



Terms of Reference

Mid Term Review of the UNDP GEF project

Mainstreaming biodiversity conservation into Moldova territorial planning policies and land-use practices

Job title:	Team of consultants (international and national) for Mid Term Review
Type of Contract:	Individual Contract (IC)
Assignment type:	International and National Consultant
Section/Unit:	Environment and Energy Cluster
Duty Station:	Home based. One mission of 5 working days to Moldova(for international consultant)
Languages required:	English
Starting Date:	01 July 2017
Duration of Assignment:	18 working days each The international consultant will work 13 days home based, and 5 working days on mission to Moldova).
Payment arrangements:	Lump sum contract (payments linked to satisfactory performance and delivery of outputs)
Evaluation method:	Desk review with validation interview

I. Introduction

This is the Terms of Reference (ToR) for the UNDP-GEF Midterm Review (MTR) of the *mid-sized* project titled *Mainstreaming biodiversity conservation into Moldova territorial*

planning policies and land-use practices, PIMS 5259, implemented in partnership with the Ministry of Environment which is to be undertaken during April 2015-April 2019. The project started on April 2015, had the inception workshop in August 2015 and it is in its second 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* (attached).

See link:

http://web.undp.org/evaluation/documents/guidance/GEF/mid-term/Guidance_Midterm%20Review%20_EN_2014.pdf

II. Project Background Information

The UNDP GEF “*Mainstreaming biodiversity conservation into Moldova territorial planning policies and land-use practices*”, funded by the Global Environment Facility (GEF), and co-financed and implemented by the United Nations Development Program has an implementation timeframe of 4 years with a total budget of 0.99 million USD of which \$958.904 USD comes from the GEF and \$40,000 USD from UNDP.

Despite the Government’s reform efforts, the spatial/ territorial planning framework continues to be deficient, primarily because biodiversity conservation is not taken into account and the lack of coordination¹ has contributed to ecosystem fragmentation. The long term solution lies in reforming the manner in which agricultural, forestry and other production activities are planned and regulated across different land units and tenure categories at the landscape scale — so as to avoid, reduce and mitigate the pressures leading to biodiversity loss. There are two types of barriers to achieving this long term solution: (i) inadequacies in the planning and enforcement framework, and (ii) insufficient demonstrated experiences in biodiversity-compatible spatial planning and land management practices.

Against this background, the BD mainstreaming Project will be addressing the gaps in land planning and enforcement systems through development of relevant regulations, standards and legislation to accommodate biodiversity conservation objectives while the gap of limited coordination across sectors will be addressed by establishing a multi-stakeholder committee which will ensure a unified approach in the development, implementation and enforcement of land-use plans from the different ministries and departments. In addition, a monitoring system will be emplaced among the various regulatory agencies, assigning responsibilities based on comparative advantage, in order to evaluate acceptable limits of change in biodiversity-important areas. The gap of inadequate demonstrated experiences in spatial planning and biodiversity-compatible land management practices will be tackled through development and testing of biodiversity-compatible district spatial (land-use) plans

¹ i.e., coordination between/ among (i) central public authorities (i.e. Ministries, Agencies subordinated to the Government) dealing with natural resources and/or land planning, and (ii) central public authorities and local public authorities, which is not always good in terms of considering biodiversity or rational use of natural resources.

in 2 districts of Moldova, relying on cross-sectoral working groups, GIS technologies for biodiversity mapping, identification of sites of conflict between biodiversity and human activities and others.

Overall, the objective of the project is to mainstream biodiversity conservation priorities into Moldova's territorial planning policies and land-use practices through two components – the first will focus on modifying the land use planning and enforcement system so that it addresses biodiversity loss, and the second will demonstrate methods for conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity on communal lands outside PAs.

III. 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.

The main output of the MTR will be specific recommendations for adaptive management to improve the project over the second half of its lifetime.

It is recommended that the Mid Term Review not provide more than 15 recommendations in total, to improve the project.

IV. MTR APPROACH & METHODOLOGY

The MTR must provide evidence based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The MTR team of consultants, led by international consultant and assisted by the national 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, national strategic and legal documents, and any other materials that the team considers useful for this evidence-based review). The MTR 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 MTR team is expected to follow a collaborative and participatory approach² 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.

² For ideas on innovative and participatory Monitoring and Evaluation strategies and techniques, see [UNDP Discussion Paper: Innovations in Monitoring & Evaluating Results](#), 05 Nov 2013.

Engagement of stakeholders is vital to a successful MTR.³ Stakeholder involvement should include interviews with stakeholders who have project responsibilities, including but not limited to Ministry of Environment, Moldsilva Forest Agency, Cadastre Agency, Ministry of Regional Development and Construction, UNDP Moldova staff, UNDP Istanbul Regional Technical Advisor on Biodiversity, executing agencies, senior officials and task team/component leaders, key experts and consultants in the subject area, Project Board, project stakeholders, academia, local government and CSOs, etc. Additionally, the MTR team is expected to conduct a field mission to Chisinau which will consist of a minimum of 5 working days (not including weekend or travel days). While in Moldova, the international consultant will meet with all key stakeholders and assess the results of the project and the extent that it is on track to meet its overall objective and outcomes. Field visits to Soroca and Stefan-Voda districts will be conducted during the in-country visit. Skype interviews will also be carried out with all other key stakeholders involved in the design and implementation of the project.

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

V. 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.

1. Project Strategy

Project design:

- Review the problem addressed by the project and the underlying assumptions. Review the effect of any incorrect assumptions or changes to the context to achieving the project results as outlined in the Project Document.
- Review the 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?

³ 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 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 the project's 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.

2. 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 ⁴	Baseline Level ⁵	Level in 1 st PIR (self-reported)	Midterm Target ⁶	End-of-project Target	Midterm Level & Assessment ⁷	Achievement Rating ⁸	Justification for Rating
------------------	------------------------	-----------------------------	--	-----------------------------	-----------------------	---	---------------------------------	--------------------------

⁴ Populate with data from the Logframe and scorecards

⁵ Populate with data from the Project Document

⁶ If available

⁷ Colour code this column only

⁸ Use the 6 point Progress Towards Results Rating Scale: HS, S, MS, MU, U, HU

Objective :	Indicator (if applicable):							
Outcome 1:	Indicator 1:							
	Indicator 2:							
Outcome 2:	Indicator 3:							
	Indicator 4:							
	Etc.							
Etc.								

Indicator Assessment Key

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

In addition to the progress towards outcomes analysis:

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

3. 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.
- Has the work planning been carried out in a manner which is consistent with the project document and with the project workplan or are there significant deviations?
- 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. Have the budget revisions strengthened or weakened the project overall?
- 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?

Project-level Monitoring and Evaluation Systems:

- Review the monitoring tools currently being used including PIR reporting and quarterly financial reporting: 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 including assessing how well the project has worked with UNDP Moldova and the UNDP Istanbul Regional Hub in identifying and implementing adaptive management measures
- Assess how well the Project international consultant 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 has 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.

4. 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 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 with the main goal of making recommendations on how to significantly improve the project (i.e – how to implement adaptive management) over the second half of its lifetime.⁹

UNDP and GEF rules for adaptive management allow for change of activities and outputs to better achieve the project objective and main outcomes. However, they do not allow for the project objective or outcomes to be changed.

There should be no more than 15 recommendations. 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.

⁹ Alternatively, MTR conclusions may be integrated into the body of the report.

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. In addition, an overall rating for the project should be given.

Table. MTR Ratings & Achievement Summary Table for BD Mainstreaming project

Measure	MTR Rating	Achievement Description
Overall Rating		<i>(Please note that for the mid-term review an overall rating is optional)</i>
Project Design and Strategy		
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)	

VI. TIMEFRAME

The total duration of the mid-term review will be **18 days** from the start date of the assignment which works out to approximately 2 months from beginning of July to the end of September 2017.

ACTIVITY	TIMEFRAME	Number of Days
Preparation for the mission by the International consultant (handover of all project documents)	<i>Beginning of July</i>	1
Document review and preparation and submission of MTR Inception Report	<i>Beginning of July</i>	4
5 working days MTR mission to Moldova: stakeholder meetings, interviews, field visits	<i>End July</i>	5
Preparing draft MTR report and submitting to Project Manager, UNDP Moldova, and UNDP Istanbul Regional Hub and holding conference call to discuss the draft report	<i>Mid of August</i>	5
Incorporating audit trail from feedback on draft report/Finalization of MTR report	<i>By end of August</i>	1
Finalization of MTR incorporating all comments and responding to all issues raised by all stakeholders	<i>By end of September</i>	2
	Total	18

Options for site visits and a detailed list of interviewees and questions to be asked should be provided in the Inception Report.

VII. Expected Deliverables

#	Deliverable	Description	Timing	Responsibilities
1	MTR Inception Report	MTR International consultant in close collaboration with national consultant clarifies objectives and methods of Midterm Review	No later than mid-July	MTR International consultant submits to the UNDP CO and project management
2	Presentation	Initial Findings	Last day of 5 working days MTR mission (PowerPoint presentation) to be carried out in late July	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 and expected to be at the end of August.	Sent to the UNDP CO reviewed by RTA, Project Coordinating Unit, GEF OFP
4	Final Report*	Revised report with audit trail detailing how	Within 1 week of receiving UNDP	Sent to the UNDP CO and UNDP Regional

		all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final MTR report	comments on draft, and expected to be at end of August.	Technical Advisor
--	--	--	---	-------------------

*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.

VIII. MTR Arrangements

Institutional arrangements

The principal responsibility for managing this MTR resides with the UNDP Moldova Country Office which is the Commissioning Unit.

The Project team will be responsible for liaising with the MTR team to provide all relevant documents, set up stakeholder interviews and agenda, and arrange field visits if necessary. The MTR team should review all documents and request meetings and interviews to take place prior to the mission.

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.

Duty station

The international MTR consultant will work home-based with 5 working days mission to Moldova which should be carried out in July 2017.

The national consultant will work home base accompanying the international consultant during the mission to Moldova.

Travel:

- **International travel** (5 working days – mission for international consultant) will be required to Moldova which is called the Mid-Term Review mission; This 5 working days mission does not include travel days or weekend days which means that the consultant will need to stay one weekend in Moldova. Weekend days are not considered working days. All envisaged travel costs must be included in the financial proposal.

Duties and responsibilities:

International Expert

- Desk review of documents, development of draft methodology, detailed work plan and MTR outline;
- Debriefing with UNDP CO, agreement on the methodology, scope and outline of the MTR report;
- Interviews with project implementing partner (executing agency), relevant Government, NGO and donor representatives and UNDP/GEF Regional Technical Advisor;
- Field visit to the pilot project sites and interviews with local stakeholders from Soroca and Stefan-Voda districts;
- Elaboration of a summary matrix of the project implementation key findings based on interviews and site visits performed;
- Debriefing with UNDP and project team;
- Development and submission of the first MTR report draft. The draft will be shared with the UNDP CO, UNDP/GEF (UNDP/GEF IRH) and key project stakeholders for review and commenting;
- Finalization and submission of the Response Grid;
- Finalization and submission of the final MTR report through incorporating suggestions received on the draft report;
- Supervision of the work of the national expert (during entire evaluation period).

National Expert

- Collection of background materials upon request by MTR Team Leader/International Expert;
- Provision of important inputs in developing methodologies, work plans and MTR report outlines upon request by MTR Team Leader/International Expert;
- Assistance to the MTR Team Leader in desk review of materials;
- Participation in debriefings with UNDP CO representatives;
- Assistance to the MTR Team Leader in conducting interviews with relevant stakeholders;
- Field visit and assistance to the MTR Team Leader in interviewing local stakeholders at project sites;
- Assist the MTR team leader in elaboration of a summary matrix of the project implementation key findings based on interviews and site visits performed;
- Participation in debriefing with UNDP and project team;
- Assistance to the MTR Team Leader in developing the first draft of the MTE report. The draft will be shared with the UNDP CO, UNDP/GEF (UNDP/GEF IRH) and key project stakeholders for review and commenting;
- Assistance to the MTR Team Leader in finalization of the Final Mid-term Evaluation report;

IX. Qualifications and experience requirements

The International Consultant - MTR Consultant should have the following qualifications and experience:

Academic qualifications:

- Master's degree in Biodiversity Conservation, Natural Resource Management, Environmental management and/or other related fields.

Experience:

- At least 7 (seven) years of work experience in the biodiversity area;
- At least 7 (seven) years' work experience with result-based management evaluation methodologies in the areas relevant to this assignment ;
- Experience in UNDP GEF project evaluation/review, including experience with SMART based indicators
- Experience in working with international technical assistance projects in the Europe and CIS region with international organizations (experience in Republic of Moldova will be an asset);
- Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender and biodiversity linkages; experience in gender sensitive evaluations/review and analysis;
- Ability to achieve results and deadlines in a timely manner, maintaining a high standard throughout
- Proven experience in preparation of written reports in an accurate and concise manner in English;
- Excellent written communication skills, with analytic capacity and ability to synthesize project outputs and relevant findings for the preparation of analytical documents

Language requirements:

- Writing and verbal skills in English, knowledge of Romanian or Russian would be an asset.

The National Consultant - MTR Consultant should have the following qualifications and experience:

Academic qualifications:

- University degree in Biodiversity Conservation, Natural Resource Management, Environment, Biology or other related fields. Advanced degree is an asset;

Experience:

- At least 3 (three) years of experience in providing management or consultancy services to the biodiversity conservation or environment projects.
- Experience with monitoring and evaluation of environment projects for UNDP or other international development agencies in the country or region.
- Experience with monitoring and evaluation of biodiversity conservation will be an asset.
-
- Experience with UNDP and/or other international projects are an advantage
- Proven experience in preparation of written reports in an accurate and concise manner in English;

Language requirements:

- Writing and verbal skills in English, Romanian and Russian.

X. Payment modalities

The international consultant shall be paid in three instalments as follows:

- 10% of total contract amount payable upon approval of the final MTR Inception Report
- 50% of total contract amount payable upon submission and acceptance of the draft MTR report
- 40% of total contract amount payable upon finalization of the MTR report and its acceptance by UNDP Moldova and UNDP Istanbul Regional Hub

The national consultant shall be paid in 2 instalments as follows:

- 20% of total contract amount payable upon approval of the final MTR Inception Report
- 80% of total contract amount payable upon submission and acceptance of the final MTR report

XI. Application process

All applications should include the following:

1. Proposal: Brief proposal explaining why you are the most suitable for this consultancy including confirmation on availability to take up assignment for the whole period.
2. Personal information (Personal History Form/P11) including past experience in similar projects.
3. Financial proposal (in USD, specifying the total lump sum amount as well as the requested amount of the fee per day).

Incomplete applications will not be considered.

Annex I – Financial Proposal of the International Consultant

	Nr. of units*	Units	Rate / USD	Total / USD
Work in home office**				
Preparation for Mission to Moldova	5	man/days		0
Follow-up to Mission to Moldova	8	man/days		0
				0
Work on mission**				
5 working day mission to Moldova	5	man/days		0
DSA				0
Return Air-Ticket				0
Sub-total fee				0
Other costs				
				0
				0
				0
Sub-total other costs				0
TOTAL	18			0

* Estimates are indicated in the TOR, the applicant is requested to review and revise, if applicable.

** Add rows as needed

I agree to perform this assignment for a lump sum of _____ USD

Name: _____

Signature: _____

Date: _____ / _____ / 2017

This offer remains valid for a period of 3 months from the date of signature.

ANNEXES to MTR TOR

ToR ANNEX A: List of Documents to be reviewed by the International consultant

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:

13. Project operational guidelines, manuals and systems
14. UNDP country/countries programme document(s)
15. Minutes of the (*Project Title*) 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 Report¹⁰

- 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
 - International consultant members
 - Acknowledgements
- ii. Table of Contents
- iii. Acronyms and Abbreviations
1. Executive Summary (*3-5 pages*)
 - Project Information Table
 - Project Description (brief)
 - Project Progress Summary (between 200-500 words)

¹⁰ The Report length should not exceed 40 pages in total (not including annexes).

- 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?			

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: _____

¹¹ www.undp.org/unegcodeofconduct

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: _____