TERMS OF REFERENCE
Individual Contractor

1. **Assignment Information**

Assignment Title:	International Mid-Term Review Consultant
Cluster/Project:	Reducing the vulnerability of Cambodian rural livelihoods through enhanced sub-national climate change planning and execution of priority actions (SRL)
Post Level:	Specialist
Contract Type:	Individual Contractor (IC)
Duty Station Expected Place of Travel:	Phnom Penh, Cambodia with some travels to provinces (Kampong Thom and Siem Reap provinces)
Contract Duration:	25 working days, from 03 September to 30 November 2018

2. **Project Description**

Over the last 20 years, Cambodia has attained impressive economic growth. With an average GDP growth of 7 percent, Cambodia has been among the fastest growing economies in Asia and becoming a lower middle-income country (LMIC). Approximately 70% of Cambodian households derive all or an important part of their income from agriculture and the majority of agricultural production is dependent on the monsoon rain and natural floods/recession of the Tonle Sap River and Lake. Climate change is likely to disrupt the natural cycle of the monsoonal system and the hydrological function of the interconnected Mekong-Tonle Sap River drainage system and therefore cause a significant impact on the livelihood and welfare of rural Cambodians.

This project has been designed to reduce the vulnerability of rural Cambodians, especially land-poor, landless and/or women-headed households. This will be achieved through investments in small-scale water management infrastructure, technical assistance to resilient agricultural practices, and capacity building support, especially targeting poor women, for improved food production in home gardens. Importantly, these services will be delivered by sub-national administrations (communes, districts and provinces) with a view to strengthen their overall capacity to plan, design and deliver public services for resilience building. The objective of the project, therefore, is to improve sub-national administration systems affecting investments in rural livelihoods through climate sensitive planning, budgeting and execution. The objective will be achieved through three Outcomes: 1). Climate Sensitive Planning, Budgeting and Execution at Sub-National Level Strengthened, 2). Resilience of Livelihoods of the most vulnerable improved against erratic rainfall, floods and droughts, and 3). Enabling environment is enhanced at sub-national level to attract and manage greater volume of climate change adaptation finance for building resilience of rural livelihoods.

The Department of Climate Change (DCC) of the General Secretariat of the National Council for Sustainable Development (NCSD), chaired by the Minister of the Ministry of Environment (MoE) is the Implementing Partner, with support from a number of key technical ministries including the Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries, the Ministry of Water Resources and Meteorology, etc. To ensure cross-sectoral integration as well as responsiveness to local needs and sustainability, sub-national activities of the Project have been integrated with the National Programme for Sub-National Democratic Development (NP-SNDD) under the coordination of National Committee for Sub-National Democratic Development Secretariat (NCDDS). The Project is implemented in 89 communes of 10 districts in Siem Reap and Kampong Thom provinces over a four-year period, starting from June 2016.However, due to a number of institutional arrangement and mobilization of the project team, the practical implementation of the project activities have been started since March 2017 following the official launch of the project inception workshop to the stakeholders.

3. Scope of Work

This is the Terms of Reference (ToR) for the Midterm Review (MTR) of the project titled "Reducing the vulnerability of Cambodian rural livelihoods through enhanced sub-national climate change planning and execution of priority actions", known as the SRL project. In line with the UNDP-GEF Guidance on MTRs, this MTR process would be initiated before the submission of the second Project Implementation Report (PIR). However, due to the delay in starting up the project, the Project Board decided in its second project board meeting to postpone the MTR to October 2018, which is after the second PIR. This ToR sets out the expectations for this MTR.

The purpose of MTR is to examine the performance of the project since the beginning of its implementation. The review will include both the evaluation of the progress in project implementation, measured against planned Outputs set forth in the Project Document, in accordance with rational budget allocation and the assessment of features related to the process involved in achieving those Outputs, as well as the initial and potential impacts of the project. The review will also address underlying causes and issues that have contributed to targets not adequately achieved.

The MTR is intended to identify weaknesses and strengths of the project design and provide recommendations for any necessary change alignments in the overall design and orientation of the project. This is done by evaluating the adequacy, efficiency, and effectiveness of project implementation, as well as assessing actual achievements of project Outputs and Outcomes to date. Consequently, the review mission is also expected to make detailed recommendations on the work plan for the remaining project period. It will also provide an opportunity to assess early signs of project success or failure, and prompt necessary adjustments.

The review mission will identify lessons learnt and best practices from the project which could be applied to future and other on-going projects. The review will also make recommendations on setting up a strategic vision for the time after the project has ended.

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

i. Project Strategy
<u>Project design</u>:
- Review the problem addressed by the project and the underlying assumptions. Review the effect of any incorrect assumptions or changes to the context to achieving the project results as outlined in the Project Document.
- Review the relevance of the project strategy and assess whether it provides the most effective route towards expected/intended results. Were lessons from other relevant projects properly incorporated into the project design?
- Review how the project addresses country priorities. Review country ownership. Was the project concept in line with the national sector development priorities and plans of the country (or of participating countries in the case of multi-country projects)?
- Review decision-making processes: were perspectives of those who would be affected by project decisions, those who could affect the outcomes, and those who could contribute information or other resources to the process, taken into account during project design processes?
- Review the extent to which relevant gender issues were raised in the project design. See Annex 9 of *Guidance for Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects* for further guidelines.
- If there are major areas of concern, recommend areas for improvement.

<u>Results Framework/Log-frame</u>:
- Undertake a critical analysis of the project's log-frame 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 catalyze 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 log-frame 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; color 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[1]	Baseline Level[2]	Level in 1st PIR (self-reported)	Midterm Target[3]	End-of-project Target	Midterm Level & Assessment [4]	Achievement Rating[5]	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:
- Compare and analyze 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.

---

[1] Populate with data from the Log-frame and scorecards
[2] Populate with data from the Project Document
[3] If available
[4] Color code this column only
[5] Use the 6-point Progress Towards Results Rating Scale: HS, S, MS, MU, U, HU

- 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.

<u>Work Planning:</u>
- 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/log-frame as a management tool and review any changes made to it since project start.

<u>Finance and co-finance:</u>
- 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?

<u>Project-level Monitoring and Evaluation Systems:</u>
- 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?

<u>Stakeholder Engagement:</u>
- 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?

<u>Reporting:</u>
- 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.

<u>Environmental risks to sustainability:</u>
- Are there any environmental risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project outcomes?

Conclusions & Recommendations

The consultant will include a section of the report setting out the MTR's evidence-based conclusions, in light of the findings.[6]

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

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

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

4. Expected Outputs and Deliverables

The consultant will produce the following deliverables to UNDP, UNDP/GEF-LDCF and the Project Board:

- A presentation of evaluation methodology and the findings to key stakeholders;
- An executive summary, jointly prepared by the MTR Team, emphasizing key findings and key recommendations;
- A detailed evaluation report covering scope of the mid-term review with detailed attention to lessons learnt and recommendations; and
- List of annexes prepared by the consultants including TOR's, itinerary, list of persons interviewed, summary of field visits, list of documents reviewed, questionnaire and summary of results, co-financing and leveraged resources.

The report together with the Annexes shall be written in English and shall be presented in electronic form in MS Word format.

The Deliverables and timeline are summarized in the below table:

N	Deliverables/Outputs	Estimated Duration to Complete	Target Due Dates	Review and Approvals Required
1	**MTR Inception Report:** Consultant clarifies objectives and methods of Midterm Review	4 days No later than 2 weeks before the MTR mission	14 Sep. 2018	UNDP CO/NCSD /NCDDS UNDP RTA
2	**Presentation:** Initial Findings	8 days End of MTR mission	30 Oct. 2018	UNDP CO/NCSD /NCDDS UNDP RTA
5	**Draft Report:** Full report (using guidelines on content outlined in Annex B) with annexes	8 days Within 2 weeks after MTR mission	09 Nov. 2018	UNDP CO/NCSD /NCDDS UNDP RTA
6	**Final Report*:** Revised report with audit trail detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final MTR report	5 days Within 1 week of receiving comments on draft	22 Nov. 2018	Project Board UNDP RTA
	Total # of Days:	**25 days**		

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

5. Institutional Arrangement

- The evaluation will be commissioned by the UNDP country office (CO) in Cambodia and managed by Head of Programme and Result Unit, UNDP. Two independent consultants (One International and One National) will be selected and tasked to carry out the evaluation.

- The International Consultant act as the Team Leader and will work with the National Consultant. The International Consultant is responsible for the leading of the MTR mission and compiling the MTR final report.

- The UNDP CO will contract the consultants and ensure the timely provision travel arrangements within the country for the evaluation team. The Project Team will be responsible for liaising with the consultant team to set up stakeholder interviews, arrange field visits, coordinate with the Government etc.

- The Consultant will also interact with the UNDP Regional Technical Advisor, if needed, to ensure that the approach and methodology are in line with the GEF requirements.

- The consultant to be hired, cannot have participated in the project preparation, formulation, and/or implementation (including the writing of the Project Document) and should not have a conflict of interest with project's related activities.

Role of the international consultant (team leader):

A. The consultant is responsible to provide her/his technical expertise to deliver the expected outputs as per her/his ToR;
B. The international consultant will be designated as the team leader and will be responsible to lead the MTR and deliver the expected outputs;
C. The international consultant shall report to the Head of Programme and Results Unit, UNDP CO.
D. The international consultant needs to maintain daily communication with the UNDP project focal person as and if/when problems emerge during the consultancy period, especially if they affect the scope of the job.

Role of the national consultant

A. The consultant is responsible to provide her/his technical expertise to deliver the expected outputs as per these ToR;
B. The consultant shall report to and work in close collaboration with the team leader of the MRT process.

6. **Duration of the Work**

The total duration of the MTR will be approximately 25 working days over a time period from early-September 2018 till late-November 2018 and shall not exceed five months from when the consultant(s) are hired. The tentative MTR timeframe is as follows:

Deliverables/Outputs	Estimated Duration to Complete	Target Due Dates
• Document review and preparing MTR Inception Report (MTR Inception Report due no later than 2 weeks before the MTR mission)	4 days	14 Sep. 2018

• MTR mission: stakeholder meetings, interviews, field visits and presentation of initial findings- last day of the MTR mission	8 days	30 Oct. 2018
• Preparing draft report (due within 3 weeks of the MTR mission)	8 days	09 Nov. 2018
• Finalization of MTR report/Incorporating audit trail from feedback on draft report (due within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on the draft) (note: accommodate time delay in dates for circulation and review of the draft report)	5 days	22 Nov. 2018

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

7. Duty Station

The Consultant will need to travel to Cambodia during the period of 17 September to 31 October 2018 to conduct stakeholder interviews, visit the project sites and make a presentation of the initial findings of the evaluation. The project team will arrange the transportation and necessary logistic arrangement for field visits when needed. Other work will be home-based.

Selected individual contract(s) who is expected to travel to the Country Office (CO) to undertake the assignment in the country (Cambodia) is required to undertake the *Basic Security in the Field (BSIF) training* (https://dss.un.org/dssweb/WelcometoUNDSS/tabid/105/Default.aspx?Returnurl=%2fdssweb%2f) prior to travelling.

8. Minimum Qualifications of the Consultant

Education:	• A Master degree in environmental studies, development studies, and other related fields.
Experience:	• Minimum 10 years of result-based project management, monitoring and evaluation of environmental related projects • Experience with GEF financed projects is an advantage • Proven experience of evaluating similar projects, preferably involving UNDP/GEF or others UN Development Agencies or major donors • Technical knowledge in the targeted focal area(s): Climate Change Adaptation/Disaster Management, agriculture, natural resource management and/or rural development. • Experience working with government, particularly with projects under National Implementation is an asset. • Experience and knowledge of the Cambodian development context.
Competencies:	• Familiarity with government planning systems and institutional roles

	• Ability to interact with senior government officials • Team leadership experience • Displays cultural, gender, religion, race, nationality and age sensitivity and adaptability
Language Requirement:	• Full proficiency in English (written and spoken).
Other Requirements (if any):	

9. Criteria for Evaluation of Level of Technical Compliance of the Consultant

The selection of consultants will be aimed at maximizing the overall qualities in the following technical evaluation areas:

Technical Evaluation Criteria	Obtainable Score
A Master degree in environmental studies, development studies, and other related field.	10
Proven experience of evaluating similar projects, preferably involving UNDP/GEF or others UN Development Agencies or major donors	30
Minimum 10 years of result-based project management, monitoring and evaluation of environmental related projects	30
Technical knowledge in the targeted focal area(s): Climate Change Adaptation/Disaster Management, agriculture, natural resource management and/or rural development.	30
Total Obtainable Score:	**100**

10. Payment Milestones

This is a fixed out-put based contract price regardless of extension of the herein specific duration. The consultant will be paid on a lump sum basis under the following installments.

N	Outputs/Deliveries	Payment Schedule	Payment Amount
1	First payment will be made upon approval of the final MTR Inception Report	20 Sep. 2018	20%
2	Second payment will be made upon satisfactory completion of the draft MTR report.	18 Nov. 2018	30%
3	Final payment will be made upon approval of the Final MTR Report	30 Nov. 2018	50%

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

1. Project Identification Form (PIF)
2. UNDP Initiation Plan
3. UNDP Project Document
4. Project Inception Report
5. All Project Implementation Reports (PIR's)
6. Quarterly progress reports and work plans of the various implementation task teams
7. Oversight mission reports
8. All monitoring reports prepared by the project
9. Financial and Administration guidelines used by Project Team

The following documents will also be available:

10. Project operational guidelines, manuals and systems
11. UNDP country/countries programme document(s)
12. Minutes of the SRL Project Board Meetings and other meetings
13. Project site location maps

ANNEX B: Guidelines on Contents for the Midterm Review Report7

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

  ii. Table of Contents

 iii. Acronyms and Abbreviations

  1.   Executive Summary *(3-5 pages)*
- Project Information Table
- Project Description (brief)
- Project Progress Summary (between 200-500 words)
- MTR Ratings & Achievement Summary Table
- Concise summary of conclusions
- Recommendation Summary Table

  2.   Introduction *(2-3 pages)*
- Purpose of the MTR and objectives
- Scope & Methodology: principles of design and execution of the MTR, MTR approach and data collection methods, limitations to the MTR
- Structure of the MTR report

  3.   Project Description and Background Context *(3-5 pages)*
- Development context: environmental, socio-economic, institutional, and policy factors relevant to the project objective and scope
- Problems that the project sought to address: threats and barriers targeted
- Project Description and Strategy: objective, outcomes and expected results, description of field sites (if any)
- Project Implementation Arrangements: short description of the Project Board, key implementing partner 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

---

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

- 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.)*

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.

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: _____

---

8 http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/100

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