## UNDP-GEF Midterm Review Terms of Reference

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Project** | **PIMS 4335:** Promotion of Biomass Production and Utilization in Georgia |
| **Assignment** | Mid-Term Review of UNDP GEF Promotion of Biomass Production and Utilization Project in Georgia |
| **Assignment #** | GEBIO-1 |
| **Positions (*provisional*)** | International Consultant on Biomass Energy (Mid-Term Review) |
| **Contract Type** | IC (Individual Consultant) |
| **Duration** | 22 Working Days (15 home based, 2 travel days, 5 working days in Tbilisi Georgia or other part of Georgia (to be determined)) |
| **Timeframe** | 7 September 2015 – 15 December 2015 |
| **Duty Station** | Home based with one mission trip to Tbilisi, Georgia |

1. **INTRODUCTION**

This is the Terms of Reference (ToR) for the UNDP-GEF Midterm Review (MTR) of the medium-sized project titled **Promotion of Biomass Production and Utilization in Georgia** (PIMS#**4335**) implemented through the Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources Protection of Georgia, which is to be undertaken in 2015.

The project started on the June 10, 2013 and is in its second 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) which will be in August-September 2015. 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://procurement-notices.undp.org/view\_file.cfm?doc\_id=43167](%20http://procurement-notices.undp.org/view_file.cfm?doc_id=43167)).

In line with UNDP and GEF requirements, UNDP now seeks to contract an international consultant to conduct the mid-term review of this project, starting on 7th September 2015. The international consultant will be supported in carrying out this work by a national consultant who will also be hired at the same time and together the international consultant on biomass and the national consultant will make up the MTR team.

**2. PROJECT BACKGROUND INFORMATION**

The project has been designed to promote sustainable production and utilization of upgraded biomass fuels to meet the municipal services sector’s heating needs in a sustainable and efficient way, thereby reducing dependence on fossil fuels and avoiding GHG emissions. There are four major expected outcomes of the project:

* Enhanced and approved policy and regulatory framework for efficient utilization of biomass energy
* Increased market confidence in the feasibility of production and utilization of upgraded biomass fuels
* Created local supply of and demand for upgraded biomass fuels
* Improved public knowledge and stakeholder capacities for bioenergy development and replication

A copy of the project document which provides more information about the project can be found at the following link:

http://www.ge.undp.org/content/georgia/en/home/operations/projects/environment\_and\_energy/promoting-the-production-and-use-of-biomass-in-georgia.html

A main objective of this project is to facilitate a shift from fossil to biomass fuels, and to promote their production and usage in the municipal services sector with the main goal that by the end of this project a municipal biomass project (for heating) has been designed, underway, and has been implemented with the biomass pellets being supplied by a private sector company. Currently, the situation in Georgia is that there is very limited use of biomass energy (for either heat supply or electricity) due to a number of legal, regulatory, policy, financial, and awareness barriers. The goal of this project is therefore to help overcome these barriers with targeted technical assistance so that by the end of the project there is increased awareness of the importance of biomass energy and that by the end of this project there is significantly increased awareness of the importance of biomass energy and the first biomass demonstrations projects in Georgia have successfully been implemented with the support of this project.

The project has a duration of 4 years and has been planned to last from June 2013 to June 2017. The half way point in the project is therefore June 2015 and in accordance with UNDP and GEF requirements, the project is now required to undertake a mandatory mid-term review (MTR).

The total budget of this UNDP GEF project is US$1,080,000 broken down as follows:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Organization** | **Amount** |
| GEF | $925,000 |
| UNDP | $155,000 |
| Total | $1,080,000 |

**Co-Financing**

The main co-financing partner for this project has been the Tbilisi City Hall. In January 2011, prior to the start of the project, the Tbilisi City Hall wrote to UNDP that they will consider co-financing of up to $3,000,000 to support the conversion of at least 10 municipal boilers in kindergartens to biomass following the outcome of favorable feasibility studies. In addition, there is in-kind contribution by Georgian Government in amount of $100,000, in-kind contribution from private sector in amount of $200,000 and co-financing from private sector $1,000,000. Other co-financing partners are also being sought by the project.

**Investment Grant Mechanism**

A key component of the project is the launch of an investment grant mechanism to support the launch of the first biomass demonstration projects in Georgia. As envisaged in the project document, a significant proportion of the budget (over 50%) should go to support launch and demonstration of the first biomass municipal heat supply project in Georgia through the launch of an Investment Grant Mechanism (IGM). During the project development phase, it was considered that consortium of private companies led by Georgian Coal Ltd. would work with the project and the Investment Grant Mechanism to construct a biomass pelletizer plant and to produce biomass fuel in Tbilisi. D&V Ltd. was considered as a possible co-investor and supplier of biomass feedstock. Earlier on prior to the start of the project, consideration was given to the Italian company Ferrero as a co-financier of the project using residues from hazelnuts from their plantations in Samegrelo region of Georgia. However, in late 2010 Ferrero informed UNDP that they were not able to provide a co-financing letter to the project. This means that in early 2011 and with short notice the PIF was revised to substitute Ferrero as the main co-financing partner of the project. Ever since early 2011, the main co-financing partner of the project has been envisaged to be the Tbilisi City Hall.

**Feasibility Studies**

When the project started in mid-2013, the first step that was undertaken was to commission feasibility studies to support the case for investment in bioenergy for heating in Georgia.

While the feasibility studies have now been completed for biomass in Tbilisi region (in 2014) the studies revealed less supply/feedstock than initially expected and economics that are not so favorable meaning that there is still no identified investor for the project – either a private sector pellet producer or demand from a Municipality to purchase these pellets. As of May 2015, the City of Tbilisi has not yet determined the extent to which they might be able to provide co-financing to the project, the Investment Grant Mechanism has not yet been launched and biomass projects (both private sector and municipal projects) for support have not yet been selected.

**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 help achieve its intended results.

The MTR will also review the project’s strategy, its risks to sustainability and make recommendations on how to improve the project over the remainder of its lifetime. The MTR will also provide an assessment and recommendations on whether the project should be extended beyond the end of its originally planned 4 years lifetime and under what conditions the project should be extended.

**4. MTR APPROACH & METHODOLOGY**

The MTR must provide evidence based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The International Consultant 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, project progress reports, national strategic and legal documents, and any other materials that the team considers useful for this evidence-based review). The International Consultant will also interview all relevant stakeholders including all parties who have been contracted by the project or participate in meetings and discussions with the project about launching a possible biomass demonstration project.

The International Consultant 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 International Consultant 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(s), UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Advisers, 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: UNDP Georgia, UNDP Istanbul Regional Centre, Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources Protection of Georgia, Tbilisi City Hall, World Experience to Georgia, New Technology Center, Energy Efficiency Center; executing agencies, senior officials and task team/ component leaders, key experts and all consultants in the subject area who have been hired by the project, Project Board, project stakeholders, academia, local government and CSOs, etc. Additionally, the International Consultants expected to be available to travel out of Tbilisi for a maximum of 2 days from the 5 days mission to Tbilisi to visit sites where biomass production and utilization facilities may be established.

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

**i. Project Strategy**

Project design:

* Review the problem addressed by the project and the underlying assumptions. Review the effect of any incorrect assumptions or changes to the context to achieving the project results as outlined in the Project Document.
* Review the relevance of the project strategy and assess whether it provides the most effective route towards expected/intended results. Were lessons from other relevant projects properly incorporated into the project design?
* Review how the project addresses country priorities. Review country ownership. Was the project concept in line with the national sector development priorities and plans of the country (or of participating countries in the case of multi-country projects)?
* Review decision-making processes: were perspectives of those who would be affected by project decisions, those who could affect the outcomes, and those who could contribute information or other resources to the process, taken into account during project design processes?
* Review the extent to which relevant gender issues were raised in the project design. See Annex 9 of *Guidance For Conducting 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:  To promote sustainable production and utilization of upgraded biomass fuels in heating applications in the municipal services sector of Georgia, to meet the sector’s thermal energy needs in a sustainable and efficient way, thereby reducing dependence on fossil fuels and avoiding GHG emissions. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Outcome 1: Enhanced policy and regulatory framework for promotion and efficient utilization of biomass energy in Georgia |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Outcome 2: Increased market confidence in the feasibility of production of upgraded biomass fuels and their utilization in municipal heating applications |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Outcome 3: Created local supply of and demand for upgraded biomass fuels |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Outcome 4: Improved knowledge and stakeholder capacities for bioenergy development and replication |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**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 international consultant for the MTR 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 to improve the project 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 international MTR consultant should make no more than 15 recommendations total.

**Ratings**

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

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

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

1. **TIMEFRAME**

Contracting of the international consultant should take place in August 2015 and the international consultant will be supported by a national consultant to assist with the local context, analysis of material available in Georgian only, and translation during meetings/ interviews. . The national consultant will be hired at the same time as the international consultant.

All documents will be sent to the international consultant before 14th September 2015, i.e. start of the assignment .

The total duration of the MTR will be 22 working days (15 home-based days, 5 mission days, 2 travel days) over a time period of almost four months from 7th September 2015 to 15th December 2015 with the first mission of the international consultant to take place in late September, following the signing of the contract. The tentative MTR timeframe is as follows:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **TIMEFRAME** | **ACTIVITY** |
| On or before 14 September 2015 | All documents are submitted to the International Consultant. |
| September 15, 2015 – September 16, 2015 **(2 working days)** | Document review and preparing MTR Inception Report within 1 week of start of assignment |
| Prior to 8 October 2015 **(8 working days)** | 5 Working Days Mission to Tbilisi, Georgia + 2 travel days + 1 preparation day |
| 23 October 2015 **(10 working days)** | Draft MTR submitted to UNDP Georgia, UNDP Biomass Project Manager and UNDP Istanbul Regional Centre no later than 23rd October 2015 |
| 12 November 2015 | Detailed comment to the draft MTR report sent to the International Consultant by Governmental representatives, UNDP Georgia, UNDP Project Manager, and UNDP Istanbul Regional Centre.  Conference Call on the Draft MTR with the international consultant, UNDP Georgia, and UNDP Istanbul Regional Centre (as required) |
| November 19th **(2 working days)** | Incorporating audit trail from feedback on draft report  Finalization of MTR report following all revised comments |
| December 4th, 2015 | Preparation & Issue of Management Response to Start by UNDP Georgia. |
| December 15th 2015 | UNDP Management Response to MTR is completed before the end of the year. |

Options for site visits should be provided in the Inception Report following discussions with UNDP Georgia, and the UNDP Project Manager.

1. **MIDTERM REVIEW DELIVERABLES**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **#** | **Deliverable** | **Description** | **Timing** | **Responsibilities** |
| **1** | **MTR Inception Report** | International Consultant clarifies objectives and methods of Midterm Review | No later than 1 weeks before the MTR mission scheduled to take place before October 8, 2015 | MTR team (international consultant and national consultant) submits to the Commissioning Unit and project management |
| **2** | **Presentation** | Initial Findings presented on the last day of the 5 working days Mission | End of MTR mission: No later than October 8 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: October 23rd, 2015 | MTR Team sends draft report 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: November 19th, 2015 | MTR report is revised and finalized and sent to the Commissioning Unit by the MTR team |

\*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 UNDP Georgia.The commissioning unit will contract the International Consultant 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 International Consultant to provide all relevant documents, set up stakeholder interviews, and arrange field visits.

The three main contact persons in UNDP for the international consultant conducting the MTR will be as follows:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Position** | **Organization** |
| Mr Vakhtang Berishvili | Project Manager, Bio-Energy Project | UNDP Georgia |
| Ms Nino Antadze | Team Leader, Energy & Environment | UNDP Georgia |
| Mr John O’Brien | Regional Technical Advisor, Climate Change Mitigation | UNDP Istanbul Regional Centre |

Email address for each of the above listed individuals can be found at firstname.lastname@undp.org

1. **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 team expert, from the country of the project. The consultants cannot have participated in the project preparation, formulation, and/or implementation (including the writing of the Project Document) and should not have a conflict of interest with project’s related activities.

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

* Recent experience with result-based management evaluation methodologies;
* Experience/proven record in undertaking evaluations with international organizations in the past 7 years;
* Experience/proven record in undertaking evaluations for UNDP or for GEF will be an advantage;
* Experience of working in former Europe & CIS Countries, preferably in energy or environment sector in the past 7 years;
* Experience working in Georgia in the past 7 years in the energy or environment sector is an asset;
* Work experience related to renewable energy in any country during the last 7 years is an asset;
* Work experience related specifically to Biomass energy projects will be an advantage;
* A Master’s degree in fields related to Environment, Natural resources, M&E, Renewable energy, Management, or other related field.
* Fluency in English.

1. **PAYMENT MODALITIES AND SPECIFICATIONS**

Payment Terms will be as follows:

* 10% of payment upon approval of the final 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.

1. **APPLICATION PROCESS[[9]](#footnote-9) (not applicable in case of using** RBEC vetted roster)

**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 to the address 9 Eristavi Street, Tbilisi 0179, Georgia in a sealed envelope indicating the following reference “Consultant for Promotion of Biomass Production and Utilization in Georgia Midterm Review” or by email at the following address ONLY:

[lia.tergiashvili@undp.org](mailto:lia.tergiashvili@undp.org). 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 International Consultant on Biomass (if applicable)**

1. PIF
2. UNDP Initiation Plan
3. UNDP Project Document
4. UNDP Environmental and Social Screening results
5. Project Inception Report
6. All Project Implementation Reports (PIR’s)
7. Quarterly progress reports and work plans of the various implementation task teams
8. Audit reports
9. 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:

1. Project operational guidelines, manuals and systems
2. UNDP country/countries programme document(s)
3. Minutes of the “Biomass Production and Utilization in Georgia” Board Meetings and other meetings (i.e. Project Appraisal 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 members (international consultant and national consultant) * Acknowledgements | | |
| **ii.** | Table of Contents | | |
| **iii.** | Acronyms and Abbreviations | | |
| **1.** | Executive Summary *(3-5 pages)*   * Project Information Table * Project Description (brief) * Project Progress Summary (between 200-500 words) * MTR Ratings & Achievement Summary Table * Concise summary of conclusions * Recommendation Summary Table | | |
| **2.** | Introduction *(2-3 pages)*   * Purpose of the MTR and objectives * Scope & Methodology: principles of design and execution of the MTR, MTR approach and data collection methods, limitations to the MTR * Structure of the MTR report | | |
| **3.** | Project Description and Background Context *(3-5 pages)*   * Development context: environmental, socio-economic, institutional, and policy factors relevant to the project objective and scope * Problems that the project sought to address: threats and barriers targeted * Project Description and Strategy: objective, outcomes and expected results, description of field sites (if any) * Project Implementation Arrangements: short description of the Project Board, key implementing partner arrangements, etc. * Project timing and milestones * Main stakeholders: summary list | | |
| **4.** | Findings *(12-14 pages)* | | |
| **4.1** | Project Strategy   * Project Design * Results Framework/Logframe | |
| **4.2** | Progress Towards Results   * Progress towards outcomes analysis * Remaining barriers to achieving the project objective | |
| **4.3** | Project Implementation and Adaptive Management   * Management Arrangements * Work planning * Finance and co-finance * Project-level monitoring and evaluation systems * Stakeholder engagement * Reporting * Communications | |
| **4.4** | Sustainability   * Financial risks to sustainability * Socio-economic to sustainability * Institutional framework and governance risks to sustainability * Environmental risks to sustainability | |
| **5.** | Conclusions and Recommendations *(4-6 pages)* | | |
|  | **5.1** | | Conclusions   * Comprehensive and balanced statements (that are evidence-based and connected to the MTR’s findings) which highlight the strengths, weaknesses and results of the project |
| **5.2** | | Recommendations   * Corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project * Actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the project * Proposals for future directions underlining main objectives |
| **6.** | Annexes   * MTR ToR (excluding ToR annexes) * MTR evaluative matrix (evaluation criteria with key questions, indicators, sources of data, and methodology) * Example Questionnaire or Interview Guide used for data collection * Ratings Scales * MTR mission itinerary * List of persons interviewed * List of documents reviewed * Co-financing table (if not previously included in the body of the report) * Signed UNEG Code of Conduct form * Signed MTR final report clearance form * *Annexed in a separate file:* Audit trail from received comments on draft MTR report * *Annexed in a separate file:* Relevant midterm tracking tools (*METT, FSC, Capacity scorecard, etc.)* | | |

**ToR ANNEX C: Midterm Review Evaluative Matrix Template**

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

**ToR ANNEX D: UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluators/Midterm Review Consultants[[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-(2009).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)