

# 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 fullsize project titled National Biodiversity Project: Conservation of Iona National Park (PIMS 4581) implemented through the Ministry of Environment, which is to be undertaken in February 2015. The project started on February 2013 and is in its third year of implementation. In line with the UNDP-GEF Guidance on MTRs, this MTR process was initiated before the submission of the second 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 (attached)*.

### 2. PROJECT BACKGROUND INFORMATION

The project was designed as the first phase of a more comprehensive national program to rehabilitate, strengthen and expand Angola's system of protected areas. For this phase of the national program, the project will focus outputs and activities - over a period of four years - at two levels of intervention. At a national level (Component 2), the project will support the government in the establishment and operationalisation of the 'Department of Conservation Areas' within the recently approved Instituto Nacional de Biodiversidade e Áreas de Conservação (INBAC). At a local level (Component 1), the project will seek to assist the government to rehabilitate a single protected area - the largest National Park in Angola, Iona National Park (15,150 km<sup>2</sup>). The total budget planned is USD10,750,000, and planned co-finance is USD2,000,000 to be provided from the Government of Angola, USD1,140,000 from UNDP TRAC funds, USD2,000,000 from the GEF, USD5,265,000 from the European Union. The total cash co-finance is USD8,040,000. The project will be implemented over a period of five years. The project will be nationally implemented (NIM) by the Ministry of Environment. The UNDP Country Office will monitor the project's implementation and achievement of the project outputs, and ensure the proper use of UNDP/GEF funds. Working in close cooperation with MINAMB, the UNDP Country Office (CO) will be responsible for: (i) providing financial and audit services to the project; (ii) recruitment and contracting of project staff; (iii) overseeing financial expenditures against project budgets approved by the Project Steering Committee (PSC); (iv) appointment of independent financial auditors and evaluators; and (v) ensuring that all activities, including procurement and financial services, are carried out in strict compliance with UNDP/GEF procedures. The European Union (EU) delegated the implementation of the joint-financing of 3.9 million Euros to the UNDP. The EU and UNDP have signed a 'Contribution Agreement' that entrusts the implementation of the specific budget tasks to the UNDP. MINAMB have the overall responsibility for achieving the project goal and objectives and designated a senior official to act as the National Project Director responsible for providing strategic oversight and guidance to project implementation. The Project Steering Committee ensures that the project remains on course to deliver the desired outcomes of the required quality. The PSC will be chaired by MINAMB. The PSC will include representation from: EU; MINADER; INBAC; Provincial Government of Namibe and UNDP.

### 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 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<sup>1</sup> 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.<sup>2</sup> Stakeholder involvement should include interviews with stakeholders who have project responsibilities, including but not limited (attached list); 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 Tombwa, and Iona National Park in Namibe province.

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

#### **5. DETAILED SCOPE OF THE MTR**

The MTR 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)?

---

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

<sup>2</sup> For more stakeholder engagement in the M&E process, see the [UNDP Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results](#), Chapter 3, pg. 93.

- 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 <sup>3</sup>	Baseline Level <sup>4</sup>	Level in 1 <sup>st</sup> PIR (self-reported)	Midterm Target <sup>5</sup>	End-of-project Target	Midterm Level & Assessment <sup>6</sup>	Achievement Rating <sup>7</sup>	Justification for Rating
------------------	------------------------	-----------------------------	--	-----------------------------	-----------------------	---	---------------------------------	--------------------------

<sup>3</sup> Populate with data from the Logframe and scorecards

<sup>4</sup> Populate with data from the Project Document

<sup>5</sup> If available

<sup>6</sup> Colour code this column only

<sup>7</sup> Use the 6 point Progress Towards Results Rating Scale: HS, S, MS, MU, U, HU

<b>Objective:</b>	<p>Indicator 1: Financial sustainability scorecard for national system of protected areas</p> <p>Indicator 2: Capacity development indicator score for protected area system</p> <p>Indicator 3: Total government budget allocation (including operational, HR and capital budget) (US\$ per annum) for protected area management</p> <p>Indicator 4: Number of protected areas in which the METT is adopted as a tool to monitor effectiveness of PA management</p>	<p>3%</p> <p>Systemic: 42% Institutional: 39% Individual: 35%</p> <p>US\$1.5 million (as at 2010/11)</p> <p>0</p>	<p>1%</p> <p>0%</p> <p>84% (estimate; information by GoA not available)</p> <p>Achieved</p>		<p>&gt;10%</p> <p>Systemic: 55% Institutional: 50% Individual: 45%</p> <p>&gt;US\$8 million</p> <p>&gt;7</p>			
<b>Outcome 1:</b>	Indicator 5: Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool scorecard: Iona National Park	7%	0		>45%			

Indicator 6: Number of park management staff appointed, equipped, trained and deployed in the park	0	Partially achieved		12			
Indicator 7: Percentage (%) of park visitors <sup>8</sup> obtaining a permit to traverse/overnight in the park	0%	0%		>80%			
Indicator 8: Proportion (%) of the plains grassland habitats of the park (~600km <sup>2</sup> ) overgrazed by livestock (goats and cattle)	>35%	0%		<20%			
Indicator 9: Increase in wildlife populations: Oryx Hartmann's Zebra Springbok Ostrich	1650 265 2400 400	0		>2000 >300 >3500 >500			
Indicator 10: Number of critical natural freshwater springs and wells secured and accessible for use by medium-sized and large wildlife species	0 (of 16)	Not achieved		4 (of 16)			

---

<sup>8</sup> 'Visitors' are defined as any person not permanently residing in the park

	Indicator 11: Number of poaching incidents (park visitors) recorded in the park/annum	No data	1		<12	
	Indicator 12: Proportion (%) of communities living in the park that are adequately represented in the park management decision-making processes	0	0%		>60%	
	Indicator 13: Number of job opportunities (direct and indirect) created for local communities living in, or adjacent to, the park	Direct: 0 Indirect: 0	Direct: achieved Indirect: 0		Direct: >10 Indirect: >30	
	Indicator 14: Average annual income (US\$) of households living in the park	US\$155/annum	No information		>US\$250/annum	
<b>Outcome 2:</b>	Indicator 15: Strategic Plan, and a policy framework, for the system of protected areas formally approved by government	No	Achieved		Yes	

Indicator 16: Organizational structure for protected areas and job descriptions, remuneration levels and conditions of service for protected area staff formally adopted by government	No	Not achieved		Yes			
Indicator 17: Recruitment of staff to approved protected area posts in the organogram of the protected area agency (as a % of posts with permanent staff appointed)	0	Not achieved		>50%			
Indicator 18: Number of protected area staff completing in-service training and skills development programmes	0	0		20			
Indicator 19: Number of senior protected area staff in a structured mentoring programme	0	1		3			

Indicator 20: Number of national parks and strict nature reserves with fully documented up-to-date assessments of their state and biodiversity value	0	0		7	
Indicator 21: Number of protected areas where a structured rationalisation and rehabilitation programme is adequately resourced and under implementation	1	Achieved		4	

**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.<sup>9</sup>

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

---

<sup>9</sup> Alternatively, MTR conclusions may be integrated into the body of the report.

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 National Biodiversity Project:  
Conservation of Iona National Park**

Measure	MTR Rating	Achievement Description
<b>Project Strategy</b>	N/A	
<b>Progress Towards Results</b>	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.	
<b>Project Implementation &amp; Adaptive Management</b>	(rate 6 pt. scale)	
<b>Sustainability</b>	(rate 4 pt. scale)	

## 6. TIMEFRAME

The total duration of the MTR will be approximately 8 weeks including a 10 days visit to Luanda and Namibe starting *September*, and shall not exceed five months from when the consultant(s) are hired. The tentative MTR timeframe is as follows:

TIMEFRAME	ACTIVITY
<i>08 May 2015</i>	Application closes
<i>15 May</i>	Select MTR Team
<i>20 May</i>	Prep the MTR Team (handover of Project Documents)
<i>26 May</i>	Document review and preparing MTR Inception Report
<i>May: (tbd)</i>	Finalization and Validation of MTR Inception Report- latest start of MTR mission
<i>10 days (r: 7-15)</i>	MTR mission: stakeholder meetings, interviews, field visits
<i>May (tbd)</i>	Mission wrap-up meeting & presentation of initial findings- earliest end of MTR mission
<i>(tbd) May 08 days (r: 5-10)</i>	Preparing draft report
<i>(tbd) May days (r: 1-2)</i>	Incorporating audit trail from feedback on draft report/Finalization of MTR report

28 March	Preparation & Issue of Management Response
3 April	Expected date of full MTR completion

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

## 7. MIDTERM REVIEW DELIVERABLES

#	Deliverable	Description	Timing	Responsibilities
1	<b>MTR Inception Report</b>	MTR team clarifies objectives and methods of Midterm Review	No later than 2 weeks before the MTR mission	MTR team submits to the Commissioning Unit and project management
2	<b>Presentation</b>	Initial Findings	End of MTR mission	MTR Team presents to project management and the Commissioning Unit
3	<b>Draft Final Report</b>	Full report (using guidelines on content outlined in Annex B) with annexes	Within 3 weeks of the MTR mission	Sent to the Commissioning Unit, reviewed by RTA, Project Coordinating Unit, GEF OFP
4	<b>Final Report*</b>	Revised report with audit trail detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final MTR report	Within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft	Sent to 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.

## 8. MTR ARRANGEMENTS

The principal responsibility for managing this MTR resides with the Commissioning Unit. The Commissioning Unit for this project's MTR is UNDP Angola.

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, set up stakeholder interviews, and arrange field visits.

## 9. TEAM COMPOSITION

A team of two independent consultants will conduct the MTR - one team leader (with experience and exposure to projects and evaluations in other regions globally) and one national expert.

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 Biodiversity focal area, 'Catalyzing Sustainability of Protected Areas Systems';
- Experience working with the GEF or GEF-evaluations;

- Experience working in Southern Africa and similar context;
- Work experience in relevant technical areas for at least 10 years;
- Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender and Biodiversity focal area, ‘Catalyzing Sustainability of Protected Areas Systems’; 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 Biodiversity Conservation, or other closely related field.

## 10. PAYMENT MODALITIES AND SPECIFICATIONS

Lumpsum or technical fee plus cost of actual travel and DSA

## 11. APPLICATION PROCESS<sup>10</sup>

### Recommended Presentation of Proposal:

- a) **Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability** using the [template](#)<sup>11</sup> provided by UNDP;
- b) **CV** and a **Personal History Form** ([P11 form](#)<sup>12</sup>);
- c) **Brief description of approach to work/technical proposal** of why the individual considers him/herself as the most suitable for the assignment, and a proposed methodology on how they will approach and complete the assignment; (max 1 page)
- d) **Financial Proposal** that indicates the all-inclusive fixed total contract price and all other travel related costs (such as flight ticket, per diem, etc), supported by a breakdown of costs, as per template attached to the Letter of Confirmation of Interest template. If an applicant is employed by an organization/company/institution, and he/she expects his/her employer to charge a management fee in the process of releasing him/her to UNDP under Reimbursable Loan Agreement (RLA), the applicant must indicate at this point, and ensure that all such costs are duly incorporated in the financial proposal submitted to UNDP.

All application materials should be submitted to UNDP, Rua Major Kanhangulo, Nr.197, C.P. 910 Luanda, Angola in a sealed envelope indicating the following reference “Consultant for National Biodiversity Project: Conservation of Iona National Park (PIMS 4581) Midterm Review” or by email at the following address ONLY Aguiar Cuiundana [aguiar.cuiundana@undp.org](mailto:aguiar.cuiundana@undp.org). Please fill in by 31 August 2015. 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

<sup>10</sup> 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>

<sup>11</sup> <https://intranet.undp.org/unit/bom/pso/Support%20documents%20on%20IC%20Guidelines/Template%20for%20Confirmation%20of%20Interest%20and%20Submission%20of%20Financial%20Proposal.docx>

<sup>12</sup> [http://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/corporate/Careers/P11\\_Personal\\_history\\_form.doc](http://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/corporate/Careers/P11_Personal_history_form.doc)

3. UNDP Project Document
4. UNDP Environmental and Social Screening results
5. Project Inception Report
6. All Project Implementation Reports (PIR's)
7. Quarterly progress reports and work plans of the various implementation task teams
8. Audit reports
9. Finalized GEF focal area Tracking Tools at CEO endorsement and midterm *(fill in specific TTs for this project's focal area)*
10. Oversight mission reports
11. All monitoring reports prepared by the project
12. Financial and Administration guidelines used by Project Team

The following documents will also be available:

13. Project operational guidelines, manuals and systems
14. UNDP country/countries programme document(s)
15. Minutes of the National Biodiversity Project: Conservation of Iona National Park (PIMS 4581) Board Meetings and other meetings (i.e. Project Appraisal Committee meetings)
16. Project site location maps

## ToR ANNEX B: Guidelines on Contents for the Midterm Review Report<sup>13</sup>

- 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

---

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

- 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
<b>Project Strategy: To what extent is the project strategy relevant to country priorities, country ownership, and the best route towards expected results?</b>			
(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.)
<b>Progress Towards Results: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved thus far?</b>			
<b>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?</b>			
<b>Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, socio-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?</b>			



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

---

<sup>14</sup> [www.undp.org/unegcodeofconduct](http://www.undp.org/unegcodeofconduct)

## ToR ANNEX E: MTR Ratings

<b>Ratings for Progress Towards Results: (one rating for each outcome and for the objective)</b>		
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.

<b>Ratings for Project Implementation &amp; Adaptive Management: (one overall rating)</b>		
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.

<b>Ratings for Sustainability: (one overall rating)</b>		
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)*

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

# UNDP-GEF Midterm Review

## Terms of Reference

Standard Template 2: Formatted information to be entered in [UNDP Jobs website](#)<sup>15</sup>

### **BASIC CONTRACT INFORMATION**

**Location:**  
**Application Deadline:**  
**Category:** Energy and Environment  
**Type of Contract:** Individual Contract  
**Assignment Type:** International Consultant  
**Languages Required:**  
**Starting Date:** September 2015  
**Duration of Initial Contract:** 8 weeks  
**Expected Duration of Assignment:**

### **BACKGROUND**

#### **A. Project Title**

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

This is the Terms of Reference for the UNDP-GEF Midterm Review (MTR) of the full or medium-sized project titled Project Title (PIMS#) implemented through the Executing Agency/Implementing Partner, which is to be undertaken in year. The project started on the Project Document signature date and is in its third year of implementation. In line with the UNDP-GEF Guidance on MTRs, this MTR process was initiated before the submission of the second Project Implementation Report (PIR). The MTR process must follow the guidance outlined in the document *Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects* (see Annex).

The project was designed to:

- Briefly describe the project rationale / background and the objectives of the project
- If applicable, explain thoroughly the peculiarity of the setting of the project or the work required, if any (e.g., security risks involved in conducting the work in certain communities, certain cultures and practices unique to the stakeholders, etc.)

---

<sup>15</sup> <https://jobs.undp.org/>

## **DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES**

### **C. Scope of Work and Key Tasks**

The MTR team will consist of two independent consultants that will conduct the MTR - one team leader (with experience and exposure to projects and evaluations in other regions globally) and one team expert, usually from the country of the project.

The MTR team will first conduct a document review of project documents (i.e. PIF, UNDP Initiation Plan, Project Document, ESSP, Project Inception Report, PIRs, Finalized GEF focal area Tracking Tools, Project Appraisal Committee meeting minutes, Financial and Administration guidelines used by Project Team, project operational guidelines, manuals and systems, etc.) provided by the Project Team and Commissioning Unit. Then they will participate in a MTR inception workshop to clarify their understanding of the objectives and methods of the MTR, producing the MTR inception report thereafter. The MTR mission will then consist of interviews and site visits to (list preliminary sites).

The MTR team will assess the following four categories of project progress and produce a draft and final MTR report. See the *Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects* (attached or hyperlinked) for requirements on ratings. No overall rating is required.

#### **1. Project Strategy**

##### *Project Design:*

- Review the problem addressed by the project and the underlying assumptions. Review the effect of any incorrect assumptions or changes to the context to achieving the project results as outlined in the Project Document.
- Review the relevanced of the project strategy and assess whether it provides the most effective route towards expected/intended results.
- Review how the project addresses country priorities
- Review decision-making processes

##### *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.
- 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.

#### **2. Progress Towards Results**

- Review the logframe indicators against progress made towards the end-of-project targets; populate the Progress Towards Results Matrix, as described in the *Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects*; colour code progress in a "traffic light system" based on the level of progress achieved; assign a rating on progress for the project objective and each outcome; make recommendations from the areas marked as "not on target to be achieved" (red).
- 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.
- By reviewing the aspects of the project that have already been successful, identify ways in which the project can further expand these benefits.

### 3. Project Implementation and Adaptive Management

Using the *Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects*, assess the following categories of project progress:

- Management Arrangements
- Work Planning
- Finance and co-finance
- Project-level monitoring and evaluation systems
- Stakeholder Engagement
- Reporting
- Communications

### 4. Sustainability

Assess overall risks to sustainability factors of the project in terms of the following four categories:

- Financial risks to sustainability
- Socio-economic risks to sustainability
- Institutional framework and governance risks to sustainability
- Environmental risks to sustainability

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

Additionally, the MTR consultant/team is expected to make **recommendations** to the Project Team. Recommendations should be succinct suggestions for critical intervention that are specific, measurable, achievable, and relevant. A recommendation table should be put in the report's executive summary. The MTR consultant/team should make no more than 15 recommendations total.

## D. Expected Outputs and Deliverables

The MTR consultant/team shall prepare and submit:

- MTR Inception Report: MTR team clarifies objectives and methods of the Midterm Review no later than **2 weeks** before the MTR mission. To be sent to the Commissioning Unit and project management. Approximate due date: (date)
- Presentation: Initial Findings presented to project management and the Commissioning Unit at the end of the MTR mission. Approximate due date: (date)
- Draft Final Report: Full report with annexes **within 3 weeks** of the MTR mission. Approximate due date: (date)
- Final Report\*: Revised report with annexed audit trail detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final MTR report. To be sent to the Commissioning Unit **within 1 week** of receiving UNDP comments on draft. Approximate due date: (date)

\*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.

## E. Institutional Arrangement

The principal responsibility for managing this MTR resides with the Commissioning Unit. The Commissioning Unit for this project's MTR is *(In the case of single-country projects, the Commissioning Unit is the UNDP Country Office. In the case of regional projects and jointly-implemented projects, typically the principal responsibility for managing this MTR resides with the country or agency or regional coordination body – please confirm with the UNDP-GEF team in the region – that is receiving the larger proportion of GEF financing. For global projects, the Commissioning Unit can be the UNDP-GEF Directorate or the lead UNDP Country 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, set up stakeholder interviews, and arrange field visits.

## F. Duration of the Work

The total duration of the MTR will be approximately (*# of weeks*) starting (*date*), and shall not exceed five months from when the consultant(s) are hired. The tentative MTR timeframe is as follows:

- (*May 2015*): Application closes
- (*August 2015*): Selection of MTR Team
- (*September 2015*): Prep the MTR Team (handover of project documents)
- (*14 – 18 September 2015*) *4 days*: Document review and preparing MTR Inception Report
- (*September / October 2015*) *5 days*: Finalization and Validation of MTR Inception Report- latest start of MTR mission
- (*21 – 29 September*) *8 days*: MTR mission: stakeholder meetings, interviews, field visits
- (*1 day*): Mission wrap-up meeting & presentation of initial findings- earliest end of MTR mission
- (*October*) *6 days* : Preparing draft report
- (*October*) *1 day*: Incorporating audit trail on draft report/Finalization of MTR report
- (*October*): Preparation & Issue of Management Response
- (*October*): Concluding Stakeholder Workshop (not mandatory for MTR team)
- (*End of October*): Expected date of full MTR completion

The date start of contract is (September).

## G. Duty Station

Identify the consultant's duty station/location for the contract duration, mentioning ALL possible locations of field works/duty travel in pursuit of other relevant activities, specially where traveling to locations at security Phase I or above will be required.

### Travel:

- The Basic Security in the Field II and Advanced Security in the Field courses must be successfully completed prior to commencement of travel;
- Individual Consultants are responsible for ensuring they have vaccinations/inoculations when travelling to certain countries, as designated by the UN Medical Director.
- Consultants are required to comply with the UN security directives set forth under <https://dss.un.org/dssweb/>
- All related travel expenses will be covered and will be reimbursed as per UNDP rules and regulations upon submission of an F-10 claim form and supporting documents.

## **REQUIRED SKILLS AND EXPERIENCE**

### **H. Qualifications of the Successful Applicants**

The selection of consultants will be aimed at maximizing the overall “team” qualities in the following areas: *(give a weight to all these qualifications so applicants know what is the max amount of points they can earn for the technical evaluation)*

- Recent experience with result-based management evaluation methodologies;
- Experience applying SMART targets and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios;
- Competence in adaptive management, as applied to *(fill in GEF Focal Area)*;
- Experience working with the GEF or GEF-evaluations;
- Experience working in *(region of project)*;
- Work experience in relevant technical areas for at least 10 years;
- Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender and *(fill in GEF Focal Area)*; 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 Conservation, or other closely related field.

#### ***Consultant Independence:***

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.

## **APPLICATION PROCESS**

### **I. Scope of Price Proposal and Schedule of Payments**

#### ***Financial Proposal:***

- Financial proposals must be “all inclusive” and expressed in a lump-sum for the total duration of the contract. The term “all inclusive” implies all cost (professional fees, travel costs, living allowances etc.);
- For duty travels, the UN’s Daily Subsistence Allowance (DSA) rates are *(fill for all travel destinations)*, which should provide indication of the cost of living in a duty station/destination *(Note: Individuals on this contract are not UN staff and are therefore not entitled to DSAs. All living allowances required to perform the demands of the ToR must be incorporated in the financial proposal, whether the fees are expressed as daily fees or lump sum amount.)*
- The lump sum is fixed regardless of changes in the cost components.

#### ***Schedule of Payments:***

10% of payment upon approval of the MTR Inception Report  
30% upon submission of the draft MTR Report  
60% upon finalization of the MTR Report

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

## J. Recommended Presentation of Offer

- a) Completed **Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability** using the [template](#) provided by UNDP;
- b) **Personal CV or a P11 Personal History form**, indicating all past experience from similar projects, as well as the contact details (email and telephone number) of the Candidate and at least three (3) professional references;
- c) **Brief description of approach to work/technical proposal** of why the individual considers him/herself as the most suitable for the assignment, and a proposed methodology on how they will approach and complete the assignment; (max 1 page)
- d) **Financial Proposal** that indicates the all-inclusive fixed total contract price, supported by a breakdown of costs, as per template provided. 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. See Letter of Confirmation of Interest template for financial proposal template.

Incomplete applications will be excluded from further consideration.

## K. Criteria for Selection of the Best Offer

The award of the contract will be made to the Individual Consultant who has obtained the highest Combined Score and has accepted UNDP's General Terms and Conditions. Only those applications which are responsive and compliant will be evaluated. The offers will be evaluated using the "Combined Scoring method" where:

- a) The educational background and experience on similar assignments will be weighted a max. of 70%;
- b) The price proposal will weigh as 30% of the total scoring.

## L. Annexes to the MTR ToR

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

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

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



