik off-meeting (on-line)	*1 day*	*October 12, 2022*
MTR mission: stakeholder meetings, interviews, field visits. Calculated based on 22 interviews (4 interviews per day); 2 focus groups (2 per day) and 2 site project visits*	*6 days*	*November 3, 2022*
Presentation of initial findings- last day of the MTR mission	*1 day*	*November 4, 2022*
Post-mission phase		
Preparing draft report (due within 3 weeks of the MTR mission)	*10 days*	*November 18, 2022*
Draft report circulation for comments. Comments send to MTR Consultant	*N/A*	*November 25, 2022*
Finalization of MTR report/ Incorporating audit trail from feedback on draft report (due within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on the draft)	*4 days*	*December 1, 2022*
Draft Management Response	*N/A*	*December 6, 2022*
Concluding stakeholder workshop	*1 day*	*December 8, 2022*
MTR translation and revision**	*1 day*	*December 13,2022*
MTR approval by Commissioning Unit and UNDP-GEF RTA	*N/A*	*December 15, 2022*

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

**The commissioning Unit will arrange for a translation of the report into English.

7. MIDTERM REVIEW DELIVERABLES

#	Deliverable	Description	Timing	Responsibilities
1	**MTR Inception Report**	MTR team clarifies objectives and methods of Midterm Review. Includes a clear overview of the midterm review approach as outlined in Chapter 1 of the *Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects*	On October 3, 2022, and no later than 2 weeks before the MTR mission	MTR consultant submits to the Commissioning Unit and project management. The Commissioning Unit will circulate among relevant stakeholders for comments. The approved inception report will be presented by the MTR Consultant and discussed in the Kick-off meeting.
2	**Presentation**	Initial Findings.	On November 4, 2022 (at the end of MTR mission)	MTR Team presents to project management and the Commissioning Unit. A presentation in Power Point or any other suitable tool should be prepared. A copy of the presentation should be submitted to the Commissioning Unit.
3	**Draft MTR Report**	Full draft report (using guidelines on content outlined in Annex B) with annexes	On November 18 and within 2 weeks of the MTR mission	Sent to the Commissioning Unit for initial formal review and further circulation for reviewing by RTA, Project Coordinating Unit, GEF OFP, and relevant Stakeholders
4	**Final Report**	Revised report with audit trail detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final MTR report.	On December 1, 2022, and within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft	Sent to the Commissioning Unit. The MTR consultant should present the key findings, conclusions, and recommendations of the MTR report in the Concluding stakeholder workshop. A presentation in Power Point or any other suitable tool should be prepared. A copy of the presentation should be submitted 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. The MTR Consultant should provide the Translator with clarification on specific terms or phrases used in the report, if necessary.

All deliverables should be presented in Spanish to ensure the adequate involvement of the national stakeholders in the MTR process. The Commissioning Unit will arrange for a translation of the report into English.

8. MTR ARRANGEMENTS

The principal responsibility for managing this MTR resides with the Commissioning Unit. The Commissioning Unit for this project's MTR is UNDP El Salvador Country Office.

The Commissioning Unit will contract the consultant and ensure the timely provision of per diems and travel arrangements within El Salvador for the MTR consultant team and will provide an updated stakeholder list with contact details (phone and email). The UNDP M&E focal point will manage the evaluation, who will brief the MTR consultant on the purpose and scope of the MTR, the required quality standards and clarify management arrangements. A kickoff meeting will be organized to introduce the MTR consultant to the Project Board and other partners to facilitate initial contact. The UNDP M&E focal point will receive, comment, and share all MTR deliverables with the relevant stakeholders. All deliverables will be reviewed in two phases: the first one, internally, to ensure the deliverables cover the requirements outlined in this ToR. In the second phase, the Commissioning Unit will distribute the reports among the relevant stakeholders to give them the opportunity to comment on the draft MTR report and to provide additional information if relevant. The Commission Unit will collate comments on the report and send them to the MTR consultant within the 8 days after reports submission. The report will be considered final once the Commissioning Unit and the UNDP-GEF RTA sign a clearance form noting their approval of the final MTR report. All anticipated meetings (kickoff wrap up and concluding workshop) will be organized by the Commissioning Unit.

The Project Team will be responsible for liaising with the MTR consultant to provide all relevant documents, set up stakeholder interviews, and arrange field visits. Also, will be responsible for reviewing MTR report and provide comments, drafting the management response in coordination with the Commissioning Unit, and to integrate MTR recommendations into subsequent Project's Annual Work Plan.

The MTR consultant is responsible to: review evaluation ethics and ensure the necessary steps are taken to protect the rights and confidentiality of persons interviewed for the MTR; review the *Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects* and other relevant UNDP and/or GEF to ensure compliance with the requirements and standards throughout the entire MTR process; prepare the inception report, including a detailed plan of the mission with an interview schedule, conduct the MTR mission, have a mission wrap-up meeting, complete the draft of the report; provide an "audit trail" to create the revised final MTR and send the final report to the Commissioning Unit. The MTR consultant should present to the relevant stakeholders the final deliverables as specified in the Section 7 of this ToR. The MTR consultant will make his/her own arrangements to undertake interviews and site visits according to the detailed MTR mission plan[8].

9. MTR CONSULTANT REQUIREMENTS

One international consultant will conduct the MTR – The consultant should have experience and exposure to projects and evaluations in other regions globally. The consultant will be responsible for the overall design and writing of the Inception, MTR report and audit trail within the agreed timeframe. He/she will assess emerging trends with respect to regulatory frameworks and the relevant context affecting the Project implementation; budget allocations, capacity building and all criteria specified in this ToR. He/she will actively participate a kick-off, a mission wrap and concluding stakeholder missions. He/she will work with the Project Team in developing the detailed MTR itinerary, assess and will maintain a close communication with the Commissioning unit to bring to its attention any issue affecting the MTR process.

---

[8] The cost of mobilization and travel expenses must be included in the proposal.

The consultant 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 consultant will be aimed at maximizing the overall consultant qualities in the following areas:

<u>Education</u>

- A Master's degree in Sustainable development, Energy Efficiency, Urban Planning, Transport, or other closely related field.

<u>Experience</u>

- Relevant experience leading at least 5 project/programme evaluations using result-based management methodologies;
- Experience in at least two (2) works applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios;
- At least five-years' experience working in adaptive management, as applied to Climate change-Mitigation projects or programme;
- Verifiable experience participating in at least two (2) UNDP, GEF or GCF evaluation processes in the last three (3) years, preferable in Latin America.
- Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender, human rights and Climate change-Mitigation; experience in gender and human rights sensitive evaluation and analysis, by applying the approaches in at least one (1) work in the related field.
- Demonstrable excellent communication skills written and spoken, both in Spanish and English;
- Demonstrable analytical skills;

<u>Language</u>

- Fluency in spoken, written and reading in Spanish and English.

10. ETHICS

The MTR consultant 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 consultant 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 consultant 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.

11. PAYMENT SCHEDULE

- 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) and clarifications are provided to the translator, if needed.
  - The Audit Trail includes responses to and justification for each comment listed.

12. APPLICATION PROCESS

Recommended Presentation of Proposal:

a) **Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability** using the template provided by UNDP;
b) **CV** and a **Personal History Form** (P11 form) including past experience from similar assignments, email, telephone and contact details for relevant references.
c) **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)
d) **Financial Proposal** that indicates the all-inclusive fixed total contract price and all other travel related costs (such as flight ticket, per diem, etc.), supported by a breakdown of costs, as per template attached to the Letter of Confirmation of Interest template. If an applicant is employed by an organization/company/institution, and he/she expects his/her employer to charge a management fee in the process of releasing him/her to UNDP under Reimbursable Loan Agreement (RLA), the applicant must indicate at this point, and ensure that all such costs are duly incorporated in the financial proposal submitted to UNDP.

All application materials should be submitted by email at the following email at the following address ONLY: Adquisiciones.sv@undp.org by 5:30 p.m. (GTM-6) August 30, 2022 indicating the following reference "Consultant of the project 00107731/00107946 San Salvador Low-emission Urban Development Path Midterm Review"..

Where a competitive process does not produce satisfactory results within a reasonable period, the candidates will be identified through vetted roster. A letter of invitation to submit an offer will be issued through the Roster administration unit. The candidates will be asked to submit a letter to UNDP confirming interest and availability together with the latest personal CV, including experience from similar projects, email, telephone, and any other contact details for references; a financial proposal and a brief methodology on how he/she will approach and complete the assignment. The contract will be negotiated based on his/her fee on the roster.

Criteria for Evaluation of Proposal: Only those applications which are responsive and compliant will be evaluated. Offers will be evaluated according to the Combined Scoring method – where the educational background and experience on similar assignments will be weighted at 70% and the price proposal will weigh as 30% of the total scoring. UNDP will check the most suitable candidate in accordance with its own rules, regulation, and policies, including reference checks. The applicant receiving the Highest Combined Score that has also accepted UNDP's General Terms and Conditions, and reference checks confirm will be awarded the contract.

Evaluation Criteria

Criteria	Points	Percentage
CV/Personal History	**60**	**60%**
Education A Master's degree in Sustainable development, Energy Efficiency, Urban Planning, Transport, or other closely related field	5	
Evaluation experience Relevant experience leading at least 5 project/programme evaluations using result-based management methodologies; 21 points Experience in project evaluation/MTR with UNDP, GEF or GCF evaluation processes will be additionally valued (At least two UNDP, GEF or GCF evaluation processes in the last three (3) years) – 5 points Experience in project evaluation in Latin America in the relevant areas will be additionally valued. – 4 points	30	
Thematic experience At least five-years' experience working in adaptive management, as applied to Climate change-Mitigation projects or programme; - 7 points Experience in at least two (2) works applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios in the relevant area; 3 points	10	
Cross-cutting issues Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender, human rights and Climate change-Mitigation (experience in gender and human rights sensitive evaluation and analysis, by applying the approaches in at least one (1) work in the related field)	5	
Language • Fluency in spoken, written, and reading in Spanish and English	10	
Technical proposal	**10**	**10%**
Appropriate understanding the nature of work	2	
The mix methods and approach ensure stakeholders participation within all evaluation process.	4	
The plan for completing the task is adequate to the needs described (in time and sequence).	4	
Economic proposal	**30**	**30%**
The highest score (30%) will be awarded to the most economical offer.		
TOTAL	**100**	**100%**

ANNEX A: Project Information Table

Project Title	San Salvador Low-Emission Urban Development Path		
UNDP Project ID (PIMS#)	5462	PIF Approval Date:	May 23, 2017
GEF Project ID (PMIS #)	9038	CEO Endorsement Date:	Nov 25, 2019
ATLAS Business Unit, Award# Proj.ID	00107731/ 00107946	Project Document (ProDoc) Signature Date (date project began):	Jul 31/2020
Country:	El Salvador	Date project manager hired:	Former: Paola Calvo: 1-feb-2021 Current: Emerson Roque 13-may-2022
Region:	Latin America and the Caribbean	Inception Workshop date:	May 27, 2021
Focal Area:	Climate Change-Mitigation	Midterm Review Completion date:	
GEF Focal Area Strategic Objective:	Greenhouse gas emission mitigated	Planned closing date:	Jul 31, 2025
Trust Fund	GEF	If revised, proposed op. closing date:	
Executing Agency/Implementing Partner:	National Energy Council -CNE		
Other execution partners	Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources-MARN Ministry of Public Works, Housing and Urban Development- MOPTVDU Metropolitan Area of San Salvador Planning Office - OPAMSS Ministry of Economy - MINEC		
Project Financing	*At CEO endorsement (US$)*		*At Midterm Review (US$)**
(1) GEF financing	2,420,548		
(2) UNDP contribution	130,000		
(3) Government	30,671,904		
Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources	*500,000*		
National Energy Council	*12,000,000*		
Ministry of Public Works, Housing and Urban Development	*17,671,904*		
Municipality of Santa Tecla	*500,000*		
(4) Other partners			
(5) Total co-financing (2+3+4):	34,601,904		
PROJECT TOTAL COSTS (1+5)	**37,022,452**		

*Draw from the last PIR

ANNEX B. List of Documents to be reviewed by the MTR Team

1. PIF
2. UNDP Initiation Plan
3. UNDP Project Document
4. UNDP Social and Environmental Screening Procedure (SESP)
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. Microassessment and Audit reports
9. Finalized GEF focal area Tracking Tools/Core Indicators at CEO endorsement and midterm *(Climate Change Mitigation (CCM)/Greenhouse gas emission mitigated)*
10. Oversight mission reports
11. All monitoring reports prepared by the project
12. Financial and Administration guidelines used by Project Team

The following documents will also be available:
13. Project operational guidelines, manuals and systems
14. UNDP country programme document for the period 2016-2021 and 2022-2026.
15. Minutes of the "San Salvador Low-emissions Urban Development path" Board Meetings, Project Appraisal Committee meeting and other meetings
16. Project site location maps
17. Risk register in Atlas
18. Project Quality assurance reports
19. Co-financing letters
20. Gender analysis and Action Plan
21. Any additional documents, as relevant.

ANNEX C: Guidelines on Contents for the Midterm Review Report[9]

i.   Basic Report Information *(for opening page or title page)*
- Title of UNDP supported GEF financed project
- UNDP PIMS# and GEF project ID#
- MTR time frame and date of MTR report
- Region and countries included in the project
- GEF Operational Focal Area/Strategic Program
- Executing Agency/Implementing Partner and other project partners
- MTR team members
- Acknowledgements

ii.   Table of Contents

iii.   Acronyms and Abbreviations

1.   Executive Summary *(3-5 pages)*
- Project Information Table (See annex A).
- Project Description (brief)
- Project Progress Summary (between 200-500 words)
- MTR Ratings & Achievement Summary Table (See annex F)
- Concise summary of conclusions
- Recommendation Summary Table (See annex K)

2.   Introduction *(2-3 pages)*
- Purpose of the MTR and objectives
- Scope & Methodology: principles of design and execution of the MTR, MTR approach and data collection methods, limitations to the MTR
- Structure of the MTR report

3.   Project Description and Background Context *(3-5 pages)*
- Development context: environmental, socio-economic, institutional, and policy factors relevant to the project objective and scope
- Problems that the project sought to address: threats and barriers targeted
- Project Description and Strategy: objective, outcomes and expected results, description of field sites (if any)
- Project Implementation Arrangements: short description of the Project Board, key implementing partner arrangements, etc.
- Project timing and milestones
- Main stakeholders: summary list

4.   Findings *(12-14 pages)*

    4.1   Project Strategy
- Project Design
- Results Framework/Logframe

    4.2   Progress Towards Results
- Progress towards outcomes analysis
- 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
- Social and Environmental Standards (Safeguards)
- Reporting

---

[9] The Report length should not exceed *40* pages in total (not including annexes).

- Communications & Knowledge Management
  - **4.4** Sustainability
    - Financial risks to sustainability
    - Socio-economic to sustainability
    - Institutional framework and governance risks to sustainability
    - Environmental risks to sustainability
5. Conclusions and Recommendations *(4-6 pages)*
   - **5.1** Conclusions
     - Comprehensive and balanced statements (that are evidence-based and connected to the MTR's findings) which highlight the strengths, weaknesses and results of the project
   - **5.2** Recommendations
     - Corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project
     - Actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the project
     - Proposals for future directions underlining main objectives
6. Annexes
   - MTR ToR (excluding ToR annexes)
   - MTR evaluative matrix (evaluation criteria with key questions, indicators, sources of data, and methodology) (See annex D).
   - Example Questionnaire or Interview Guide used for data collection
   - Ratings Scales (See annex F)
   - 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 (See Annex E)
   - Signed MTR final report clearance form (See annex G)
   - *Annexed in a separate file:* Audit trail from received comments on draft MTR report (See Annex H)
   - *Annexed in a separate file: Relevant midterm tracking tools ((Climate Change Mitigation (CCM)/Greenhouse gas emission mitigated)*
   - *Annexed in a separate file: GEF Co-financing template (categorizing co-financing amounts by source as 'investment mobilized' or 'recurrent expenditure') (See annex J)*

ANNEX D: Midterm Review Evaluative Matrix Template

This Midterm Review Evaluative Matrix must be fully completed/amended by the consultant and included in the MTR inception report and as an Annex to the MTR report.

Evaluative Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
Project Strategy: To what extent is the project strategy relevant to country priorities, country ownership, and the best route towards expected results?			
To what extent the project strategy is relevant to the problem that seek to address? Does the strategy provide the most effective route towards expected/intended results? (Consider sustainability and viability of the project and externalities relevant to the project).	(i.e. relationships established, level of coherence between project design and implementation approach, specific activities conducted, quality of risk mitigation strategies, etc.)	(i.e. project documents, national policies or strategies, websites, project staff, project partners, data collected throughout the MTR mission, etc.)	(i.e. document analysis, data analysis, interviews with project staff, interviews with stakeholders, etc.)
To what extent lessons from other relevant projects were incorporated into the project design?			
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, considered during project design processes?			
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?			
Were gender issues triggered during the mandatory UNDP Environmental and Social project screening? If so, were mitigation measures built into the project document? What other steps were taken to address these issues?			
Does the project budget include funding for gender-relevant outcomes, outputs and activities?			
Were gender specialists and representatives of women at different levels consulted throughout the project design and preparation process?			
Review the extend to wich relevant human rights issues were raised in the project design.			

Were the impact of the project in individual and collective rights as claims towards legal and moral duty bearers raised in the Project Document?			
To what extent has the project ensured that the various needs of marginalized and excluded populations, including persons with disabilities, been taken into account in the preparation process?			
Progress Towards Results: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved thus far?			
Are the project's objectives and outcomes or components clear, practical, and feasible within its time frame?			
Are the project indicators SMART?			
Are the project's results framework indicators disaggregated by sex and wherever possible by age and by socio-economic group (or any other socially significant category in society, including persons with disabilities)? Are broader development and gender aspects of the project being monitored effectively?			
Has the progress so far led to or could in the future catalyse beneficial development effects (i.e., income generation, gender equality and women's empowerment, improved social, legal and policy frameworks that determine the relationship between rights holders and duty bearers, improved governance etc...)? Where the catalytic beneficial effects included in the project results framework? Are they monitored on an annual basis?			
What is the level of project's progress toward its objective and each outcome achieved so far? How can the project further expand the benefits in the aspects the project has already been successful? Is there any risk or barriers to achieve the project objective by the end of the project? What are the reasons behind the achievement or lack thereof?			
Project Implementation and Adaptive Management: Has the project been implemented efficiently, cost-effectively, and been able to adapt to any changing conditions thus far? To what extent are project-level			

monitoring and evaluation systems, reporting, and project communications supporting the project's implementation? To what extent has progress been made in the implementation of social and environmental management measures? Have there been changes to the overall project risk rating and/or the identified types of risks as outlined at the CEO Endorsement stage?			
Have any changes been made to the Project Document? Are they effective?			
Are responsibilities and reporting lines clear?			
What is the gender balance of the Project Board? What steps have been taken to ensure gender balance in the Project Board?			
What is the gender balance of project staff? What steps have been taken to ensure gender balance in project staff?			
Is decision-making transparent and undertaken in a timely manner?			
How was the quality of the Executing Agency/Implementing Partner performance?			
How was the quality of support provided by the UNDP (GEF Partner Agency)			
Do the Executing Agency/Implementing Partner and/or UNDP and other partners have the capacity to deliver benefits to or involve women and other vulnerable populations, including persons with disabilities? If yes, how?			
Have there been any delays in project start-up and implementation? What are the causes? Have they been resolved?			
Are work-planning processes results-based? Is the project's results framework/ log frame used as a management tool? Are there any changes made to it since project start? What can the project do to re-orientate work planning to focus on results?			
Are interventions of the project cost-effectiveness?			
Does the project have adequate resources for integrating HR & GE in the intervention as an investment in short-term and medium-term benefits?			
Are there any changes to fund allocations as a result of budget revisions? Are they appropriate and relevant?			

Are there any variances between planned and actual expenditures?			
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? Does the project demonstrate due diligence in the management of funds, including annual audits or spotchecks?			
What is the level of co-financing reported to date? What is the amount of "investment mobilized"? What is the amount of "recurrent expenditures"?			
Is there sufficient clarity in the reported co-financing to substantiate in-kind and cash co-financing from all listed sources?			
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?			
What is the quality of the Monitoring Evaluation Plan Implementation? Does it include inclusive, innovative and participatory monitoring system? Do the project's monitoring tools provide the necessary information for decision making?			
Are the monitoring tools aligned or mainstreamed with national systems? Do they use existing information?			
Are there sufficient resources being allocated to monitoring and evaluation? Are they efficient? Are they cost-effective? Are additional tools required?			
Do the monitoring tools involve key partners, including women and men, and any other relevant group? How could they be made more participatory and inclusive?			
To what extent relevant gender issues are incorporated in monitoring systems?			
Is the responsibility for ensuring adherence to Human			

Rights and gender objectives well-articulated in the performance monitoring framework and implementation plans?			
Has the project developed and leveraged the necessary and appropriate partnerships with direct and tangential stakeholders?			
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?			
To what extent has stakeholder involvement and public awareness contributed to the progress towards achievement of project objectives? Are there any limitations to stakeholder awareness of project outcomes or to stakeholder participation in project activities? Is there invested interest of stakeholders in the project's long-term success and sustainability?			
How does the project engage with the rights-holders to enjoy their rights and duty bearers can comply with their obligations?			
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? Are there any legal, cultural, or religious constraints on women's participation in the project? What can the project do to enhance its gender benefits?			
Were the risks identified in the project's most current SESP the most strategic? Are the risks rating appropiate? Are management measures appropriate? To what extent the management measures include Environmental and Social Management plan? Are any revisions needed?			
Are there any revisions made to the idenfied riks (type, categorization, ratings and measures) in the SESP since CEO Endorsement/			

Approval? Are they up to date?			
To what extent adaptive management chages have been reported by the project management and shared with the Project Board?			
How well the Project Team and partners undertake and fulfil GEF reporting requirements? Have they addressed poorly-rated PIRs, if applicable?			
How lessons derived from the adaptive management process have been documented? Have they been shared with key partners? Have them internalized?			
To what extent the project has a Communication plan? Are proper means of communication established or being established to express the project progress and intended impact to the public? What are the main activities/products developed?			
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?			
What can do the project better to expand educational or awareness aspects of the project?			
Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, socio-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?			
What is the likelihood of financial and economic resources not being available once the GEF assistance ends for sustaining project's outcomes? Are financial and economic instruments and mechanisms in place to ensure the ongoing flow of benefits once the GEF assistance ends to promote the project's objectives?			
What opportunities for financial sustainability exist? What additional factors are needed to create an enabling			

environment for continued financing?			
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?			
Are the project's successful aspects being transferred to appropriate parties, potential future beneficiaries, and others who could learn from the project and potentially replicate and/or scale it in the future?			
Do the legal frameworks, policies, governance structures and processes pose risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project benefits?			
How has the project developed appropriate institutional capacity (systems, structures, staff, expertise, etc.) that will be self-sufficient after the project closure date? Is the project conducive to an institutional change to systematically addressing Human Rights and Gender concerns?			
Has the project put in place frameworks, policies, governance structures and processes that will create mechanisms for accountability, transparency, and technical knowledge transfer after the project's closure?			
Has the project achieved stakeholders' (including government stakeholders')			

consensus regarding courses of action on project activities after the project's closure date? Does the project leadership have the ability to respond to future institutional and governance changes (i.e. foreseeable changes to local or national political leadership)? Can the project strategies effectively be incorporated /mainstreamed into future planning?			
Are there any environmental risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project outcomes?			

ANNEX E: UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluators/Midterm Review Consultants[10]

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.
8. Must ensure that independence of judgement is maintained, and that evaluation findings and recommendations are independently presented.
9. Must confirm that they have not been involved in designing, executing, or advising on the project being evaluated.

MTR Consultant Agreement Form

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

Name of Consultant: _____

Name of Consultancy Organization (where relevant): _____

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

Signed at _____ *(Place)* on _____ *(Date)*

Signature: _____

ANNEX F: MTR Ratings & Achievement Summary Table + Rating Scales

MTR Ratings & Achievement Summary Table for (*Project Title*)[11]

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)	

Rating Scales

	Ratings for Progress Towards Results: (one rating for each outcome and for the objective)	
6	Highly Satisfactory (HS)	The objective/outcome is expected to achieve or exceed all its end-of-project targets, without major shortcomings. The progress towards the objective/outcome can be presented as "good practice".
5	Satisfactory (S)	The objective/outcome is expected to achieve most of its end-of-project targets, with only minor shortcomings.
4	Moderately Satisfactory (MS)	The objective/outcome is expected to achieve most of its end-of-project targets but with significant shortcomings.
3	Moderately Unsatisfactory (HU)	The objective/outcome is expected to achieve its end-of-project targets with major shortcomings.
2	Unsatisfactory (U)	The objective/outcome is expected not to achieve most of its end-of-project targets.
1	Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)	The objective/outcome has failed to achieve its midterm targets, and is not expected to achieve any of its end-of-project targets.

	Ratings for Project Implementation & Adaptive Management: (one overall rating)	
6	Highly Satisfactory (HS)	Implementation of all seven components – management arrangements, work planning, finance and co-finance, project-level monitoring and evaluation systems, stakeholder engagement, reporting, and communications – is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management. The project can be presented as "good practice".
5	Satisfactory (S)	Implementation of most of the seven components is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management except for only few that are subject to remedial action.
4	Moderately Satisfactory (MS)	Implementation of some of the seven components is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management, with some components requiring remedial action.

---

[11] After completing Table I (Progress Towards Results Matrix), the MTR Consultant should also fill out Table, to be included in the report's executive summary. Table's MTR Rating column should include the same assigned ratings for the objective/outcomes as assigned in Table 1's column Achievement Rating, whereas the ratings for 'Project Implementation & Adaptive Management', and 'Sustainability' should be assigned based on analysis from the MTR mission, interviews, document review, etc.

3	Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)	Implementation of some of the seven components is not leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive, with most components requiring remedial action.
2	Unsatisfactory (U)	Implementation of most of the seven components is not leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management.
1	Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)	Implementation of none of the seven components is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management.

Ratings for Sustainability: (one overall rating)		
4	Likely (L)	Negligible risks to sustainability, with key outcomes on track to be achieved by the project's closure and expected to continue into the foreseeable future
3	Moderately Likely (ML)	Moderate risks, but expectations that at least some outcomes will be sustained due to the progress towards results on outcomes at the Midterm Review
2	Moderately Unlikely (MU)	Significant risk that key outcomes will not carry on after project closure, although some outputs and activities should carry on
1	Unlikely (U)	Severe risks that project outcomes as well as key outputs will not be sustained

ANNEX G: MTR Report Clearance Form

(to be completed and signed by the Commissioning Unit and RTA and included in the final document)

Midterm Review Report Reviewed and Cleared By:

Commissioning Unit (M&E Focal Point)

Name: _____

Signature: _____   Date: _____

Regional Technical Advisor (Nature, Climate and Energy)

Name: _____

Signature: _____   Date: _____

ANNEX H: 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 Midterm Review of "San Salvador Low-emission Urban Development path" (UNDP Project ID00107731/00107946 -*PIMS 5462*)

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 I: Progress Towards Results Matrix

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

Project Goal:								
Project Strategy	**Indicator[12]**	**Baseline Level[13]**	**Level in 1st PIR (self-reported)**	**Midterm Target[14]**	**End-of-project Target**	**Midterm Level & Assessment[15] ***	**Achievement Rating[16]**	**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

---

[12] Populate with data from the Logframe and scorecards
[13] Populate with data from the Project Document
[14] If available
[15] Colour code this column only
[16] Use the 6 point Progress Towards Results Rating Scale: HS, S, MS, MU, U, HU

ANNEX J: GEF Co-Financing Template

Co-Financing Table for UNDP Supported GEF Financed projects

Note: This table should be completed by the MTR Team with support from the Project Team

Source of Co-financing[17]	Name of Co-financer	Type of Co-financing[18]	Amount Confirmed at CEO endorsement (US$)	Actual Amount Contributed at stage of Midterm Review (US$)	Actual% of Expected Amount
	TOTAL				

---

[17] Sources of Co-financing may include: Bilateral Aid Agency(ies), Foundation, GEF Partner Agency, Local Government, National Government, Civil Society Organization, Other Multi-lateral Agency(ies), Private Sector, Other.

[18] Type of Co-financing may include: Grant, Soft Loan, Hard Loan, Guarantee, In-Kind, Other

ANNEX K. Recommendations Table

This is a guidance chart for the MTR Consultant in designing recommendations to the project

Rec #	Recommendations[19]	Entity Responsible
A	*State Outcome 1* (Outcome 1)	
A.1	**Key recommendation:**	
A.2		
A.3		
B.	*State Outcome 2* (Outcome 2)	
B.1	**Key recommendation:**	
B.2		
B.3		
C	*State Outcome 3* (Outcome 3), etc.	
C.1	**Key recommendation:**	
C.2		
C.3		
D	Project Implementation & Adaptive Management	
D.1	**Key recommendation:**	
D.2		
D.3		
E	Sustainability	
E.1	**Key recommendation:**	
E.2		
E.3		

---

[19] Recommendations should be "SMART": Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant, Time-bound (however, giving a suggested time frame is not mandatory for recommendations from the MTR Consultant; the project management should address the time frame of actions in the management response)