

IW:LEARN and LME:LEARN Midterm Review

Terms of Reference

1. INTRODUCTION

This is the Terms of Reference (ToR) for the UNDP-GEF Midterm Review (MTR) of the full sized projects titled “International Waters Learning Exchange and Resource Network (IW:LEARN)” - PIMS no. 5337 and Strengthening Global Governance of Large Marine Ecosystems and Their Coasts through Enhanced Sharing and Application of LME/ICM/MPA Knowledge and Information Tools (LME:LEARN)” – PIMS no. 4481, implemented by UNDP and executed by IOC of UNESCO, which is to be undertaken in 2018. The projects started on the 16 March 2016 and are in their 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). 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*.

2. PROJECTS’ BACKGROUND INFORMATION

For sixteen years, **IW:LEARN** has helped strengthen transboundary water management around the globe by collecting and sharing best practices, lessons learned, and innovative solutions to common problems across the GEF International Waters portfolio. The latest round of the project, started in 2016, marks the beginning of the new phase of IW:LEARN and the start of its co-executed sister project, **LME:LEARN**. Together, the two projects help promote learning among project managers, country officials, implementing agencies, and other partners in GEF International Waters projects.

Both projects offer a suite of technical and financial assistance that have become standardized as IW:LEARN enters into its sixteenth year of operations. While IW:LEARN provides support to the entire portfolio of GEF International Waters projects, this phase contains additional support aimed at building the capacity of river and lake basin projects in areas such as the water-energy-food nexus, climate change and variability, benefit sharing, legal and institutional support for basin organizations, sustainable infrastructure, and conjunctive management of surface and groundwater. For its part, LME:LEARN will undertake additional activities in support of the marine portfolio. In order to carry out proper regional governance of Large Marine Ecosystem regions, coordination between LME, Marine Protected Area, and Integrated Coastal Management projects will be supported.

The focal point of the project is the IW:LEARN website which serves as the premiere results archive and data collection service for the GEF International Waters portfolio. The site makes available case studies and best practices, Transboundary Diagnostic Analyses and Strategic Action Programmes from projects around the world, news and events related to International Waters, and targeted knowledge sharing tools to practitioners and the wider public. The website also hosts a unique Portfolio Visualization Tool and Portfolio Results Archive that allows users to quickly discover and analyze the impacts of GEF interventions across the world. Guidance documents and other resources are also made available here to further disseminate the experiences of International Waters projects. We are currently creating a brand-new website for IW:LEARN, to make it more user-friendly and to improve the overall user experience. See below for a preview of the new home-page. LME:LEARN holds a special section of that web site, with a structure that is similar to IW:LEARN but adapted to marine issues.

In addition to the website, both IW:LEARN and LME:LEARN support GEF International Waters projects through activities such as face-to-face training and knowledge sharing activities. The GEF Biennial International Waters Conference (IWC) is the signature learning event for the GEF International Waters portfolio. Bringing together a broad range of stakeholders, the conference aims to facilitate cross-sectoral and portfolio-wide learning and experience sharing, and to assist in building capacity in key management and technical areas. The Ninth GEF IWC is set for 2018. In addition to the IWC, both projects also support Targeted Training activities on water resources management and capacity building, Regional Dialogues and Workshops to help foster transboundary cooperation, Project Twinning for face-to-face engagement between project sharing common objectives or challenges and Global Dialogue Participation support to build partnerships with organizations working outside the immediate GEF IW portfolio

IW:LEARN has been a leader in designing and delivering new management tools, guidance and approaches for International Waters projects. The new phase of IW:LEARN will undertake activities to support gender mainstreaming by introducing systematic consideration of gender equity, women's empowerment, and social inclusion into International Waters projects for the improved management of transboundary waters. IW:LEARN will also support private sector engagement to help facilitate effective partnerships between projects and private enterprises. Activities will include training on water stewardship and risk tools, dialogues on business participation in water resource management, and multi-stakeholder basin funds. IW:LEARN will also work to integrate the economic valuation of natural resources into the Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis/Strategic Action Plan (TDA/SAP) process to influence decision-making and helping to bridge the science-policy gap. IW:LEARN will also aim to improve the quality of the SAPs to ensure that they focus on actions that can realistically be implemented through new guidance. LME:LEARN, will provide additional value-added support in terms of governance, ecosystem-based management, environmental economics, data and information management, marine spatial planning and stakeholder engagement.

A joint Project Coordination Unit (PCU) for IW:LEARN and LME:LEARN was established at IOC of UNESCO in Paris, France. The PCU has a joint Project Manager, Deputy Project Manager and the Administrative Assistant, while a Chief Technical Advisor has been hired as a long-term consultant to assist implementation of LME:LEARN.

3. OBJECTIVES OF THE MTR

The MTR will assess progress towards the achievement of the projects' objectives and outcomes as specified in their Project Documents, and assess early signs of projects' success or failure with the goal of identifying the necessary changes to be made in order to set the projects on-track to achieve its intended results. The MTR will also review the projects' strategy, their risks to sustainability.

4. MTR APPROACH & METHODOLOGY

The MTR must provide evidence based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The MTR 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 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 consultant is expected to follow a collaborative and participatory approach¹ ensuring close engagement with the Project Coordination Unit (PCU), project partners, 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; executing agencies, senior officials and task team/ component leaders, key experts and consultants in the subject area, Project Steering Committee, project stakeholders, academia, local government and CSOs, etc. Additionally, the MTR consultant is expected to conduct field mission to Paris (seat of PCU).

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 consultant will assess the following four categories of each 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 each project and the underlying assumptions. Review the effect of any incorrect assumptions or changes to the context to achieving each project results as outlined in their respective Project Documents.
- Review the relevance of each project's strategy and assess whether it provides the most effective route towards expected/intended results. Were lessons from other relevant projects properly incorporated into the projects' design?
- Review decision-making processes: were perspectives of those who would be affected by projects' decisions, those who could affect the outcomes, and those who could contribute information or other resources to the process, taken into account during each project's design process?
- Review the extent to which relevant gender issues were raised in each project's 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 each 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 each project's objectives and outcomes or components clear, practical, and feasible within their 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.

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.

- Ensure broader development and gender aspects of each 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). Prepare separate table for each project.

Table. Progress Towards Results Matrix (Achievement of outcomes against End-of-project Targets)

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

Indicator Assessment Key

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

In addition to the progress towards outcomes analysis prepare the following for each project:

- 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.

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

- Review the synergies created by the joint implementation of the projects.

Work Planning:

- Review any delays in projects' 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 projects' results framework/ logframe as a management tool and review any changes made to it since projects' start.

Finance and co-finance:

- Consider the financial management of the projects, 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 projects 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 projects? Is the PCU 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 projects' monitoring and evaluation budget. Are sufficient resources being allocated to monitoring and evaluation? Are these resources being allocated effectively?

Stakeholder Engagement:

- Project management: Have the projects 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 projects? Do they continue to have an active role in projects' decision-making that supports efficient and effective projects' implementation?
- Participation and public awareness: To what extent has stakeholder involvement and public awareness contributed to the progress towards achievement of projects' objectives?

Reporting:

- Assess how adaptive management changes have been reported by the project management and shared with the Project Steering Committee.
- Assess how well the PCU 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 projects' 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 projects' outcomes and activities and investment in the sustainability of projects' results?
- Review external project communication: Are proper means of communication established or being established to express the projects 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 projects' 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 Documents, Annual Project Reviews/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 projects' outcomes)?

Socio-economic risks to sustainability:

- Are there any social or political risks that may jeopardize sustainability of projects' 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 projects' outcomes/benefits to be sustained? Do the various key stakeholders see that it is in their interest that the projects benefits continue to flow? Is there sufficient public / stakeholder awareness in support of the long term objectives of the projects? Are lessons learned being documented by the PCU on a continual basis and shared/transferred to appropriate parties who could learn from the projects 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 projects 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 projects outcomes?

Conclusions & Recommendations

The MTR consultant will include a section of the report setting out the MTR's evidence-based conclusions, in light of the findings.⁸

⁸ Alternatively, MTR conclusions may be integrated into the body of the report.

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 consultant should make no more than 15 recommendations total for each project.

Ratings

The MTR consultant will include its ratings of the projects' 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 Projects' Strategy and no overall project rating is required.

Table. MTR Ratings & Achievement Summary Table for (for each project separately)

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)	

6. TIMEFRAME

The total duration of the MTR will be approximately 35 days over a time period of 14 weeks starting 9 March 2018. The tentative MTR timeframe is as follows:

TIMEFRAME	ACTIVITY
22 February 2018	Application closes
2 March 2018	Select MTR Consultant
9 March 2018	Prep the MTR Team (handover of Project Documents)
20 March 2018 (6 days)	Document review and preparing MTR Inception Report
23 March 2018 (2 days)	Finalization and Validation of MTR Inception Report- latest start of MTR mission
30 March 2018 (3 days)	Stakeholder telecon interviews
13 April 2018	Mission to attend the Steering Committee Meeting. Wrap-up meeting & presentation of initial findings at the end of MTR mission
11 May 2018 (20 days)	Preparing draft report
18 May 2018	Review of the draft report by PCU and feedback
25 May 2018 (4 days)	Incorporating audit trail from feedback on draft report/Finalization

	of MTR report
29 May 2018	Preparation & Issue of Management Response
31 May 2018	Expected date of full MTR completion

7. MIDTERM REVIEW DELIVERABLES

#	Deliverable	Description	Timing	Responsibilities
1	MTR Inception Report	MTR consultant clarifies objectives and methods of Midterm Review	No later than 2 weeks before the MTR mission: (20 March 2018)	MTR consultant submits to the Commissioning Unit and project management
2	Presentation	Initial Findings	End of MTR mission: (13 April 2018)	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. There will be one report covering two projects	Within 3 weeks of the MTR mission: (11 May 2018)	Sent to the Commissioning Unit, reviewed by RTA, Project Coordinating Unit
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: (31 May 2018)	Sent to the Commissioning Unit

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

8. MTR ARRANGEMENTS

The principal responsibility for managing this MTR resides with the Commissioning Unit. The Commissioning Unit for this project's MTR is IOC of UNESCO.

The commissioning unit will contract the consultants and ensure the timely provision of per diems and travel arrangements for the MTR consultant. The PCU will be responsible for liaising with the MTR consultant to provide all relevant documents, set up stakeholder interviews, and arrange the mission.

Travel:

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

9. REQUIRED SKILLS AND EXPERIENCE

One independent consultant will conduct the MTR. The consultant cannot have participated in either of the projects preparation, formulation, and/or implementation (including the writing of the Project Document) and should not have a conflict of interest with projects' related activities.

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

Consultant's experiences/qualification related to the services		
Criteria		Maximum Points
1.	Recent experience with result-based management evaluation methodologies	20
2.	Experience applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios	10
3.	Competence in adaptive management, as applied to GEF International Waters Focal Area	10
4.	Experience working with the GEF or GEF-evaluations	10
5.	Work experience in relevant technical areas for at least 10 years	10
6.	Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender and GEF International Waters Focal Area; experience in gender sensitive evaluation and analysis	5
7.	Excellent communication skills	5
8.	Demonstrable analytical skills	5
9.	Project evaluation/review experiences within United Nations system will be considered an asset	5
10.	A Master's degree in water resource management, environmental management, international waters, climate change, transboundary monitoring, and other environmental issues, marine spatial planning, integrated coastal zone management or other closely related field	20
TOTAL		100

10. PAYMENT MODALITIES AND SPECIFICATIONS

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

11. APPLICATION PROCESS⁹

Recommended Presentation of Proposal:

- a) **Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability** using the [template](#)¹⁰ provided by UNDP;
- b) **CV** and a **Personal History Form** ([P11 form](#)¹¹);

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>

¹⁰

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

¹¹ http://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/corporate/Careers/P11_Personal_history_form.doc

- 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 he/she will approach and complete the assignment; (max 1 page)
- d) **Financial Proposal** that indicates the all-inclusive fixed total contract price, as per template attached to the Letter of Confirmation of Interest template. If an applicant is employed by an organization/company/institution, and he/she expects his/her employer to charge a management fee in the process of releasing him/her to UNDP under Reimbursable Loan Agreement (RLA), the applicant must indicate at this point, and ensure that all such costs are duly incorporated in the financial proposal submitted to UNDP.

All application materials should be submitted by email at the following address ONLY: (j.barbiere@unesco.org with CC to i.chavez@unesco.org) by **22 February 2018**. Incomplete applications will be excluded from further consideration.

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

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

1. PIF
2. UNDP Initiation Plan
3. UNDP Project Document
4. 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
10. Oversight mission reports
11. All monitoring reports prepared by the project
12. Financial and Administration guidelines used by PCU

The following documents will also be available:

13. Project operational guidelines, manuals and systems
14. Minutes of the Project Steering Committee Meetings and other meetings (i.e. Project Appraisal Committee meetings)

ToR ANNEX B: Guidelines on Contents for the Midterm Review Report¹²

- i. Basic Report Information (*for opening page or title page*)
 - Title of UNDP supported GEF financed projects
 - UNDP PIMS# and GEF project ID#
 - MTR time frame and date of MTR report
 - Region and countries included in the projects
 - GEF Operational Focal Area/Strategic Program
 - Executing Agency/Implementing Partner and other project partners
 - Acknowledgements

¹² The Report length should not exceed 40 pages in total (not including annexes).

- ii. Table of Contents
- iii. Acronyms and Abbreviations
- 1. Executive Summary (3-5 pages)
 - Projects Information Table
 - Projects Description (brief)
 - Project sProgress 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. Projects Description and Background Context – separately for each project (3-5 pages)
 - Development context: environmental, socio-economic, institutional, and policy factors relevant to the project objective and scope
 - Problems that the projects sought to address: threats and barriers targeted
 - Projects’ Description and Strategy: objective, outcomes and expected results, description of field sites (if any)
 - Projects Implementation Arrangements: short description of the Project Steering Committee, key implementing partner arrangements, etc.
 - Projects timing and milestones
 - Main stakeholders: summary list
- 4. Findings – separately for each project (12-14 pages)
 - 4.1 Project Strategy – separately for each project
 - Project Design
 - Results Framework/Logframe
 - 4.2 Progress Towards Results – separately for each project
 - Progress towards outcomes analysis
 - Remaining barriers to achieving the project objective
 - 4.3 Project Implementation and Adaptive Management – jointly for both projects
 - Management Arrangements
 - Work planning
 - Finance and co-finance
 - Project-level monitoring and evaluation systems
 - Stakeholder engagement
 - Reporting
 - Communications
 - 4.4 Sustainability– separately for each project
 - 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 – separately for each project
 - 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: _____

¹³ www.undp.org/uneqcodeofconduct

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: _____

ToR ANNEX G: MTR Report Audit Trail Template

Note: The following is a template for the MTR Team to show how the received comments on the draft MTR report have (or have not) been incorporated into the final MTR report. This audit trail should be included as an annex in the final MTR report.

To the comments received on (*date*) from the Midterm Review of (*project name*) (UNDP Project ID-*PIMS #*)

The following comments were provided in track changes to the draft Midterm Review report; they are referenced by institution ("Author" column) and track change comment number ("#" column):

Author	#	Para No./ comment location	Comment/Feedback on the draft MTR report	MTR team response and actions taken