## UNDP-GEF Midterm Review PIMS 4333 – Removal of Barriers to Solar PV Power Generation in Mauritius Rodrigues and Outer Islands - Terms of Reference

1. **INTRODUCTION**

This is the Terms of Reference (ToR) for the UNDP-GEF Mid-Term Review (MTR) of the full-sized project titled ‘Removal of Barriers to Solar PV Power Generation in Mauritius, Rodrigues and the Outer Islands’ (PIMS 4333) implemented through the Central Electricity Board (CEB) as delegated by the Ministry of Energy and Public Utilities, which is to be undertaken in 2015. The project started on the 20th of October 2011 and is in its Second year of implementation, considering that the Inception workshop was carried out in April 2014. This ToR sets out the expectations for this MTR. The MTR process must follow the guidance outlined in the document Guidance For Conducting Mid-Term Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects which may be obtained online.

**2. PROJECT BACKGROUND INFORMATION**

The Republic of Mauritius is an island nation off the southeast coast of the African continent in the southwest Indian Ocean, approximately 900 km (560 mi) east of Madagascar. In addition to the island of Mauritius, the Republic includes the islands of Cargados Carajos, Rodrigues and the Agalega Islands totalling a population of 1,277,853 inhabitants (2009). With a per capita income (purchasing power parity) of US$ 12,400, the Republic of Mauritius is one of the best performing economies in Africa. The main islands of Mauritius and Rodrigues (population of 35,000) are fully connected to the Central Electricity Board electricity grid. Electricity generation in the Republic is highly dependent on fossil fuels.

The Central Electricity Board, a parastatal body wholly owned by the Government and established in 1952, has responsibility under the Central Electricity Board Act of 25 January 1964 to "prepare and carry out development schemes with the general object of promoting, coordinating and improving the generation, transmission, distribution and sale of electricity" in Mauritius. It presently generates approximately 46% (Chart 1) of the country's total power requirements from its 4 thermal power stations and 9 hydroelectric plants, including the fully automated 350 kW hydropower station at La Nicolière that was recently commissioned; the remaining 54% is purchased from Independent Power Producers using a combination of bagasse and imported coal for generation.

Mauritius views the expansion of its electricity generation capacity through the utilisation of renewable energy resources, including grid-connected PV, as central to its longer-term development prospects. The objective is to utilise renewable sources of energy to the maximum extent possible, taking into consideration the grid absorption capacity, thereby reducing its reliance on imported fossil fuel. Hence, this project will promote and accelerate a climate-friendly solution to the energy situation in Mauritius through harnessing its abundant solar radiation for PV-based electricity generation to supply the grid.

The objective of this project is to accelerate sustainable on-grid PV electricity generation in Mauritius by leveraging $ 17.5 million in private sector investment over its four-year implementation period. This, in turn, is expected to generate direct global benefits of almost 13,295 tons of CO2 over the same period and almost 5,318 tons CO2/yr thereafter in avoided greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. The project will do this by introducing a conducive regulatory framework that will facilitate private sector participation in supplying the national grid with PV-generated electricity at market-determined prices and assist the Government in closing private sector funded PV investments. It is envisaged that this project will enable Mauritius to meet (and maybe even surpass) its target of 2% of electricity generation from on-grid PV by 2025, as established in its “Long Term Energy Strategy 2009-2025”.

The project’s goal is to reduce GHG emissions by creating favourable legal, regulatory and market environment and building institutional, administrative and technical capacities to promote the utilisation of the country’s favourable solar radiation potential for PV grid-connected electricity generation. The objective is to assist the Government of Mauritius in addressing the various barriers with a view to achieving at least 2% of grid-connected electricity generation from PV by 2025, as outlined in the “Long Term Energy Strategy 2009-2025”.

The Ministry of Energy and Public Utilities is the central body responsible for formulating and implementing the Government’s policy in the field of energy. In the specific area of renewable energy, MEPU is entrusted with formulating policy, plans and programmes for the development and utilisation of renewable energy sources and to make proposals for appropriate legislation/regulations that would promote such activities. The Central Electricity Board, responsible for generation (in conjunction with IPPs), transmission, distribution and sale of electricity, operates under the general purview of the Ministry of Energy and Public Utilities (MEPU). MEPU is also entrusted with the formulation and implementation of energy efficiency measures in the country and, as such, is directly responsible for implementing the recently-completed UNDP-GEF project entitled “Removal of Barriers to Energy Efficiency and Energy Conservation in Buildings”.

The ‘Removal of Barriers to Solar PV Power Generation in Mauritius, Rodrigues and the Outer Islands’ project is promoting a market-driven approach to encourage the participation of the private sector to supply the electricity grid in Mauritius with electricity generated from PV systems. In line with GEF requirements, “the emphasis will be upon developing policies and regulatory frameworks that provide limited incremental support to strategically important investments”, such as investment in new power generation capacity in Mauritius through on-grid PV, allowing the country to cope with its increased demand for electricity services in an environmentally and climate-friendly way. During the PPG phase, a co-financing letter for a 6MW plant was received. A total of USD 17 M was mentioned in the project document as planned co-financing. A number of promoters have also shown interest to install utility scale grid PV systems for a combined capacity of 16 MW and cost of $65m.

At project design stage, the Government had plans to install one 5-kW PV system each at 10 educational institutions in Mauritius. Consideration was also to be given to similar projects in Rodrigues and Agalega. The objective of this initiative is to sensitise the young generation of school children to the benefits of sustainable development through the provision of electricity services at these institutions to power lights, laboratory equipment, small appliances, etc. obtained from PV, thereby obviating the need, albeit to a limited extent, to resort to fossil fuel for electricity generation. The Government has solicited the support of UNDP to implement this project and activities to be implemented under the UNDP-GEF on-grid PV barrier removal project will be instrumental in supporting this initiative, especially as they relate to standards in the choice and installation of PV equipment, capacity development for installers, operators and maintenance personnel. Connection of these systems to the grid with the appropriate metering systems will enable the school children to monitor their respective energy generation and export/sale to the grid, especially during times of low “in-house” electricity usage on week-ends and over school holidays. This will be combined with energy efficiency measures that the schools could implement and it is expected that the children will, in turn, be instrumental in “educating” their parents in the rational use of energy, for both the financial and environmental benefits that it provides.

The private sector was considered to have a role to play a key role in project implementation. At the PPG stage, discussions were held with three potential local companies, viz. British American Investment, PV Energy and Outre Mer Energies Renouvelables, that are prepared to invest a total of $ 65 million for on-grid PV electricity generation, on the understanding that the Government formulates and approves feed-in tariffs for capacities more than 50 kW (co-financing letter is provided in Annex G). On the basis of estimated future installation costs of grid-based PV in Mauritius, this investment will likely culminate into a total of at least 16 MW of PV installed, with the minimum installation of an estimated 3 MW completed within the 4-year timeframe of the present project. In addition, discussions were on-going with other potential investors for more grid-connected PV capacities to be installed.

**3. OBJECTIVES OF THE MTR**

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

**4. MTR APPROACH & METHODOLOGY**

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

The MTR team is expected to follow a collaborative and participatory approach, ensuring close engagement with the Project Team, government counterparts (the GEF Operational Focal Point), the UNDP Country Office(s), UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Advisers, 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 agencies, senior officials and task team/ component leaders, key experts and consultants in the subject area, Project Board, project stakeholders, academia, local government and CSOs, etc. Additionally, the MTR team is expected to conduct field missions to Rodrigues.

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

**5. DETAILED SCOPE OF THE MTR**

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

**i. Project Strategy**

Project design:

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

Results Framework/Logframe:

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

**ii. Progress Towards Results**

Progress Towards Outcomes Analysis:

* Review the logframe indicators against progress made towards the end-of-project targets using the Progress Towards Results Matrix and following the *Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects*; colour code progress in a “traffic light system” based on the level of progress achieved; assign a rating on progress for each outcome; make recommendations from the areas marked as “Not on target to be achieved” (red).

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

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Project Strategy** | **Indicator[[1]](#footnote-1)** | **Baseline Level[[2]](#footnote-2)** | **Level in 1st PIR (self- reported)** | **Midterm Target[[3]](#footnote-3)** | **End-of-project Target** | **Midterm Level & Assessment[[4]](#footnote-4)** | **Achievement Rating[[5]](#footnote-5)** | **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 for 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:

* 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 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:

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

Institutional Framework and Governance risks to sustainability:

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

Environmental risks to sustainability:

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

**Conclusions & Recommendations**

The MTR team will include a section of the report setting out the MTR’s evidence-based conclusions, in light of the findings.[[6]](#footnote-6)

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 & Adaptive Management** | (rate 6 pt. scale) |  |
| **Sustainability** | (rate 4 pt. scale) |  |

1. **TIMEFRAME**

The total duration of the MTR will be approximately *15 days* over a time period of *6 weeks* starting 20 March 2015. The tentative MTR timeframe is as follows:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **TIMEFRAME** | **ACTIVITY** |
| *22 March 2015* | Application closes |
| *26 March 2015* | Select MTR Team |
| *26 March 2015*  | Prep the MTR Team (handover of Project Documents) |
| *30 March 2 days*  | Document review and preparing MTR Inception Report |
| *31 March 1 day*  | Finalization andValidation of MTR Inception Report- latest start of MTR mission |
| *31 March- 8 April 2015 – 7 days* | MTR mission: stakeholder meetings, interviews, field visits |
| *7 April 2015*  | Mission wrap-up meeting & presentation of initial findings- earliest end of MTR mission |
| *17 April - 3 days*  | Preparing draft report and draft Tracking Tool |
| *30 April - 2 days*  | Incorporating audit trail from feedback on draft report/Finalization of MTR report (note: accommodate time delay in dates for circulation and review of the draft report) |
| *5 May 2015* | Preparation & Issue of Management Response |
| *5 May 2015* | Expected date of full MTR completion, including Tracking Tool |

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

1. **MIDTERM REVIEW DELIVERABLES**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **#** | **Deliverable** | **Description** | **Timing** | **Responsibilities** |
| **1** | **MTR Inception Report** | MTR team clarifies objectives and methods of Midterm Review | No later 30 March | MTR team submits to the UNDP Mauritius CO and project management |
| **2** | **Presentation** | Initial Findings | End of MTR mission: 8 April 2015 | MTR Team presents to project management and the UNDP Mauritius CO |
| **3** | **Draft Final Report and Tracking Tool** | Full report (using guidelines on content outlined in Annex B) with annexes | 17 April 2015 | Sent to the UNDP Mauritius CO, reviewed by RTA, Project Coordinating Unit, GEF OFP |
| **4** | **Final Report and Tracking Tool\*** | 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: 30 April 2015 | Sent to the UNDP Mauritius CO |

1. **MTR ARRANGEMENTS**

The principal responsibility for managing this MTR resides with the Commissioning Unit. The Commissioning Unit for this project’s MTR is the UNDP Mauritius Country Office. The Consultants shall comply strictly with comments made on any deliverable by the UNDP CO, the UNDP GEF Regional Technical Adviser and the UNDP Independent Evaluation office.

The commissioning unit will contract the consultants and ensure the timely provision of per diems and travel arrangements within the country for the MTR team. The Project Team will be responsible for liaising with the MTR team to provide all relevant documents, assist in set up stakeholder interviews, and assist in arranging field visits.

1. **TEAM COMPOSITION**

A team of two independent consultants will conduct the MTR - one international consultant and team leader and one local consultant. The consultants cannot have participated in the project preparation, formulation, and/or implementation (including the writing of the Project Document) and should not have a conflict of interest with project’s related activities.

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

* Recent experience with result-based management evaluation methodologies;
* Experience applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios;
* Competence in adaptive management, as applied to Climate Change Mitigation Focal Area
* Experience working with the GEF or GEF-evaluations;
* Experience working in Mauritius or SIDS
* Work experience in relevant technical areas for at least 10 years for the International Consultant and 5 years for the local consultant;
* Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender and Climate Change Mitigation; experience in gender sensitive evaluation and analysis.
* Excellent communication skills;
* Demonstrable analytical skills;
* Project evaluation/review experiences within United Nations system will be considered an asset;
* A Master’s degree in Electronic or Electrical Engineering, Renewable Energy, Science, or other closely related field for the International Consultant and a Degree in the same fields for the National Consultants.
1. **PAYMENT MODALITIES AND SPECIFICATIONS**

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

30% upon submission of the draft MTR report and Tracking Tool

60% upon finalization of the MTR report and Tracking Tool

1. **APPLICATION PROCESS[[7]](#footnote-7)**

**Recommended Presentation of Proposal:**

1. **Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability** using the [template](https://intranet.undp.org/unit/bom/pso/Support%20documents%20on%20IC%20Guidelines/Template%20for%20Confirmation%20of%20Interest%20and%20Submission%20of%20Financial%20Proposal.docx)[[8]](#footnote-8) provided by UNDP;
2. **CV** and a **Personal History Form** ([P11 form](http://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/corporate/Careers/P11_Personal_history_form.doc)[[9]](#footnote-9));
3. **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)
4. **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.

Applications should be submitted online through the UNDP jobs website. No other mode of application will be accepted.

**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. The applicant receiving the Highest Combined Score that has also accepted UNDP’s General Terms and Conditions will be awarded the contract.

The Evaluation Criteria will be as follows:

International Consultant

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Criteria (Technical)** | **Weight (%)** |
| Advanced University Degree (Masters or equivalent) in Electrical or Electronic Engineering, Renewable Energy, Science or other closely related field. | 15 |
| At least 10 years of relevant professional experience in Climate Change mitigation and Project Evaluation | 15 |
| Highly knowledgeable of GEF and UNDP-GEF monitoring and evaluation policies procedures an advantage; | 10 |
| Familiarity with Mauritius or any Small Island Development States (SIDS); | 5 |
| Excellent in human relations, coordination, planning and team work. | 5 |
| Be fully IT literate | 5 |
| Brief Technical Proposal  | 15 |
| Criteria (Financial) | 30 |
| Total points obtainable | 100 |

National Consultant

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Criteria (Technical)** | **Weight (%)** |
| University Degree (Masters or equivalent) in Electrical or Electronic Engineering, Renewable Energy, Science, or other closely related field. | 15 |
| At least 5 years of relevant professional experience in Climate Change mitigation and Project Evaluation | 15 |
| knowledgeable of GEF and UNDP-GEF monitoring and evaluation policies procedures an advantage; | 10 |
| Excellent in human relations, coordination, planning and team work. | 5 |
| Be fully IT literate | 5 |
| Brief Technical Proposal  | 20 |
| Criteria (Financial) | 30 |
| Total points obtainable | 100 |

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

1. PIF
2. UNDP Initiation Plan
3. UNDP Project Document
4. Project Inception Report
5. All Project Implementation Reports (PIR’s)
6. Quarterly progress reports and work plans of the various implementation task teams
7. Audit reports, if available
8. GEF focal area Tracking Tools at CEO endorsement
9. All monitoring reports prepared by the project
10. Financial and Administration guidelines used by Project Team
11. Project deliverables

The following documents will also be available:

1. UNDP country/countries programme document(s)
2. Minutes of the Steering Committee Meetings and other meetings (i.e. Project Appraisal Committee meetings)

**ToR ANNEX B: Guidelines on Contents for the Midterm Review Report**[[10]](#footnote-10)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **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
* 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
 |
| **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:* Relevant midterm tracking tools (*METT, FSC, Capacity scorecard, etc.)*
 |

**ToR ANNEX C: Midterm 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?** |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

**ToR ANNEX D: UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluators/Midterm Review Consultants[[11]](#footnote-11)**

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

**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 Commissioning Unit 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: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

##

1. Populate with data from the Logframe and scorecards [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Populate with data from the Project Document [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. If available [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. Colour code this column only [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. Use the 6 point Progress Towards Results Rating Scale: HS, S, MS, MU, U, HU [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. Alternatively, MTR conclusions may be integrated into the body of the report. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. 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> [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. <https://intranet.undp.org/unit/bom/pso/Support%20documents%20on%20IC%20Guidelines/Template%20for%20Confirmation%20of%20Interest%20and%20Submission%20of%20Financial%20Proposal.docx> [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. <http://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/corporate/Careers/P11_Personal_history_form.doc> [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. The Report length should not exceed *40* pages in total (not including annexes). [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
11. [www.undp.org/unegcodeofconduct](http://www.undp.org/unegcodeofconduct) [↑](#footnote-ref-11)