## UNDP-GEF Midterm Review Terms of Reference

1. **INTRODUCTION**

This is the Terms of Reference (ToR) for the UNDP-GEF Midterm Review (MTR) of the full-sized project titled **“Mainstreaming biodiversity conservation into Russia’s energy sector policies and operations”** (PIMS#4241) implemented through the Ministry of natural resources and environment of the Russian Federation, which is to be undertaken in 2015 year. The Project Document was signed on July 25, 2011; however, the project was not operationalised till July 2012; this is the third year of the project implementation. Due to the protracted project start, the MTR will be conducted just before the submission of the third Project Implementation Report (PIR). This ToR sets out the expectations for this MTR. The MTR process must follow the guidance outlined in the document *Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects* (<http://web.undp.org/evaluation/documents/guidance/GEF/mid-term/Guidance_Midterm%20Review%20_EN_2014.pdf>).

**2. PROJECT BACKGROUND INFORMATION**

The Project was designed to improve the status of biodiversity in the industrialized regions of Russia, assisting in the arrangements of biodiversity monitoring system and implementation of environmentally and biodiversity friendly techniques within oil production, coal production and hydropower sector business companies in demonstration regions: Kemerovo, Amur, and Sakhalin oblasts, Republic of Khakassia, North Caspian / Lower Volga region, and the Nenets Autonomous District.

The project Objective is to promote management practices compatible with the principles of biodiversity conservation.

The Project is implemented through four major Outcomes:

- putting in place a legislative, regulatory and institutional framework to mainstream the principles of biodiversity preservation into business standards in the oil, coal and hydro power sectors (project Outcome 1);

- demonstrating the prevent-reduce-recover-compensate principle in oil, coal and hydro power sectors (project Outcomes 2, 3, 4);

- replicating the project’s strategies, experience and achievements on a country-wide scale.

Overall the Project promotes the adoption of federal and regional laws / regulations on EIA, SEA, environmental damage remediation, and other mechanisms aimed at reduction of negative biodiversity and general environmental impacts and mainstreaming ecosystems issues in the energy sector business. The Project is also aimed at identification and sharing of information on implementation of best available techniques on biodiversity management among energy companies within Russia. Promotion of efforts to protect ecosystems will have a positive effect on biodiversity within demonstration areas, as well as indigenous peoples and local communities’ quality of life.

The project is supported by key federal and regional authorities in the energy sector, including Ministry of Natural recourses and environment of the Russian Federation, Federal Service for Supervision of Natural Resource Usage, core committees of The Council of the Federation of the Federal Assembly of the Russian Federation and core Ministries and Committees of the Project demonstration sites. The Project stakeholders include key energy companies operating across Russia and on the Project demonstration sites, which are oil companies LUKOIL, Sakhalin Energy Investment Company Ltd., coal mining companies SUEK, SDS-Coal, KTK (Kuzbasskaya Toplivnaya Company), RusHydro and its regional divisions.

The Project encourages companies operating in various segments of the energy sector to cooperate and exchange the best practices in the area of corporate environmental responsibility, environmental and social risk assessment, and other project areas.

The Project budget is:

7 200 000 USD (GEF funds)

31 950 000 USD (co-financing), according to ProDoc.

The Project implementation started in December 2012 and expected to end in 2017.

**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 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 the midterm GEF focal area Tracking Tool that must be completed before the MTR field mission begins.

The MTR team is expected to follow a collaborative and participatory approach[[1]](#footnote-1) ensuring close engagement with the Project Team, government counterparts (the GEF Operational Focal Point), the UNDP Country Office, UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Adviser, and other key stakeholders.

Engagement of stakeholders is vital to a successful MTR.[[2]](#footnote-2) Stakeholder involvement should include interviews with stakeholders who have project responsibilities, including but not limited to MNRE as an Implementing Partner for the project, major energy sector companies such as LUKOIL, Skhalin Energy, RusHydro, KTK, SDS-Coal; regional government officials, project implementation team and task leaders, key experts and consultants in the subject area, Project Steering Committee members, academia, local government and CSOs, etc. Additionally, the MTR team is expected to conduct a field mission to one of the pilot regions of the project.

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

**Indicator Assessment Key**

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

In addition to the progress towards outcomes analysis:

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

**iii. Project Implementation and Adaptive Management**

Management Arrangements:

* Review overall effectiveness of project management as outlined in the Project Document. Have changes been made and are they effective? Are responsibilities and reporting lines clear? Is decision-making transparent and undertaken in a timely manner? Recommend areas for improvement.
* Review the quality of execution of the Executing Agency/Implementing Partner(s) and recommend areas for improvement.
* Review the quality of support provided by the GEF Partner Agency (UNDP) and recommend areas for improvement.

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.[[8]](#footnote-8)

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 “Mainstreaming biodiversity conservation into Russia’s energy sector policies and operations” Project

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **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. **MTR SCHEDULE AND TIMEFRAME**

The total duration of the MTR will be approximately 31 days over a time period of April - July 2015*,* and shall not exceed five months from when the consultant(s) are hired.

The evaluation is planned in two stages with tentatively two missions to the country. During the first stage the MTR consultant will review the project design and assess the proposed strategy to achieve the development objective and outcomes of the project. The consultant is to confirm/otherwise that the project strategy is relevant to country priorities, country ownership, and is believed to be the best route towards expected results. The consultant will review the original Logframe indicators against progress made towards the end-of-project targets. He/she is also requested to assist the project team with revision of the Logframe indicators according to the SMART criteria; the consultant is expected to propose alternative/additional indicators which would be fully relevant and indicative of the project impact. The key deliverable for the first stage of the MTR is the proposals for the project Logframe revision.

During the second stage of the MTR process, the evaluator will conduct a field trip to one/two of the project pilot sites. Having met with the key project stakeholders and the project team, the consultant will finalise analysis of progress towards outcomes and the achievement of the target indicators. The second stage of the MTR will include assessment of project management arrangements, project finance, monitoring tools, quality of reporting and adaptive management, stakeholder engagement, communication aspects of the project. The MTR consultant is advised to revisit the risk analysis for the project and specifically assess the risks to project sustainability. The second stage of the MTR will result in the evaluation report with the recommendations for the 2nd half of project implementation.

 The tentative MTR timeframe is as follows:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **TIMEFRAME** | **ACTIVITY** |
| *By April 8, 2015* | Select MTR consultant |
| *April 9-12, 2015 (3 days maximum)* | Prep the MTR consultant for the first field mission; handover of relevant document such as Prodoc, PIRs, track record for the Project Logframe development and revision |
| *April 13-17, 2015 (tent. 3 days)* | First MTR mission: meetings with the project team and key experts aimed to review and revise project Logframe |
| *April 18-30(3 days maximum)* | Presentation of proposals for revised project Logframe |
| *May 1-12 (3 days maximum)* | Debriefings for the second stage of the MTR |
| *May 14-21, 2015(tent. 7 days)* | Second MTR mission: stakeholder meetings, interviews, field visits |
| *May 21, 2015* | Mission wrap-up meeting & presentation of initial findings- earliest end of MTR mission |
| *By June 15, 2015(maximum 10 days)* | Preparing draft report |
| *By July 31 (tent. 2 days)* | Incorporating audit trail from feedback on draft report/Finalization of MTR report ) |

1. **MIDTERM REVIEW DELIVERABLES**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **#** | **Deliverable** | **Description** | **Timing** | **Responsibilities** |
| **1** | **Proposals for Project Logframe indicator revisions** | Justified proposals for revision of project Logframe indicators | No later than April 30, 2015 | MTR team submits to the Commissioning Unit and project management |
| **2** | **Presentation** | Initial Findings | End of the second MTR mission: May 21, 2015 | MTR Team presents to project management and the Commissioning Unit |
| **3** | **Draft Final Report** | Full report (using guidelines on content outlined in Annex B) with annexes | Within 3 weeks of the MTR mission: June 15 | Sent to the Commissioning Unit, reviewed by RTA, Project Coordinating Unit, GEF OFP |
| **4** | **Final Report\*** | Revised report with audit trail detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final MTR report | Within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft: tentatively not later than July 31 | Sent to the Commissioning Unit |

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

1. **MTR ARRANGEMENTS**

The principal responsibility for managing this MTR resides with the Commissioning Unit. The Commissioning Unit for this project’s MTR is the UNDP Project Support Office in Russia.

The commissioning unit will contract the consultant and ensure the timely provision of per diems and travel arrangements within the country for the MTR consultant. 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.

1. **TEAM COMPOSITION**

An independent consultant will conduct the MTR who did not participate in the project preparation, formulation, and/or implementation (including the writing of the Project Document) and does not have a conflict of interest with project’s related activities. The consultant is expected to have the following qualifications:

* 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 the GEF BD Focal Area;
* Experience working with the GEF or GEF-evaluations;
* Experience working in Russia;
* Work experience in relevant technical areas for at least 10 years;
* Excellent communication skills;
* Demonstrable analytical skills;
* Project evaluation/review experiences within UNDP/GEF system will be considered an asset;
* A Master’s degree in environmental science, or other closely related field.
1. **PAYMENT MODALITIES AND SPECIFICATIONS**

20% of payment upon submission of proposals for the revised project Logframe;

60% upon submission of the draft MTR report

20% upon finalization of the MTR report

Or, as otherwise agreed between the Commissioning Unit and the MTR team.

1. **APPLICATION PROCESS[[9]](#footnote-9)**

**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)[[10]](#footnote-10) 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)[[11]](#footnote-11));
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.

##### All application materials should be submitted by email at the following address ONLY: irina.bredneva@undp.org by April 7, 2015 COB. 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 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.

**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
8. Finalized GEF focal area Tracking Tools at CEO endorsement and midterm
9. Oversight mission reports
10. All monitoring reports prepared by the project
11. Financial and Administration guidelines used by Project Team

The following documents will also be available:

1. Project operational guidelines, manuals and systems
2. UNDP country/countries programme document(s)
3. Minutes of the “Mainstreaming biodiversity conservation into Russia’s energy sector policies and operations” Board Steering Committee Meetings
4. Project site location maps

**ToR ANNEX B: Guidelines on Contents for the Midterm Review Report**[[12]](#footnote-12)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **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?**  |
| * Does the project objective fit within the national priorities, the priorities of the local government and local communities?
 | * Level of coherence between project objective and national policy priorities and strategies, as stated in official document, as well as stated priorities of local stakeholders
 | * National policy documents, such as National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan, National Capacity Self-Assessment, etc.
* National legislation such as EIA regulations, etc.
* Regional government, private sector and community stakeholders
* Relevant regional and local planning documents
 | * Field visit interviews
* Desk review
 |
| * Did the project concept originate from local or national stakeholders, and/or were relevant stakeholders sufficiently involved in project development?
 | * Level of involvement of local and national stakeholders in project origination and development as indicated by number of planning meetings held, representation of stakeholders in planning meetings, and level of incorporation of stakeholder feedback in project planning
 | * Project staff
* Local and national stakeholders
* Project documents
 | * Field visit interviews
* Desk review
 |
| * Does the project design and project strategy seem adequate for the achievement of the declared objective?

  | * The project Logframe is clear and its indicators respond to SMART criteria
* The project is designed in a way that the route towards achievement of the expected results is clear and the project interventions are planned to contribute to the achievement of the overall objectives
 | * Project documents
 | * Desk review
* Brainstorming with the project team and key experts
 |
| **Progress Towards Results: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved thus far?** |
| * Are the planned outputs being produced? Are they likely to contribute to the expected project outcomes and objective?
 | * Level of project implementation progress relative to expected level at current stage of implementation
* Existence of logical linkages between project outputs and outcomes/impacts
 | * Project documents
* Project staff
* Project stakeholders
 | * Field visit interviews
* Desk review
 |
| * Are the anticipated outcomes likely to be achieved? Are the outcomes likely to contribute to the achievement of the project objective?
 | * Existence of logical linkages between project outcomes and impacts
 | * Project documents
* Project staff
* Project stakeholders
 | * Field visit interviews
* Desk review
 |
| * Are the key assumptions and impact drivers relevant to the achievement of Global Environmental Benefits likely to be met?
 | * Actions undertaken to address key assumptions and target impact drivers
 | * Project documents
* Project staff
* Project stakeholders
 | * Field visit interviews
* Desk review
 |
| * Are impact level results likely to be achieved? Are the likely to be at the scale sufficient to be considered Global Environmental Benefits?
 | * Environmental indicators
 | * Project documents
* Project staff
* Project stakeholders
 | * Field visit interviews
* Desk review
 |
| **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?** |
| * Are management and implementation arrangements efficient in delivering the outputs necessary to achieve outcomes?
 | * Appropriateness of structure of management arrangements
* Extent of necessary partnership arrangements
* Level of participation of relevant stakeholders
 | * Project documents
* Project staff
* Local, regional and national stakeholders
 | * Desk review
* Interviews with project staff
* Field visit interviews
 |
| * Is the project cost-effective?
 | * Quality and comprehensiveness of financial management procedures
* Project management costs share of total budget
 | * Project documents
* Project staff
 | * Desk review
* Interviews with project staff
 |
| * Is the project objective likely to be met? To what extent and in what timeframe?
 | * Level of progress toward project indicator targets relative to expected level at current point of implementation
 | * Project documents
* Project staff
* Project stakeholders
 | * Field visit interviews
* Desk review
 |
| * What are the key factors contributing to project success or underachievement?
 | * Level of documentation of and preparation for project risks, assumptions and impact drivers
 | * Project documents
* Project staff
* Project stakeholders
 | * Field visit interviews
* Desk review
 |
| * What are the key risks and priorities for the remainder of the implementation period?
 | * Presence, assessment of, and preparation for expected risks, assumptions and impact drivers
 | * Project documents
* Project staff
* Project stakeholders
 | * Field visit interviews
* Desk review
 |
| * Is adaptive management being applied to ensure effectiveness?
 | * Identified modifications to project plans, as necessary in response to changing assumptions or conditions
 | * Project documents
* Project staff
* Project stakeholders
 | * Field visit interviews
* Desk review
 |
| * Is monitoring and evaluation used to ensure effective decision-making?
 | * Quality of M&E plan in terms of meeting minimum standards, conforming to best practices, and adequate budgeting
* Consistency of implementation of M&E compared to plan, quality of M&E products
* Use of M&E products in project management and implementation decision-making
 | * Project documents
* Project staff
* Project stakeholders
 | * Field visit interviews
* Desk review
 |
| **Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, socio-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?** |
| * To what extent are project results likely to be dependent on continued financial support? What is the likelihood that any required financial resources will be available to sustain the project results once the GEF assistance ends?
 | * Financial requirements for maintenance of project benefits
* Level of expected financial resources available to support maintenance of project benefits
* Potential for additional financial resources to support maintenance of project benefits
 | * Project documents
* Project staff
* Project stakeholders
 | * Field visit interviews
* Desk review
 |
| * Do relevant stakeholders have or are likely to achieve an adequate level of “ownership” of results, to have the interest in ensuring that project benefits are maintained?
 | * Level of initiative and engagement of relevant stakeholders in project activities and results
 | * Project documents
* Project staff
* Project stakeholders
 | * Field visit interviews
* Desk review
 |
| * To what extent are the project results dependent on issues relating to institutional frameworks and governance?
 | * Existence of institutional and governance risks to project benefits
 | * Project documents
* Project staff
* Project stakeholders
 | * Field visit interviews
* Desk review
 |

**ToR ANNEX D: UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluators/Midterm Review Consultants[[13]](#footnote-13)**

**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. For ideas on innovative and participatory Monitoring and Evaluation strategies and techniques, see [UNDP Discussion Paper: Innovations in Monitoring & Evaluating Results](http://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/librarypage/capacity-building/discussion-paper--innovations-in-monitoring---evaluating-results/), 05 Nov 2013. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. For more stakeholder engagement in the M&E process, see the [UNDP Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results](http://www.undg.org/docs/11653/UNDP-PME-Handbook-%282009%29.pdf), Chapter 3, pg. 93. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Populate with data from the Logframe and scorecards [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. Populate with data from the Project Document [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. If available [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. Colour code this column only [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. Use the 6 point Progress Towards Results Rating Scale: HS, S, MS, MU, U, HU [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. Alternatively, MTR conclusions may be integrated into the body of the report. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. 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-9)
10. <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-10)
11. <http://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/corporate/Careers/P11_Personal_history_form.doc> [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
12. The Report length should not exceed *40* pages in total (not including annexes). [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
13. [www.undp.org/unegcodeofconduct](http://www.undp.org/unegcodeofconduct) [↑](#footnote-ref-13)