

UNDP-GEF Mid-Term Review Terms of Reference

Market Transformation through the Introduction of Energy Efficiency Standards and the Labeling of Appliances in South Africa (PIMS 3277)

1. INTRODUCTION

This is the Terms of Reference (ToR) for the UNDP-GEF Mid-Term Review (MTR) of the full-sized project titled “Market Transformation Through the Introduction of Energy Efficiency Standards and the Labeling of Appliances in South Africa” (PIMS: 3277), implemented through the National Department of Energy (DoE), which is to be undertaken in early 2015. The project started on 11th November 2011 and is in its fourth year of implementation. In line with the UNDP-GEF Guidance on MTRs, this MTR process was initiated before the submission of the third Project Implementation Report (PIR). This ToR sets out the expectations for the MTR. The MTR process must follow the guidance outlined in the document *Guidance For Conducting Mid-Term Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects* http://www.mn.undp.org/content/dam/mongolia/Procurement/proc-notices/ProcurementAnnouncement2014/EbA/20140827/Guidance%20for%20Conducting%20Midterm%20Reviews%20of%20UNDP-Supported%20GEF-Financed%20Projects_Final_June%202014.pdf.

2. PROJECT BACKGROUND INFORMATION

The project was designed to support the implementation of South Africa’s Energy Efficiency Strategy, which set an overall energy intensity reduction target of 12% by 2015 and 10% reduction in the residential sector. The Strategy includes a Standards and Labelling (S&L) programme for appliances and equipment as a key market transformation strategy for achieving such a reduction. The Global Environment Facility (GEF) committed US\$ 4.375 million to support this project. Total co-financing from Government is US\$4.75 million (cash \$ 3,435,000 and in-kind \$1,315,000).

The project is designed to address the policy, information, technology and financial barriers that are preventing the widespread introduction and uptake of efficient appliances. GEF funds are being used to provide assistance to the Government, national agencies and the private sector to introduce and implement a mandatory S&L programme successfully. At the same time, relevant capacity building activities are being implemented through training and technical assistance.

2.1 Project Goal, Objective and Key Outcomes

The **goal** of the project is to reduce greenhouse gas emissions caused by household appliances’ electricity consumption by facilitating a comprehensive market transformation of the South African market towards

the use of energy efficient electrical appliances. The project targets 12 electrical appliances¹ which are also part of the EE Action Plan. This is being achieved through the introduction of a combination of two regulatory tools - Minimum Energy Performance Standards (MEPS) and Information Labels. It is estimated that the project will save up to 388 GWh per year, which will lead to 4.6 Mt of direct CO₂ emissions reductions (over the lifetime of the appliances covered) and indirect CO₂ emissions reductions of 11.5 Mt CO₂.

The main **objective** of the UNDP-implemented, GEF-financed project is to remove the most significant barriers impeding the widespread uptake of energy efficient residential appliances as well as to assist households in making a contribution towards meeting the 10% electricity demand reduction in the residential sector by 2015.

The key project outcomes are as follows:

Outcome 1: Policy and regulatory framework for the S&L programme

The outcome will review, and where necessary refine or define, the policy framework and the institutional arrangements needed for the widespread uptake of energy efficient appliances in the market. As South Africa has already decided to implement a mandatory S&L programme for household appliances, rules must be established for all subsequent steps such as stakeholder inputs, analysis, market surveillance, compliance, testing, enforcement, monitoring, dissemination and evaluation

Outcome 2: Define labelling specifications and MEPS thresholds for the 12 products considered by the DoE & DTI for S&L regulation

The outcome will propose energy classes for the information label and MEPS thresholds for the 12 identified appliances, by conducting market and engineering analyses to demonstrate the cost-effectiveness of the proposed specifications. Market research and industry studies will be undertaken to guide stakeholders in their decision-making process.

Outcome 3: Strengthen the capacity of institutions and individuals involved in the S&L programme

This outcome will strengthen the capacities of agencies such as the National Energy Efficiency Agency (NEEA), the National Regulator for Compulsory Specifications (NRCS), the South African Bureau for Standards (SABS) and testing facilities, by providing training to the current staff and identifying the required skills for successful implementation and monitoring of the S&L programme.

Outcome 4: Awareness-raising campaign for standards and labels - targeting manufacturers, distributors, retailers and end-users.

This outcome includes the provision of information – in cooperation with main importers and the power utility – about the costs and benefits of energy efficient products, together with an explanation of energy labels and MEPS. A training programme will be prepared for distributors and retail staff, to help them inform end-users about the benefits of purchasing efficient products. The programme will also help them understand the business opportunities of selling efficient appliances.

¹ The appliances included in the EE Action Plan are: refrigerators, freezers and their combinations, water heaters, air conditioners, heaters, washing machines, driers and their combinations, dishwashers, hot plates and ovens.

2.2 Project Implementation arrangement

The National Department of Energy (DoE), located in Pretoria, retains the overall responsibility for execution of the project activities and maintains accountability of the UNDP/GEF support as per National Implementation Modality (NIM). DoE is working on this project in close cooperation with the Department of Trade and Industry (DTI), NRCS and SABS. The GEF grant to the project is managed by UNDP. Coordination among these key project partners and management of day-to-day operations of the project is achieved through the support of a Project Management Unit (PMU) located inside DoE. The PMU is currently only staffed by a full-time Project Manager recruited by UNDP. The overall project oversight is guided by a Project Steering Committee (PSC), chaired by DoE with representatives from all the relevant national stakeholders, including DTI, UNDP, SABS, NRCS and Eskom.

3. OBJECTIVES OF THE MTR

The MTR will assess progress towards the achievement of the project objectives and outcomes as specified in the Project Document, and assess 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.

4. MTR APPROACH & METHODOLOGY

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

The MTR consultant is expected to follow a collaborative and participatory approach² ensuring close engagement with the Project Team, Government counterparts (e.g. the GEF Operational Focal Point), the UNDP Country Office, the UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Adviser, and other key stakeholders.

Engagement of stakeholders is vital to a successful MTR.³ Stakeholder involvement should include interviews with stakeholders who have project responsibilities, including but not limited to SABS, DTI, NRCS, Eskom, SANEDI; executing agencies, senior officials and task team/component leaders, key experts and consultants in the subject area, the Project Steering Committee, project stakeholders, academia, local government and CSOs, etc. Additionally, the MTR consultant is expected to conduct field missions, including to the following sites: 3 test facilities (Gerotek, Test Africa and South African Bureau of Standards); 4 manufacturing companies (Defy, WE Geysers, Kwikot and Franke) and 5 importing companies (Whirlpool, Smeg, Panasonic,

² For ideas on innovative and participatory Monitoring and Evaluation strategies and techniques, see [UNDP Discussion Paper: Innovations in Monitoring & Evaluating Results](#), 05 Nov 2013.

³ For more stakeholder engagement in the M&E process, see the [UNDP Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results](#), Chapter 3, pg. 93.

Inventum and Samsung) with the majority located in Johannesburg, Gauteng Province except for Defy offices located in Durban, KwaZulu Natal Province.

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

5. DETAILED SCOPE OF THE MTR

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

i. Project Strategy

Project design:

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

Results Framework/Logframe:

- Undertake a critical analysis of the project's logframe indicators and targets, assess how "SMART" the mid-term and end-of-project targets are (Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Relevant, Time-bound), and suggest specific amendments/revisions to the targets and indicators as necessary.
- Are the project's objectives and outcomes or components clear, practical, and feasible within its time frame?
- Examine if progress so far has led to, or could in the future catalyse, beneficial development effects (i.e. income generation, gender equality and women's empowerment, improved governance etc...) that should be included in the project results framework and monitored on an annual basis.
- Ensure broader development and gender aspects of the project are being monitored effectively. Develop and recommend SMART 'development' indicators, including sex-disaggregated indicators and indicators that capture development benefits.

ii. Progress Towards Results

Progress Towards Outcomes Analysis:

- Review the logframe indicators against progress made towards the end-of-project targets using the Progress Towards Results Matrix and following the *Guidance For Conducting Mid-Term Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects*; colour code progress in a "traffic light system" based on the

level of progress achieved; assign a rating on progress for each outcome; make recommendations from the areas marked as “Not on target to be achieved” (red).

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

Project Strategy	Indicator ⁴	Baseline Level ⁵	Level in 1 st PIR (self-reported)	Midterm Target ⁶	End-of-project Target	Midterm Level & Assessment ⁷	Achievement Rating ⁸	Justification for Rating
Objective:	Indicator (if applicable):							
Outcome 1:	Indicator 1:							
	Indicator 2:							
Outcome 2:	Indicator 3:							
	Indicator 4:							
	Etc.							
Etc.								

Indicator Assessment Key

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

In addition to the progress towards outcomes analysis:

- Compare and analyse the GEF Tracking Tool at the Baseline with the one completed right before the Mid-Term 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.

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:

⁴ Populate with data from the Logframe and scorecards

⁵ Populate with data from the Project Document

⁶ If available

⁷ Colour code this column only

⁸ Use the 6 point Progress Towards Results Rating Scale: HS, S, MS, MU, U, HU

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

Project-level Monitoring and Evaluation Systems:

- Review the monitoring tools currently being used: Do they provide the necessary information? Do they involve key partners? Are they aligned or mainstreamed with national systems? Do they use existing information? Are they efficient? Are they cost-effective? Are additional tools required? How could they be made more participatory and inclusive?
- Examine the financial management of the project monitoring and evaluation budget. Are sufficient resources being allocated to monitoring and evaluation? Are these resources being allocated effectively?

Stakeholder Engagement:

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

Reporting:

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

Communications:

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

iv. Sustainability

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

Financial risks to sustainability:

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

Socio-economic risks to sustainability:

- Are there any social or political risks that may jeopardise sustainability of project outcomes? What is the risk that the level of stakeholder ownership (including ownership by Government 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 jeopardise 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 jeopardise sustainability of project outcomes?

Conclusions & Recommendations

The MTR consultant will include a section of the report setting out the MTR's evidence-based conclusions, in light of the findings.⁹

Recommendations should be succinct suggestions for critical intervention that are specific, measurable, achievable, and relevant. A recommendation table should be put in the report's executive summary. See the *Guidance For Conducting Mid-Term Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects* for guidance on a recommendation table.

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

Ratings

The MTR consultant 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.

⁹ Alternatively, MTR conclusions may be integrated into the body of the report.

Table. MTR Ratings & Achievement Summary Table for Market Transformation Through the Introduction of Energy Efficiency Standards and the Labeling of Appliances in South Africa

Measure	MTR Rating	Achievement Description
Project Strategy	N/A	
Progress Towards Results	Objective Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale)	
	Outcome 1 Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale)	
	Outcome 2 Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale)	
	Outcome 3 Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale)	
	Etc.	
Project Implementation & Adaptive Management	(rate 6 pt. scale)	
Sustainability	(rate 4 pt. scale)	

6. TIMEFRAME

The total duration of the MTR will be approximately **17 working days** (including 2 days of travel to and from South Africa) starting **12 March 2015** and shall not exceed three months from when the consultant(s) are hired. The tentative MTR timeframe is as follows:

TIMEFRAME	ACTIVITY
6 March 2015	Application closes
10 March 2015	Select MTR consultant
12 March 2015	Prep the MTR consultant (hand-over of Project Documents)
16 – 17 March (2 days)	Document review and preparing MTR Inception Report
20 – 23 March (2 days)	Finalisation and Validation of MTR Inception Report- latest start of MTR mission
24 – 30 March 2015 (5 days)	MTR mission: stakeholder meetings, interviews, field visits
1 April 2015	Mission wrap-up meeting & presentation of initial findings- earliest end of MTR mission
2 - 9 April 2015(4 days) <i>Easter weekend in between</i>	Preparing draft report
10 – 14 April 2015	Stakeholder inputs / comments into draft report
15-16 April (2 days)	Incorporating audit trail from feedback on draft report/Finalisation of MTR report
20-22 April 2015	Preparation & Issue of Management Response
27 April 2015	Expected date of full MTR completion

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

7. MIDTERM REVIEW DELIVERABLES

#	Deliverable	Description	Timing	Responsibilities
1	MTR Inception	MTR consultant clarifies	No later than 1	MTR consultant submits

	Report	objectives and methods of Mid-Term Review	week before the MTR mission	to the UNDP and project management
2	Presentation	Initial Findings	End of MTR mission	MTR consultant presents to project management and UNDP
3	Draft Final Report	Full report (using guidelines on content outlined in Annex B) with annexes	Within 1 weeks of the MTR mission	Sent to UNDP, reviewed by RTA, Project Coordinating Unit, GEF OFP
4	Final Report*	Revised report with audit trail detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final MTR report	Within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft	Sent to UNDP

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

8. MTR ARRANGEMENTS

The principal responsibility for managing this MTR resides with the UNDP Country Office (CO) in Pretoria, South Africa in collaboration with the Department of Energy through the PMU. The UNDP CO will contract the consultant and ensure the timely provision of per diems and travel arrangements within the country for the consultant. The Project Team will be responsible for liaising with the consultant to provide all relevant documents, set up stakeholder interviews, and arrange field visits.

9. CONSULTANT REQUIREMENTS

An independent international consultant with experience and exposure to projects and evaluations in other regions globally will conduct the MTR. 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 maximising the qualities in the following areas:

Experience (50%)- max 50 points

- Recent experience with result-based management evaluation methodologies (7 points);
- Experience applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios (6 points);
- Project evaluation/review experiences within United Nations system (6 points);
- Competence in adaptive management, as applied to climate change mitigation (6 points);
- Experience working with the GEF or GEF evaluations (8 points);
- Experience working in Africa (6 points);
- Work experience in relevant technical areas for at least 10 years (6 points);
- Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender and climate change mitigation (5 points).

Education (10%) – max 10 points

- At least a Master's degree in relevant areas such as Environmental Sciences, Energy Studies, Engineering or other closely related fields (10 points).

Skills & Language (10%) – max 10 points

- Fluent in written and spoken English (3 points);
- Excellent communication skills (3 points);
- Demonstrable analytical skills (4 points).

Financial Proposal (30%) – max. 30 points

10. PAYMENT MODALITIES AND SPECIFICATIONS

10% of payment upon approval of the final MTR Inception Report

30% upon submission of the draft MTR report

60% upon finalisation of the MTR report

11. APPLICATION PROCESS¹⁰

Recommended Presentation of Proposal:

- a) **Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability** using the [template](#)¹¹ provided by UNDP;
- b) **CV** and a **Personal History Form** ([P11 form](#)¹²);
- 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 organisation/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 to the address: **United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), Metropark Building, 10th Floor, 351 Francis Baard Street, Pretoria, South Africa** in a sealed envelope indicating the following reference “**Consultant for Market Transformation Through the Introduction of Energy Efficiency Standards and the Labeling of Appliances in South Africa - Midterm Review**” or by e-mail at the following address ONLY: procurement.za@undp.org by **6th of March 2015 at 17h00** (local South Africa time). Incomplete applications will be excluded from further consideration.

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 be weighted as 30% of the total scoring. The applicant receiving the Highest Combined Score that has also accepted UNDP’s General Terms and Conditions will be awarded the contract.

¹⁰ Engagement of the consultants should be done in line with guidelines for hiring consultants in the POPP: <https://info.undp.org/global/popp/Pages/default.aspx>

¹¹

<https://intranet.undp.org/unit/bom/pso/Support%20documents%20on%20IC%20Guidelines/Template%20for%20Confirmation%20of%20Interest%20and%20Submission%20of%20Financial%20Proposal.docx>

¹² http://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/corporate/Careers/P11_Personal_history_form.doc

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

1. PIF
2. UNDP Initiation Plan
3. UNDP Project Document
4. UNDP Environmental and Social Screening results
5. Project Inception Report
6. All Project Implementation Reports (PIR's)
7. Quarterly progress reports and work plans of the various implementation task teams
8. Audit reports
9. Finalised GEF Climate Change Mitigation (CCM) Tracking Tools at CEO endorsement and mid-term
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. Minutes of the *Market Transformation Through the Introduction of Energy Efficiency Standards and the Labeling of Appliances in South Africa* Board Meetings and other meetings (i.e. Project Appraisal Committee meetings)

ToR ANNEX B: Guidelines on Contents for the Mid-Term Review Report¹³

- 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
 - Acknowledgements
- ii. Table of Contents
- iii. Acronyms and Abbreviations
1. Executive Summary (*3-5 pages*)
 - Project Information Table
 - Project Description (brief)
 - Project Progress Summary (between 200-500 words)
 - MTR Ratings & Achievement Summary Table
 - Concise summary of conclusions
 - Recommendation Summary Table
2. Introduction (*2-3 pages*)
 - Purpose of the MTR and objectives
 - Scope & Methodology: principles of design and execution of the MTR, MTR approach and data collection methods, limitations to the MTR
 - Structure of the MTR report

¹³ The Report length should not exceed 40 pages in total (not including annexes).

3. Project Description and Background Context (3-5 pages)
 - Development context: environmental, socio-economic, institutional, and policy factors relevant to the project objective and scope
 - Problems that the project sought to address: threats and barriers targeted
 - Project Description and Strategy: objective, outcomes and expected results, description of field sites (if any)
 - Project Implementation Arrangements: short description of the Project Board, key implementing partner arrangements, etc.
 - Project timing and milestones
 - Main stakeholders: summary list
4. Findings (12-14 pages)
 - 4.1 Project Strategy
 - Project Design
 - Results Framework/Logframe
 - 4.2 Progress Towards Results
 - Progress towards outcomes analysis
 - Remaining barriers to achieving the project objective
 - 4.3 Project Implementation and Adaptive Management
 - Management Arrangements
 - Work planning
 - Finance and co-finance
 - Project-level monitoring and evaluation systems
 - Stakeholder engagement
 - Reporting
 - Communications
 - 4.4 Sustainability
 - Financial risks to sustainability
 - Socio-economic to sustainability
 - Institutional framework and governance risks to sustainability
 - Environmental risks to sustainability
5. Conclusions and Recommendations (4-6 pages)
 - 5.1 Conclusions
 - Comprehensive and balanced statements (that are evidence-based and connected to the MTR's findings) which highlight the strengths, weaknesses and results of the project
 - 5.2 Recommendations
 - Corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project
 - Actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the project
 - Proposals for future directions underlining main objectives
6. Annexes
 - MTR ToR (excluding ToR annexes)
 - MTR evaluative matrix (evaluation criteria with key questions, indicators, sources of data, and methodology)
 - Example Questionnaire or Interview Guide used for data collection
 - Ratings Scales
 - MTR mission itinerary
 - List of persons interviewed
 - List of documents reviewed
 - Co-financing table (if not previously included in the body of the report)
 - Signed UNEG Code of Conduct form
 - Signed MTR final report clearance form
 - *Annexed in a separate file:* Audit trail from received comments on draft MTR report
 - *Annexed in a separate file:* CCM midterm tracking tools

ToR ANNEX C: Mid-Term Review Evaluative Matrix Template

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

Evaluators/Consultants:

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

MTR Consultant Agreement Form

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

Name of Consultant: _____

Name of Consultancy Organization (where relevant): _____

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

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

Signature: _____

¹⁴ www.undp.org/unegcodeofconduct

ToR ANNEX E: MTR Ratings

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

Ratings for Project Implementation & Adaptive Management: (one overall rating)		
6	Highly Satisfactory (HS)	Implementation of all seven components – management arrangements, work planning, finance and co-finance, project-level monitoring and evaluation systems, stakeholder engagement, reporting, and communications – is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management. The project can be presented as “good practice”.
5	Satisfactory (S)	Implementation of most of the seven components is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management except for only few that are subject to remedial action.
4	Moderately Satisfactory (MS)	Implementation of some of the seven components is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management, with some components requiring remedial action.
3	Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)	Implementation of some of the seven components is not leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive, with most components requiring remedial action.
2	Unsatisfactory (U)	Implementation of most of the seven components is not leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management.
1	Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)	Implementation of none of the seven components is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management.

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

ToR ANNEX F: MTR Report Clearance Form

(to be completed by the UNDP CO and UNDP-GEF RTA and included in the final document)

Midterm Review Report Reviewed and Cleared By:	
Commissioning Unit	
Name: _____	
Signature: _____	Date: _____
UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Advisor	
Name: _____	
Signature: _____	Date: _____

