

Midterm Evaluation

Increased Resilience to Climate Change in Northern Ghana through the Management of Water Resources and Diversification of Livelihoods Project

Terms of Reference

1. INTRODUCTION

This is the Terms of Reference (ToR) for the Mid-Term Evaluation (MTE) for the UNDP-supported Adaptation Fund financed project titled **Increased Resilience to Climate Change in Northern Ghana through the Management of Water Resources and Diversification of Livelihoods** (00095434) implemented through the Ministry of Environment, Science, Technology and Innovation (MESTI), which is to be undertaken in year 2018. The project started on 23 May 2016 and is in its third year of implementation. This ToR sets out the expectations for this MTE. **The MTR process must follow the guidance outlined in the document [Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects](http://web.undp.org/evaluation/documents/guidance/GEF/mid-term/Guidance_Midterm%20Review%20EN_2014.pdf) (http://web.undp.org/evaluation/documents/guidance/GEF/mid-term/Guidance_Midterm%20Review%20EN_2014.pdf).**

2. PROJECT BACKGROUND INFORMATION

The Government of Ghana (GoG), with funding from the Adaptation Fund Board Secretariat is implementing a four-year project dubbed “Increased resilience to climate change in northern Ghana through the management of water resources and diversification of livelihoods”.

The project aims at addressing climate change-induced decreases in the availability and increasing unpredictability of water resources, and the associated negative impacts of these trends on the livelihoods of rural communities. It is expected to enhance the resilience and adaptive capacity of rural livelihoods to climate impacts and risks on water resources in Northern Ghana.

The objective of the project is expected to be achieved through key results centered on the improvement of water access and increase institutional capacity as well as coordination for integrated water management to support other uses of water resources especially for the diversification of livelihoods by rural communities. This will be done so by delivering the following three complementary outcomes:

- Outcome 1: Improved planning and management of water resources taking into account climate change impacts on surface and groundwater sources
- Outcome 2: Climate resilient management of water resources by communities in Northern Ghana
- Outcome 3: Enhanced diversification of livelihoods of communities in northern Ghana

The project is being executed by the Ministry of Environment, Science, Technology and Innovation (MESTI) of Ghana in partnership with the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), with close cooperation with sectoral ministries and agencies, NGOs and the private sector. The project has been implemented for two (2) full years; May 2016 to April 2018 in selected districts and communities in the three (3) Northern regions of Ghana.

The Project target locations are in the Northern, Upper East and West Regions of Ghana and is expected to directly benefit 60,000 as well as indirectly benefit over 8 million Ghanaians living along the Volta River Basin.

In all ten (10) District Assemblies and a total of fifty (50) selected communities¹ are benefitting directly from the project. The target project areas were selected based on an assessment of district vulnerability. A list of major activities undertaken has been attached as an appendix. Detailed annual reports from project implementation and M&E data will be provided to the consultant at the inception stage.

3. OBJECTIVES OF THE MTE

The MTE 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 MTE will also review the project's strategy, its risks to sustainability.

4. MTE APPROACH & METHODOLOGY

The MTE must provide evidence based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The MTE team will review all relevant sources of information including documents prepared during the preparation phase (i.e. AF Concept, AF Proposal, UNDP Initiation Plan, UNDP Environmental & Social Safeguard Policy, the Project Document, project reports including Project Performance Reports/PPRs, 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 MTE team is expected to follow a collaborative and participatory approach² ensuring close engagement with the Project Team, government counterparts, the UNDP Country Office(s), UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Advisers, and other key stakeholders.

Engagement of stakeholders is vital to a successful MTE. Stakeholder involvement should include interviews with stakeholders who have project responsibilities, including but not limited to field regional and zonal EPA staff, District staff Ministry of Food and Agriculture; District Assembly teams, Regional, District and Community Adaptation Monitoring committees 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 consultant is expected to conduct field missions to the 3 Northern regions of Ghana where the project is being implemented, including the following project districts; Savelugu-Nanton, Zabzugu, Bole, Bongo, Builsa South, Bawku West, Bawku Municipal, Sissala East, Nandom and Nadowli.

The final MTE report should describe the full MTE 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 MTE

The MTE team will assess the following four categories of project progress.

i. Project Strategy

¹ Detailed Beneficiary Districts and Communities are indicated in Appendix 1 of the TOR

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.

Project design:

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

Results Framework/Logframe:

- Are the project's objectives and outcomes or components clear, practical, and feasible within its time frame?
- Examine if progress so far has led to, or could in the future catalyse beneficial development effects (i.e. income generation, gender equality and women's empowerment, improved governance etc..) that should be included in the project results framework and monitored on an annual basis.
- Ensure broader development and gender aspects of the project are being monitored effectively.

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; colour code progress in a "traffic light system" based on the level of progress achieved; assign a rating on progress for each outcome; make recommendations from the areas marked as "Not on target to be achieved" (red).

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

Project Strategy	Indicator ³	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:	<i>Indicator 1:</i> Existence of historical and downscaled climate projections	No downscaled climate projections are in place	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Trend/historical analysis of the impact of climate variability on the White, Black and Oti River basins completed • Climate change projections for the White and Black Volta and the Oti River basins generated • Vulnerability analysis of communities along the White and Black Volta as well as the Oti River Basins Conducted 	All studies in this category has been carried	Downscaled and historical climate projections available for the White Volta, Black Volta and Oti Basins			
	<i>Indicator 2:</i> Revised White Volta management plan	Current plan does not address climate change impacts nor link clearly to community level	The plan has been prepared by another project. The AF project has received a copy of this management plan.	Revised White Volta Plan completed	Revised White Volta Plan completed and adopted at inter-ministerial level			

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

	<i>Indicator 3:</i> Management plans in the Black Volta and five sub-basins in the White Volta and the Oti basins at ministerial level	No plans are in place	National consultants recruited are currently developing these plans	Black Volta and Oti Basin-wide management plans prepared	Black Volta and Oti basin plans adopted at inter-ministerial level			
	<i>Indicator 4:</i> Three regional Climate Change Adaptation Monitoring Committees	There is no committee in place	Adaptation Committees has been established at all 3 levels: Regional, District and Community.	Regional Climate Change Adaptation Monitoring Committees established in the three target regions	Regional Climate Change Adaptation Monitoring Committees established in the three target regions			
Outcome 2:	<i>Indicator 3:</i> Number of communities in which management plans have been developed and are being implemented	Management plans are not in place. Lack of coherent and planned water management activities in communities.	National consultant recruited is currently developing these plans	5 sub-basin plans in the White Volta and the Oti Basins	50 community water management plans implemented by community institutions with at least 50% representation by women in place by end of programme year 2.			
	<i>Indicator 4:</i> Number of operational boreholes, dugouts/dams and rainwater harvesting systems	Communities have limited infrastructure in place for supply and storage of water	50 Boreholes constructed. Recruitment for 50 more to be drilled underway Recruitment for contractors for dams/dugouts underway	50 Boreholes 10 dams/dugouts	100 operational boreholes, benefitting at least 30,000 people (50% of whom should be women) Rainwater harvesting systems in place, providing water supplies to 50 community facilities			
	<i>Indicator 4:</i> Number of operational community scale irrigation systems installed	Very few communities have effective irrigation systems in place	Recruitment for contractors for Mechanised Irrigation schemes to commence in July, 2018	25 mechanised borehole systems for irrigations ddams	50 operational irrigation systems, benefitting at least 2,500 farmers			

Outcome 3	<i>Indicator 5:</i> Number of operational community fish farms established	Few communities benefit from community fish farms	NGOs to undertake this activity has been recruited for this activity in year 3	20 communities should have had fish farms activities started by mid year.	20 community fish farms established, benefitting at least 10,000 people (50% of whom should be women)			
	<i>Indicator 6:</i> Number of tree nurseries/wood lots established	Few communities benefit from community managed tree nurseries and wood lots, nor from bee keeping activities	NGOs to undertake this activity has been recruited for this activity in year 3	40 community tree nurseries and wood lots have nursery/woodlot activities started by mid year.	40 community tree nurseries and wood lots, incorporating bee keeping, established			
	<i>Indicator 7:</i> Number of dry season gardening schemes for women established	Few communities benefit from effective dry season gardening	NGOs to undertake this activity has been recruited for this activity in year 3	18 Dry season gardening schemes for women established.	50 dry season gardening schemes for women established, directly benefitting at least 1,000 women			
	<i>Indicator 8:</i> Number of women led agricultural product processing schemes established	Few communities benefit from agricultural product processing	NGOs to undertake this activity has been recruited for this activity in year 3	12 community level women led agricultural product processing schemes established	40 community level women led agricultural product (shea butter or honey) processing schemes established, directly benefitting at least 1,200 women			
	<i>Indicator 9:</i> Household income	More than 50% of the households in the target communities have income levels below the poverty line	NGOs to undertake livelihood activities has been recruited for this activity in year 3. The full extent of improved household living conditions and income increment.		At least 50% of the households in the target communities increase their income by 30% by the end of the project			

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 AF Results Tracker within the PPR at the Baseline with the one completed right before the Midterm Evaluation.
- 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 AF Partner Agency (UNDP) and recommend areas for improvement.

Work Planning:

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

Finance and co-finance:

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

Project-level Monitoring and Evaluation Systems:

- Review the monitoring tools currently being used: Do they provide the necessary information? Do they involve key partners? Are they aligned or mainstreamed with national systems? Do they use existing information? Are they efficient? Are they cost-effective? Are additional tools required? How could they be made more participatory and inclusive?
- Examine the financial management of the project monitoring and evaluation budget. Are sufficient resources being allocated to monitoring and evaluation? Are these resources being allocated effectively?

Stakeholder Engagement:

- Project management: Has the project developed and leveraged the necessary and appropriate partnerships with direct and tangential stakeholders?
- Participation and country-driven processes: Do local and national government stakeholders support the objectives of the project? Do they continue to have an active role in project decision-making that supports efficient and effective project implementation?
- Participation and public awareness: To what extent has stakeholder involvement and public awareness contributed to the progress towards achievement of project objectives?

Reporting:

- Assess how adaptive management changes have been reported by the project management and shared with the Project Board.
- Assess how well the Project Team and partners undertake and fulfil AF reporting requirements (i.e. how have they addressed poorly-rated PPRs, 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, PPRs, 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 AF assistance ends (consider potential resources can be from multiple sources, such as the public and private sectors, income generating activities, and other funding that will be adequate financial resources for sustaining project's outcomes)?

Socio-economic risks to sustainability:

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

Institutional Framework and Governance risks to sustainability:

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

Environmental risks to sustainability:

- Are there any environmental risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project outcomes?

Conclusions & Recommendations

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

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

The consultant should make no more than 15 recommendations total.

Rec #	Recommendation	Entity Responsible
A	<i>(State Outcome 1)</i> (Outcome 1)	
A.1	Key recommendation:	
A.2		
A.3		
B	<i>(State Outcome 2)</i> (Outcome 2)	
B.1	Key recommendation:	
B.2		
B.3		
C	<i>(State Outcome 3)</i> (Outcome 3), etc.	
C.1	Key recommendation:	
C.2		
C.3		
D	Project Implementation & Adaptive Management	
D.1	Key recommendation:	
D.2		
D.3		
E	Sustainability	
E.1	Key recommendation:	
E.2		
E.		

Ratings

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

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

Measure	MTE 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)	

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

	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 MTE will be approximately 30 working days over 10 -12 weeks and shall not exceed five months from when the consultant(s) are hired. The tentative MTE timeframe is as follows:

TIMEFRAME	ACTIVITY
29 th June, 2018	Application closes
16 th July, 2018	Select MTE Team
17 th July, 2018	Prep the MTE Team (handover of Project Documents)
By 23 rd July, 2018	Document review and preparing MTE Inception Report
By 30 th July, 2018	Finalization and Validation of MTE Inception Report- latest start of MTE mission
6 th – 17 th August, 2018	MTE mission: stakeholder meetings, interviews, field visits
17 th August, 2018	Mission wrap-up meeting & presentation of initial findings
27 th August, 2018	Preparing draft report
14 th September, 2018	Incorporating audit trail from feedback on draft report/Finalization of MTE report
21 st September, 2018	Preparation & Issue of Management Response
28 th September, 2018	Expected date of full MTE completion

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

7. MIDTERM EVALUATION DELIVERABLES

#	Deliverable	Description	Timing	Responsibilities
1	MTE Inception Report	MTE team clarifies objectives and methods of Midterm Evaluation	No later than 2 weeks before the MTE mission <i>30th July, 2018</i>	MTE team submits to the Commissioning Unit and project management
2	Presentation	Initial Findings	End of MTE mission <i>17th August, 2018</i>	MTE 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 MTE mission <i>27th August, 2018</i>	Sent to the Commissioning Unit, reviewed by RTA, Project Coordinating Unit, GEF OFP

4	Final Report*	Revised report with audit trail detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final MTE report	Within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft <i>14th September, 2018</i>	Sent to the Commissioning Unit
---	----------------------	--	---	--------------------------------

*The final MTE 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. MTE ARRANGEMENTS

The principal responsibility for managing this MTE resides with the Commissioning Unit. The Commissioning Unit for this project’s MTE is UNDP Ghana Country Office.

The commissioning unit will contract the consultants and ensure the timely provision of per diems and travel arrangements Ghana for the MTE team. The Project Team will be responsible for liaising with the MTE team to provide all relevant documents, set up stakeholder interviews, and arrange field visits.

9. TEAM COMPOSITION

A team of two independent consultants will conduct the MTE - one team leader (with experience and exposure to climate change and related projects and evaluations in other regions globally) and one local team expert from Ghana. The consultants cannot have participated in the project preparation, formulation, and/or implementation (including the writing of the Project Document) and should not have a conflict of interest with project’s related activities. **The team leader will be responsible to identify the local team expert and include his/her CV in the technical proposal and cost in the financial proposal. UNDP will sign a contract only with the team leader.**

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

A. Team Leader- International (70%)

- A Master’s degree in Climate Change and Livelihoods, Evaluation or Social Research, or other closely related field (*5 marks*);
- At least 10 years experience in conducting result-based management project mid-term or terminal evaluations, preferably for GEF/AF projects (*30 marks*);
- Experience applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios (*5 marks*);
- Demonstrated work experience in the technical areas of the project (*15 marks*);
- Competence in adaptive management regarding climate change adaptation (*5 marks*);
- Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender and livelihoods in relation to climate change Adaptation; experience in gender sensitive evaluation and analysis (*5 marks*);
- Knowledge of and experience in West Africa and Ghana in particular is an asset (*5 marks*);
- Excellent communication skills;
- Demonstrable analytical skills.

B. Assistant Team Leader- National/Local (30%)

- A Master’s degree in Climate Change and Livelihoods, Evaluation or Social Research, or other closely related field (3 marks);
- At least 5 years experience in conducting result-based management project mid-term or terminal evaluations, preferably for GEF/AF projects (10 marks);

- Experience applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios (5 marks);
- Demonstrated work experience in the technical areas of the project (5 marks);
- Competence in adaptive management regarding climate change adaptation (2 marks);
- Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender and livelihoods in relation to climate change Adaptation; experience in gender sensitive evaluation and analysis (2marks);
- Knowledge of and experience in West Africa and Ghana in particular is an asset (3 marks);
- Excellent communication skills;
- • Demonstrable analytical skills.

10. PAYMENT MODALITIES AND SPECIFICATIONS

The payment plan will follow this modality;

15% of payment upon approval of the final MTE Inception Report and Work plan

30% upon submission of the draft MTE report

55% upon finalization of the MTE 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);
- c) **Brief description of approach to work/technical proposal** of why the individual considers him/herself as the most suitable for the assignment, and a proposed methodology on how they will approach and complete the assignment; (max 1 page)
- d) **Financial Proposal** that indicates the all-inclusive fixed total contract price and all other travel related costs (such as flight ticket, per diem, etc), supported by a breakdown of costs, as per template attached to the Letter of Confirmation of Interest template. If an applicant is employed by an organization/company/institution, and he/she expects his/her employer to charge a management fee in the process of releasing him/her to UNDP under Reimbursable Loan Agreement (RLA), the applicant must indicate at this point, and ensure that all such costs are duly incorporated in the financial proposal submitted to UNDP.

All application materials should be submitted to the address:

XXX

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

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

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 MTE 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 Performance Reports (PPR's)
7. Quarterly progress reports and work plans of the various implementation task teams
8. Audit reports
9. Oversight mission reports
10. All monitoring reports prepared by the project
11. Financial and Administration guidelines used by Project Team

The following documents will also be available:

12. Project operational guidelines, manuals and systems
13. UNDP country/countries programme document(s)
14. Minutes of the Increased Resilience to Climate Change in Northern Ghana through the Management of Water Resources and Diversification of Livelihoods Board Meetings and other meetings (i.e. Project Appraisal Committee meetings)
15. Project site location maps

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

- i. Basic Report Information (*for opening page or title page*)
 - Title of UNDP supported AF financed project
 - UNDP PIMS# and AF project ID#
 - MTE time frame and date of MTE report
 - Region and countries included in the project
 - AF Operational Focal Area/Strategic Program
 - Executing Agency/Implementing Partner and other project partners
 - MTE 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)
 - MTE Ratings & Achievement Summary Table
 - Concise summary of conclusions
 - Recommendation Summary Table
2. Introduction (*2-3 pages*)
 - Purpose of the MTE and objectives
 - Scope & Methodology: principles of design and execution of the MTE, MTE approach and data collection methods, limitations to the MTE
 - Structure of the MTE report

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

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 MTE'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
 - MTE ToR (excluding ToR annexes)
 - MTE evaluative matrix (evaluation criteria with key questions, indicators, sources of data, and methodology)
 - Example Questionnaire or Interview Guide used for data collection
 - Ratings Scales
 - MTE 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 MTE final report clearance form
 - *Annexed in a separate file:* Audit trail from received comments on draft MTE report
 - *Annexed in a separate file:* Relevant midterm tracking tools

ToR ANNEX C: Midterm Evaluation 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 MTE 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.

MTE 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: MTE 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 Evaluation
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: MTE Report Clearance Form

(to be completed by the Commissioning Unit and UNDP-GEF RTA and included in the final document)

Midterm Evaluation Report Reviewed and Cleared By:	
Commissioning Unit	
Name: _____	
Signature: _____	Date: _____
UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Advisor	
Name: _____	
Signature: _____	Date: _____

ToR ANNEX G: Audit Trail Template

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

To the comments received on 15th August from the Midterm Evaluation of Increased Resilience to Climate Change in Northern Ghana through the Management of Water Resources and Diversification of Livelihoods (UNDP Project ID - 00095434)

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