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1. INTRODUCTION
This is the Terms of Reference (ToR) for the UNDP-GEF Midterm Review (MTR) of the full-sized project titled Effective Governance for Small-scale Rural Infrastructure and Disaster Preparedness in a Changing Climate (PIMS 4710) in Lao PDR, implemented through the Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment (MONRE)/Department of Disaster Management and Climate Change (DDMCC), which is to be undertaken in 2016. The project started on the 8th May 2013 and is in its third year of implementation. This ToR sets out the expectations for this MTR. The MTR process must follow the guidance outlined in the document Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects (http://web.undp.org/evaluation/documents/guidance/GEF/midterm/Guidance_Midterm%20Review%20EN%202014.pdf).

2. PROJECT BACKGROUND INFORMATION
Lao PDR is one of the poorest countries in Asia and according to IPCC findings particularly vulnerable to the effects of climate change. Low productive agriculture, poor infrastructure development and limited levels of service delivery jointly contribute to low adaptive capacity of livelihood systems, which are already affected by impacts of climate variability. Stresses on livelihoods will further increase due to expected climate change.

The project target area is the two provinces of Sekong and Saravane in southern Lao PDR, including all their 12 districts. Those two provinces have been heavily affected by climate change in recent years. Changing rainfall and temperature patterns have caused an increased frequency and intensity of storms leading to flash-floods, flooding and landslides, as well more frequent and persistent dry periods and droughts.

The project was designed to increase climate resilience of rural small-scale water infrastructure, and the communities using them, through participatory planning processes that ensures full considerations of the genuine needs of communities vulnerable to climate variability and change, so that the development prospects of these communities are secured in face of increasing climate risks.

In order to achieve this, the project applies a ‘three-pronged’ approach: (i) strengthening of the national, provincial and district capacities for planning for rural infrastructure that incorporates climate considerations; (ii) direct financing for infrastructure projects to vulnerable districts through an existing District Development Fund (DDF) mechanism; (iii) implementing ecosystem-based adaptation measures that provide additional climate resilience at the watershed level of project infrastructure intervention.

The District Development Fund (DDF) mechanism has been applied in Lao PDR over the past 10 years through the National Governance and Administration Reform Project (NGPAR), implemented with support from UNDP/UNCDF by Ministry of Home Affairs (MOHA). The project uses this mechanism through a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) between MONRE/UNDP and MOHA/UNCDF.
The overall Project Objective is to “improve local administrative systems affecting the provision and maintenance of small scale rural infrastructure through participatory decision making that reflects the genuine needs of communities and natural systems vulnerable to climate risk”.

Three outcomes will contribute to this objective; the progress toward the objective and outcomes is measured through the following indicators.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective / Outcomes</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Target by end of project, relative to the baseline (unless specified otherwise)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Objective: Local administrative systems affecting the provision and maintenance of small scale rural infrastructure will be improved through participatory decision making that reflects the genuine needs of communities and natural systems vulnerable to climate risk</td>
<td>- Percentage change in number of district development plans including specific climate change adaptation actions in the target provinces and districts &lt;br&gt; - Percentage change in the level of active local community participation in climate risk related planning in target provinces and districts</td>
<td>50% of district development plans in the project area include at least 3 specific CCA actions by mid project and at least 5 CCA actions by end of project 60% of District Development Support Committees in the target districts and provinces record specific climate related concerns emerging from community level annual planning consultations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 1: Capacities provided for local administrative institutions to integrate climate risks into participatory planning and financing of small scale rural water infrastructure provision</td>
<td>1.1 Percentage change in the ability of local and some national officials to apply methodologies to analyse climate risks and identify CC vulnerabilities in 12 districts &lt;br&gt; 1.2 Procedures are in place to integrate climate change resilient advice and investment for small scale rural water infrastructure into district planning &lt;br&gt; 1.3 Number of district development plans available, reflecting costs for adaptation in the water sector.</td>
<td>50% of sub-national officials and 10% of national officials are able to analyse climate risks for their districts on a macro level (V&amp;A analysis) and are able to identify specific vulnerabilities and adaptation options at village level (CRVA) All 12 target districts are applying a climate resilient planning mechanism including project identification, site assessment, approval, execution and M&amp;E All annual district investment plans include evidence of incremental CCA costings for water sector projects by year 4 and at least 4 provide this evidence by Year 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 2: Incentives in place for small-scale rural infrastructure to be protected and diversified</td>
<td>2.1 Number of districts routinely investing in climate resilient measures to improve village level water harvesting.</td>
<td>By the end of the project all target districts are investing at least 2 projects per year in village level climate resilient</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Outcome 3:
Natural assets (such as wetlands, forests and other ecosystems in sub-catchments) are managed to maintain the critical ecosystem services, especially water provisioning, flood control and protection under increasing climate change induced stresses, in Sekong and Saravane provinces.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.2 Number of people benefitting from investments in small-scale irrigation systems to increase their resilience against climate change risks</td>
<td>3.1 Number of management action plans developed and under implementation, which protect natural assets through local scale ecosystems based adaptation measures to improve the resilience of small-scale rural infrastructure against floods and drought</td>
<td>At least 6 management and action plans covering project-targeted climate resilience small-scale infrastructure investments under implementation across both Sekong and Saravane provinces.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 District level fiscal and administrative incentives are introduced that incorporate climate resilient measures for small scale rural infrastructure</td>
<td>3.2 Number of key project stakeholders aware of links between improved ecosystem management and sustainability of investments in small scale rural water infrastructure.</td>
<td>At least 250 national, provincial and district planners have received knowledge and learning approaches and materials produced by the project on ecosystem based management linkages to infrastructure provision.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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\(^1\) 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.\(^2\) Stakeholder involvement should include interviews with stakeholders who have project responsibilities, including but not limited to:

- UNDP staff who have project responsibilities
- Implementing Partner – National
- The Chair of Project Board
- The National Project Director (NPD) and Project Manager (PM)
- Component leaders and key experts
- Other project stakeholders, to be discussed at the MTR inception meeting

Additionally, the MTR team is expected to conduct field missions to different government agencies in Vientiane capital, Saravane and Sekong provinces, including project sites in Lamarm, Thateng, Saravane and Khongsedone districts.

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)?

\(^1\) For ideas on innovative and participatory Monitoring and Evaluation strategies and techniques, see *UNDP Discussion Paper: Innovations in Monitoring & Evaluating Results*, 05 Nov 2013.

\(^2\) 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>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Strategy</th>
<th>Indicator3</th>
<th>Baseline Level4</th>
<th>Level in 1st PIR (self-reported)</th>
<th>Midterm Target5</th>
<th>End-of-project Target</th>
<th>Midterm Level &amp; Assessment6</th>
<th>Achievement Rating7</th>
<th>Justification for Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Objective:</td>
<td>Indicator (if applicable):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 1:</td>
<td>Indicator 1:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indicator 2:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 2:</td>
<td>Indicator 3:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indicator 4:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 3:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Indicator Assessment Key**
- **Green= Achieved**
- **Yellow= On target to be achieved**
- **Red= Not on target to be achieved**

3 Populate with data from the Logframe and scorecards
4 Populate with data from the Project Document
5 If available
6 Colour code this column only
7 Use the 6 point Progress Towards Results Rating Scale: HS, S, MS, MU, U, HU
In addition to the progress towards outcomes analysis:

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

### iii. Project Implementation and Adaptive Management

#### Management Arrangements:

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

#### Work Planning:

- Review any delays in project start-up and implementation, identify the causes and examine if they have been resolved.
- Are work-planning processes results-based? If not, suggest ways to re-orientate work planning to focus on results?
- Examine the use of the project’s results framework/logframe as a management tool and review any changes made to it since project start.

#### Finance and co-finance:

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

#### Project-level Monitoring and Evaluation Systems:

- Review the monitoring tools currently being used: Do they provide the necessary information? Do they involve key partners? Are they aligned or mainstreamed with national systems? Do they use existing information? Are they efficient? Are they cost-effective? Are additional tools required? How could they be made more participatory and inclusive?
- Examine the financial management of the project monitoring and evaluation budget. Are sufficient resources being allocated to monitoring and evaluation? Are these resources being allocated effectively?
Stakeholder Engagement:
- Project management: Has the project developed and leveraged the necessary and appropriate partnerships with direct and tangential stakeholders?
- Participation and country-driven processes: Do local and national government stakeholders support the objectives of the project? Do they continue to have an active role in project decision-making that supports efficient and effective project implementation?
- Participation and public awareness: To what extent has stakeholder involvement and public awareness contributed to the progress towards achievement of project objectives?

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Environmental risks to sustainability:**
- Are there any environmental risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project outcomes?

**Conclusions & Recommendations**

The MTR team will include a section of the report setting out the MTR’s evidence-based conclusions, in light of the findings.\(^8\)

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

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

**Ratings**

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

**Table. MTR Ratings & Achievement Summary Table for Effective Governance for Small-scale Rural Infrastructure and Disaster Preparedness in a Changing Climate**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>MTR Rating</th>
<th>Achievement Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Strategy</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progress Towards Results</td>
<td>Objective Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Outcome 1 Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Outcome 2 Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Outcome 3 Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Implementation &amp; Adaptive Management</td>
<td>(rate 6 pt. scale)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability</td>
<td>(rate 4 pt. scale)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^8\) Alternatively, MTR conclusions may be integrated into the body of the report.
6. **TIMEFRAME**

The total duration of the MTR will be 24 working days over a time period of approximately 11 weeks starting in March 2016, and shall not exceed five months from when the consultant(s) are hired. The tentative MTR timeframe is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIMEFRAME</th>
<th>ACTIVITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>04 March 2016</td>
<td>Application closure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 days after application closure</td>
<td>Select MTR Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 March 2016</td>
<td>Contract signing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14-18 March 2016</td>
<td>Preparation of the MTR Team (handover of Project Documents)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 March 2016</td>
<td><em>Inception Meeting with UNDP via Skype</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Within first two weeks of contract</strong></td>
<td>Document review and preparing MTR Inception Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 March 2016</td>
<td>Submission of Inception Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 March – 08 April</td>
<td>MTR mission (12 days): stakeholder meetings, interviews, field visits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07 April 2016</td>
<td>Preparing initial findings for stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 April 2016</td>
<td>Submission of Draft MTR Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 May 2016</td>
<td>Finalization of MTR report including incorporating audit trail from feedback on draft report/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 May 2016</td>
<td>Submission of Final MTR Report</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

7. **MIDTERM REVIEW DELIVERABLES**

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

*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 the UNDP Country Office of Lao PDR.

The commissioning unit will contract the consultants and ensure the timely provision of per diems and travel arrangements within Lao PDR 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

The evaluation team will consist of 1 international and 1 national evaluators. The consultants shall have prior experience in evaluating similar projects. Experience with GEF financed projects is an advantage. (The international evaluator will be designated as the team leader and will be responsible for finalizing the report). The evaluators selected should not have participated in the project preparation and/or implementation and should not have conflict of interest with project related activities.

The International Team leader must present the following qualifications:

**Education:**

- Technical knowledge/recognized advanced (Masters of higher) degree in the targeted focal area(s): natural resource management, environmental engineering, hydrology and water resource management.

**Experience:**

- 10 years technical experience with climate change adaptation analysis and the socio-economic impact assessment related to infrastructure, hydrological disaster risk management, water resource management, climate change adaptation and ecosystem based adaptation
- Experience in project reviewing or evaluating within United Nations system
- Experience in reviewing or evaluation of similar climate change adaptation in the water resource management sector projects with UNDP-GEF supported projects
- Experience with results-based monitoring and evaluation methodologies
- 3 years of working experience in the Mekong region (South East Asia)

**Other Knowledge and Skills:**

- Capability to lead and guide the works of the national consultant into joint working results and evaluation reports
- Demonstrated analytical and presentation skills
- Excellent English communication and report writing skills
10. PAYMENT MODALITIES AND SPECIFICATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>%</th>
<th>Milestone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10%</td>
<td>On submission of Inception Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30%</td>
<td>On completion of Mission to Lao PDR and presentation of initial findings to stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40%</td>
<td>On submission and acceptance (by UNDP-CO and UNDP RTA) of the 1st draft mid-term review report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20%</td>
<td>On submission and acceptance (by UNDP-CO and UNDP RTA) of the final mid-term review report</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. APPLICATION PROCESS

Recommended Presentation of Proposal:

a) **Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability** using the [template](https://info.undp.org/global/popp/Pages/default.aspx) provided by UNDP;

b) CV in English (with indication of e-mail and phone contact) and a **Personal History Form (P11 form)**;

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.

Applicants are requested to submit an application letter with a technical and financial proposal by 04 March 2016. Qualified women and members of social minorities are encouraged to apply.

**Criteria for Evaluation of Proposal:** Only those applications which are responsive and compliant will be evaluated. Offers will be evaluated according to the Combined Scoring method – where the educational background and experience on similar assignments will be weighted at 70% and the price proposal will weigh as 30% of the total scoring. The applicant receiving the Highest Combined Score that has also accepted UNDP’s General Terms and Conditions will be awarded the contract.

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

1. PIF
2. UNDP Initiation Plan
3. UNDP Project Document
4. UNDP Environmental and Social Screening results
5. Project Inception Report

---

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](https://info.undp.org/global/popp/Pages/default.aspx)


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
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 GIDCC 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

1. 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

2. Table of Contents

3. Acronyms and Abbreviations

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

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

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

Findings (12-14 pages)
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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

ToR ANNEX C: Midterm Review Evaluative Matrix Template

This Midterm Review Evaluative Matrix must be fully completed/amended by the consultant and
included in the MTR inception report and as an Annex to the MTR report.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluative Questions</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>Methodology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Strategy: To what extent is the project strategy relevant to country priorities, country ownership, and the best route towards expected results?</td>
<td>(include evaluative (i.e. relationships (i.e. project documents; (i.e. document analysis, question(s)) established, level of national policies or data analysis, interviews)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Progress Towards Results: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved thus far?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Progress Towards Results</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Implementation and Adaptive Management</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, socio-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sustainability</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| coherence between project design and implementation approach, specific activities conducted, quality of risk mitigation strategies, etc. | strategies, websites, project staff, project partners, data collected throughout the MTR mission, etc. | with project staff, interviews with stakeholders, etc. |
ToR ANNEX D: UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluators/Midterm Review Consultants

Evaluator/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. |

www.undp.org/unegcodeofconduct
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### Ratings for Project Implementation & Adaptive Management: (one overall rating)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6 (HS)</td>
<td>Highly Satisfactory: Implementation of all seven components leads to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management. The project can be presented as “good practice”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 (S)</td>
<td>Satisfactory: Implementation of most of the seven components leads to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management except for only few that are subject to remedial action.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 (MS)</td>
<td>Moderately Satisfactory: Implementation of some of the seven components leads to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management, with some components requiring remedial action.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 (MU)</td>
<td>Moderately Unsatisfactory: Implementation of some of the seven components is not leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management, with most components requiring remedial action.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 (U)</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory: Implementation of most of the seven components is not leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (HU)</td>
<td>Highly Unsatisfactory: Implementation of none of the seven components is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Ratings for Sustainability: (one overall rating)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4 (L)</td>
<td>Likely: 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</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 (ML)</td>
<td>Moderately Likely: Moderate risks, but expectations that at least some outcomes will be sustained due to the progress towards results on outcomes at the Midterm Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 (MU)</td>
<td>Moderately Unlikely: Significant risk that key outcomes will not carry on after project closure, although some outputs and activities should carry on</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (U)</td>
<td>Unlikely: Severe risks that project outcomes as well as key outputs will not be sustained</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**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: ________________________________