ANNEX 2

SUPPORTING INFORMATION TO TERMS OF REFERENCE

1. **INTRODUCTION**

1.1 Project Background

The project being implemented in collaboration with the General Directorate of Forestry, Department of Forest and Village Relations (aka ORKOY) is a 4 year long (2016-2020) GEF Full Size Project, namely Sustainable Energy Financing Mechanism for Solar Photovoltaic Systems in Forest Villages in Turkey, aka ORKOY GEF Project. The project assists Turkey with the promotion and financing of on-grid solar PV systems via village cooperatives in forest villages. The public support and involvement in the initiative will be led by the GDF, working together with other key actors in the solar PV value chain, including private sector solar PV installers, Turkish utilities, and domestic and international banks as well as other institutions that provide financing. The project objective is to support the successful launching of a sustainable energy financing mechanism within the ORKOY credit mechanism to ensure that there is at least 30 MW of installed capacity of grid-connected, cooperative solar PV in forest villages) by the end of the project; 28,750 tons CO_2eq avoided emissions from the power sector (compared to the project baseline) by the end of the project; 30MWp cumulative installed capacity of grid-connected PV systems; 47,520,000 kWh/year cumulative total electricity generation from installed grid-connected PV systems and 450 created job positions for forest villagers. The project is divided in 3 components focused on;

- Developing and expanding the policy and institutional framework to promote on-grid, residential solar PV (Component 1),

- Demonstrating the technical and economic viability as well as the business model of the ORKOY sustainable energy financing mechanism for solar PV systems through 4 pilot installations (Component 2), and

- Scaling up and replication at the national level (Component 3).

The financing scheme will be divided on 4 phases. The first one will use grants only for financing of the pilot sites installation; second phase will use combination of GEF and ORKOY grants and ORKOY soft loan; third phase will introduce commercial loan together with GEF/ORKOY grants and ORKOY soft loan and the last phase will use deferred supplier payment tool in combination with ORKOY grant/soft loan and commercial line of credit.

1.2 Standard UNDP/GEF M&E requirements

This Mid Term Review (MTR) is initiated by the UNDP Turkey as the Implementation Agency for this project and it aims to provide managers (at the Project Implementation Unit, UNDP Turkey Country Office and UNDP-GEF levels) with strategy and policy options for more effectively and efficiently achieving the project's expected results and for replicating the results. It also provides the basis for learning and accountability for managers and stakeholders.

The Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) policy at the project level in UNDP/GEF has four objectives:

- to monitor and evaluate results and impacts;
- to provide a basis for decision making on necessary amendments and improvements;
- to promote accountability for resource use; and
- to document, provide feedback on, and disseminate lessons learned.

A mix of tools is used to ensure effective project M&E. These might be applied continuously throughout the lifetime of the project – e.g. periodic monitoring of indicators -, or as specific time-bound exercises such as mid-term reviews, audit reports and independent evaluations.

In accordance with UNDP/GEF M&E policies and procedures, all projects with long implementation periods are strongly encouraged to conduct mid-term evaluations. In addition to providing an independent in-depth review of implementation progress, this type of evaluation is responsive to GEF Council decisions on transparency and better access of information during implementation.

The MTR is intended to identify potential project design problems, assess progress towards the achievement of objective, identify and document lessons learned (including lessons that might improve design and implementation of other UNDP-GEF projects), and to make recommendations regarding specific actions that might be taken to improve the project. It is expected to serve as a tool of validating or filling the gaps in the initial assessment of relevance, effectiveness and efficiency obtained from monitoring. The MTR provides the opportunity to assess early signs of project success or failure and prompt necessary adjustments.

DETAILED SCOPE OF THE MTR

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

i. Project Strategy

Project design:

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

- Review the relevance of the project strategy and assess whether it provides the most effective route towards expected/intended results. Were lessons from other relevant projects properly incorporated into the project design?

- Review how the project addresses country priorities. Review country ownership. Was the project concept in line with the national sector development priorities and plans of the country (or of participating countries in the case of multi-country projects)?

- Review decision-making processes: were perspectives of those who would be affected by project decisions, those who could affect the outcomes, and those who could contribute information or other resources to the process, taken into account during project design processes?

- Review the extent to which relevant gender issues were raised in the project design. See Annex 9 of *Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects* for further guidelines.

- If there are major areas of concern, recommend areas for improvement.

Results Framework/Logframe:

- Undertake a critical analysis of the project's logframe indicators and targets, assess how "SMART" the midterm and end-of-project targets are (Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Relevant, Time-bound), and suggest specific amendments/revisions to the targets and indicators as necessary.

- Are the project's objectives and outcomes or components clear, practical, and feasible within its time frame?

- Examine if progress so far has led to, or could in the future catalyse beneficial development effects (i.e. income generation, gender equality and women's empowerment, improved governance etc...) that should be included in the project results framework and monitored on an annual basis.

- Ensure broader development and gender aspects of the project are being monitored effectively. Develop and recommend SMART 'development' indicators, including sex-disaggregated indicators and indicators that capture development benefits.

ii.   Progress Towards Results

Progress Towards Outcomes Analysis:

- Review the logframe indicators against progress made towards the end-of-project targets using the Progress Towards Results Matrix and following the *Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects*; colour code progress in a "traffic light system" based on the level of progress achieved; assign a rating on progress for each outcome; make recommendations from the areas marked as "Not on target to be achieved" (red).

Indicator Assessment Key

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

In addition to the progress towards outcomes analysis:

- Compare and analyse the GEF Tracking Tool at the Baseline with the one completed right before the Midterm Review.

- Identify remaining barriers to achieving the project objective in the remainder of the project.

- By reviewing the aspects of the project that have already been successful, identify ways in which the project can further expand these benefits.

iii.   Project Implementation and Adaptive Management

Management Arrangements:

- Review overall effectiveness of project management as outlined in the Project Document. Have changes been made and are they effective? Are responsibilities and reporting lines clear? Is decision-making transparent and undertaken in a timely manner? Recommend areas for improvement.

- Review the quality of execution of the Executing Agency/Implementing Partner(s) and recommend areas for improvement.

- Review the quality of support provided by the GEF Partner Agency (UNDP) and recommend areas for improvement.

Work Planning:

- Review any delays in project start-up and implementation, identify the causes and examine if they have been resolved.

- Are work-planning processes results-based? If not, suggest ways to re-orientate work planning to focus on results?

- Examine the use of the project's results framework/ logframe as a management tool and review any changes made to it since project start.

Finance and co-finance:

- Consider the financial management of the project, with specific reference to the cost-effectiveness of interventions.

- Review the changes to fund allocations as a result of budget revisions and assess the appropriateness and relevance of such revisions.

- Does the project have the appropriate financial controls, including reporting and planning, that allow management to make informed decisions regarding the budget and allow for timely flow of funds?

- Informed by the co-financing monitoring table to be filled out, provide commentary on co-financing: is co-financing being used strategically to help the objectives of the project? Is the Project Team meeting with all co-financing partners regularly in order to align financing priorities and annual work plans?

Project-level Monitoring and Evaluation Systems:

- Review the monitoring tools currently being used: Do they provide the necessary information? Do they involve key partners? Are they aligned or mainstreamed with national systems? Do they use existing information? Are they efficient? Are they cost-effective? Are additional tools required? How could they be made more participatory and inclusive?

- Examine the financial management of the project monitoring and evaluation budget. Are sufficient resources being allocated to monitoring and evaluation? Are these resources being allocated effectively?

Stakeholder Engagement:

- Project management: Has the project developed and leveraged the necessary and appropriate partnerships with direct and tangential stakeholders?

- Participation and country-driven processes: Do local and national government stakeholders support the objectives of the project? Do they continue to have an active role in project decision-making that supports efficient and effective project implementation?

- Participation and public awareness: To what extent has stakeholder involvement and public awareness contributed to the progress towards achievement of project objectives?

Reporting:

- Assess how adaptive management changes have been reported by the project management and shared with the Project Board.

- Assess how well the Project Team and partners undertake and fulfil GEF reporting requirements (i.e. how have they addressed poorly-rated PIRs, if applicable?)

- Assess how lessons derived from the adaptive management process have been documented, shared with key partners and internalized by partners.

Communications:

- Review internal project communication with stakeholders: Is communication regular and effective? Are there key stakeholders left out of communication? Are there feedback mechanisms when communication is received? Does this communication with stakeholders contribute to their awareness of project outcomes and activities and investment in the sustainability of project results?

- Review external project communication: Are proper means of communication established or being established to express the project progress and intended impact to the public (is there a web presence, for example? Or did the project implement appropriate outreach and public awareness campaigns?)

- For reporting purposes, write one half-page paragraph that summarizes the project's progress towards results in terms of contribution to sustainable development benefits, as well as global environmental benefits.

iv. **Sustainability**

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

- In addition, assess the following risks to sustainability:

Financial risks to sustainability:

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

Socio-economic risks to sustainability:

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

Institutional Framework and Governance risks to sustainability:

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

Environmental risks to sustainability:

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

Conclusions & Recommendations

The MTR expert will include a section of the report setting out the MTR's evidence-based conclusions, in light of the findings.[1]

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 expert should make no more than 15 recommendations total.

Ratings

The MTR expert 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 the Project

Measure	MTR Rating	Achievement Description

---

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

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)	

3. TEAM COMPOSITION

An Independent International Consultant will conduct the MTR in collaboration with Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy Senior Technical Advisor and Monitoring & Evaluation Advisor at UNDP CO. The consultant 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.

List of Documents to be reviewed by the MTR Expert

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. Audit reports

8. Knowledge products and visibility materials including reports, training materials, etc. produced under the project

9. Finalized GEF focal area Tracking Tools at CEO endorsement and midterm (*fill in specific TTs for this project's focal area*)

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. UNDP country/countries programme document(s)

13. Minutes of the Project Steering Committee Meetings and other meetings (if any)

14. Project site location maps

Guidelines on Contents for the Midterm Review Report[2]

   i. Basic Report Information *(for opening page or title page)*

- Title of UNDP / UNIDO supported GEF financed project

- UNDP PIMS#, UNIDO SAP# 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 Expert

- 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

---

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

- Structure of the MTR report

3. **Project Description and Background Context** *(3-5 pages)*

- Development context: environmental, socio-economic, institutional, and policy factors relevant to the project objective and scope

- Problems that the project sought to address: threats and barriers targeted

- Project Description and Strategy: objective, outcomes and expected results, description of field sites (if any)

- Project Implementation Arrangements: short description of the Project Board, key implementing partner arrangements, etc.

- Project timing and milestones

- Main stakeholders: summary list

4. **Findings** *(12-14 pages)*

    4.1 Project Strategy

- Project Design

- Results Framework/Logframe

    4.2 Progress Towards Results

- Progress towards outcomes analysis

- Remaining barriers to achieving the project objective

    4.3 Project Implementation and Adaptive Management

- Management Arrangements

- Work planning

- Finance and co-finance

- Project-level monitoring and evaluation systems

- Stakeholder engagement

- Reporting

- Communications

    4.4 Sustainability

- Financial risks to sustainability

- Socio-economic to sustainability

- Institutional framework and governance risks to sustainability

- Environmental risks to sustainability

5. **Conclusions and Recommendations** *(4-6 pages)*

    5.1 Conclusions

- Comprehensive and balanced statements (that are evidence-based and connected to the MTR's findings) which highlight the strengths, weaknesses and results of the project

5.2 Recommendations

- Corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project
- Actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the project
- Proposals for future directions underlining main objectives

6. Annexes

- MTR ToR (excluding ToR annexes)
- MTR evaluative matrix (evaluation criteria with key questions, indicators, sources of data, and methodology)
- Example Questionnaire or Interview Guide used for data collection
- Ratings Scales
- MTR mission itinerary
- List of persons interviewed
- List of documents reviewed
- Co-financing table (if not previously included in the body of the report)
- Signed UNEG Code of Conduct form
- Signed MTR final report clearance form
- *Annexed in a separate file:* Audit trail from received comments on draft MTR report
- *Annexed in a separate file:* Relevant midterm tracking tools (*METT, FSC, Capacity scorecard, etc.*)

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	(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.)

mitigation strategies, 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?			

UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluators/Midterm Review Consultants[3]

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: _____

MTR Ratings

---

[3] www.undp.org/unegcodeofconduct

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

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: _____

Audit Trail Template

Note: The following is a template for the MTR Expert 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 Expert response and actions taken

2. EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

The project progress and achievements will be tested against following GEF evaluation criteria:

- Relevance – the extent to which the activity is suited to local and national development priorities and organizational policies, including changes over time.
- Effectiveness – the extent to which an objective has been achieved or how likely it is to be achieved.
- Efficiency – the extent to which results have been delivered with the least costly resources possible.
- Results/impacts – the positive and negative, and foreseen and unforeseen, changes to and effects produced by a development intervention. In GEF terms, results include direct project outputs, short-to medium term outcomes, and longer-term impact including global environmental benefits, replication effects and other, local effects.

- Sustainability – the likely ability of an intervention to continue to deliver benefits for an extended period of time after completion. Projects need to be environmentally as well as financially and socially sustainable.

The Project will be rated against individual criterion of *relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and impact/results based* on the following scale:

- Highly Satisfactory (HS): The project has no shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives.
- Satisfactory (S): The project has minor shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives.
- Moderately Satisfactory (MS): The project has moderate shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives.
- Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): The project has significant shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives.
- Unsatisfactory (U) The project has major shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives.
- Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): The project has severe shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives.

As for *sustainability criteria* the evaluator should at the minimum evaluate the "likelihood of sustainability of outcomes at project termination, and provide a rating for this.

The following four dimensions or aspects of sustainability should be addressed:

Financial resources:

a. Are there any financial risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project outcomes?
b. What is the likelihood of financial and economic resources not being available once the GEF assistance ends (resources can be from multiple sources, such as the public and private sectors, income generating activities, and trends that may indicate that it is likely that in future there will be adequate financial resources for sustaining project's outcomes)?

Socio-political:

a. Are there any social or political risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project outcomes?
b. 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?
c. Do the various key stakeholders see that it is in their interest that the project benefits continue to flow?
d. Is there sufficient public / stakeholder awareness in support of the long term objectives of the project?

Institutional framework and governance:

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

Environmental:

a. Are there any environmental risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project outcomes? The evaluation should assess whether certain activities will pose a threat to the sustainability of the project outcomes. For example, construction of dam in a protected area could inundate a sizable area and thereby neutralizing the biodiversity related gains made by the project.

On each of the dimensions of sustainability of the project outcomes will be rated as follows:

- Likely (L): There are no or negligible risks that affect this dimension of sustainability.
- Moderately Likely (ML): There are moderate risks that affect this dimension of sustainability.
- Moderately Unlikely (MU): There are significant risks that affect this dimension of sustainability
- Unlikely (U): There are severe risks that affect this dimension of sustainability.

All the risk dimensions of sustainability are critical. Therefore, overall rating for sustainability will not be higher than the rating of the dimension with lowest ratings. For example, if a project has an 'Unlikely' rating in either of the dimensions then its overall rating cannot be higher than 'Unlikely'.

The evaluator should develop detailed methodology and work plan for MTR during the preparatory phase of the MTR. The MTR tools and techniques may include, but not limited to:

- Desk review;
- Interviews with Project Management Unit and key stakeholders, including UNDP Country Office in Turkey, General Directorate of Forestry (GDF) of the Ministry of Forestry and Water Affairs and any other stakeholders as deemed necessary.
- Questionnaires.
- Participatory techniques and other approaches for gathering and analysis of data.

An indicative outline of the Mid-term Evaluation Report is presented below.

3. INDICATIVE OUTLINE OF THE MID-TERM EVALUATION REPORT

Title and opening page

- Provide the following information:
- Name of the UNDP/GEF project
- UNDP and GEF project ID#s.
- Evaluation time frame and date of evaluation report
- Region and countries included in the project
- GEF Operational Program/Strategic Program
- Executing Agency and project partners
- Evaluation team members
- Acknowledgements

Executive Summary

- 2 -3 pages that:
- Briefly describe the project evaluated
- Explain the purpose and objectives of the evaluation, including the audience
- Describes key aspects of the evaluation approach and methods
- Summarizes principle conclusions, recommendations and lessons

(See: UNDP Editorial Manual[4])

Introduction

- Purpose of the evaluation
- Briefly explain why the mid-term evaluation was conducted (the purpose), why the project is being evaluated at this point in time, why the evaluation addressed the questions it did, and the primary intended audience.
- Key issues addressed
- Providing an overview of the evaluation questions raised
- Methodology of the evaluation
- Clear explanation of the evaluation's scope, primary objectives and main questions. The Evaluation ToR may also elaborate additional objectives that are specific to the project focal area and national circumstances, and which may address the project's integration with other UNDP strategic interventions in the project area
- Stakeholders' engagement in the evaluation, including how the level of stakeholder involvement contributes to the credibility of the evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendations.
- Structure of the evaluation
- Acquaint the reader with the structure and contents of the report and how the information contained in the report will meet the purposes of the evaluation and satisfy the information needs of the report's intended users

Evaluation Team

- Briefly describing the composition of the evaluation team, background and skills and the appropriateness of the technical skill mix, gender balance and geographical representation.

Ethics

- The evaluator should note the steps taken to protect the rights and confidentiality of persons interviewed (see UNEG 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluators' for more information).[5] Attached to this report should be a signed 'Code of Conduct' form from the evaluator.

Project Description and development context

- Project start and duration
- Problems that the project seeks to address
- Immediate and development objectives of the project

---

[4] UNDP Style Manual, Office of Communications, Partnerships Bureau, updated November 2008

[5] UNEG, 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation', June 2008.

- Main stakeholders

Findings

- (In addition to a descriptive assessment, all criteria marked with (*) should be rated[6])

Project Formulation

- Analysis of LFA (Project logic /strategy; Indicators)
- Assumptions and Risks
- Lessons from other relevant projects (e.g., same focal area) incorporated into project implementation
- Stakeholder participation
- Replication approach
- UNDP comparative advantage
- Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector, including management arrangements

Project Implementation

- The logical framework used during implementation as a management and M&E tool
- Effective partnerships arrangements established for implementation of the project with relevant stakeholders involved in the country/region
- Feedback from M&E activities used for adaptive management

  Financial Planning

  Monitoring and evaluation: design and implementation (*)

  UNDP and Executing Agency execution (*) coordination, and operational issues

Project Results

- Overall results (attainment of objectives) (*)
- Relevance, Effectiveness, & Efficiency (*)
- Country ownership
- Mainstreaming
- Sustainability (*)
- Catalytic Role & Impact
- Conclusions, recommendations & lessons
- 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
- Best and worst practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance and success
- Annexes.
- TOR
- Itinerary
- List of persons interviewed

---

[6] Using a six-point rating scale: 6:Highly Satisfactory, 5: Satisfactory, 4: Marginally Satisfactory, 3: Marginally Unsatisfactory, 2: Unsatisfactory and 1: Highly Unsatisfactory, see section 3.5, page 37 for ratings explanations.

- Summary of field visits
- List of documents reviewed
- Questionnaire used and summary of results
- Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form

The length of the MTR Report shall not exceed 30 pages in total (not including annexes).