

Terms of Reference for the Midterm Review (MTR)

Project Name: Conservation of Ecuadorian Amphibian Biodiversity and Sustainable Use of its Genetic Resources - PARG

Functional Name: Independent consultancy for the Midterm Review (MTR)

Duration: 45 calendar days

1. INTRODUCTION

This is the terms of reference (ToR) for the UNDP-GEF Midterm Review (MTR) of the medium-sized project titled *Conservation of Ecuadorian Amphibian Biodiversity and Sustainable Use of its Genetic Resources* (PIMS 5314) implemented through the Ministry of the Environment of Ecuador (MAE), which is to be undertaken in 2018. The project started on October 1, 2015 and is in its third year of implementation. In line with the UNDP-GEF Guidance on MTRs, this MTR process was initiated after the submission of the second Project Implementation Report (PIR). This ToR sets out the expectations for this MTR. The MTR process must follow the guidance outlined in the document *Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects*.¹

2. PROJECT BACKGROUND INFORMATION

In general, the project arises through the Government of Ecuador's request for assistance from the GEF and UNDP to eliminate barriers and ensure long-term conservation of the country's biodiversity. The goal of the project is to safeguard Ecuador's globally significant biodiversity by building capacity in accessing its genetic resources and sharing the benefits, and at the same time improve the sustainability of the protected areas system by strengthening the reserves of the decentralized autonomous governments (GAD).

The overall objective of the PARG project in the long term is the conservation of the biological and genetic resources of Ecuadorian amphibians at high risk of extinction, through an integrated strategy that links: i) *in situ* conservation actions (habitat protection); ii) *ex situ* conservation actions (the creation of a Life Bank that preserves specimens of genetic material, skin molecules, and germ cells and that raises genetically viable colonies of species in the laboratory); iii) multidisciplinary and cooperative research to discover active compounds derived from the skin secretions of Ecuadorian amphibians with potential applications in biomedicine; iv) monitoring species at high risk of extinction; and, v) institutional strengthening for the implementation of biodiversity conservation measures and the sustainable use of genetic resources in Ecuador, using amphibians as a pilot study case. Collectively, these actions will define the integrated approach required to launch a consolidated ABS framework in Ecuador².

The overall outcome of the project and the expected outcome of the UNPD Country Program both affirm that "Up to the year 2018 [the project] has contributed to strengthening institutional and civic capacities to promote

¹ Available at:

https://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=1&cad=rja&uact=8&ved=0ahUKEwjS4Jek47fcAhXRtVMKHeXuAT0QFggmMAA&url=http%3A%2F%2Fweb.undp.org%2Fevaluation%2Fdocuments%2Fguidance%2FGEF%2Fmid-term%2FGuidance_Midterm%2520Review%2520_EN_2014.pdf&usg=AOvVaw2SqTXXf9AP4ytNKX8CfKrThttps://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=1&cad=rja&uact=8&ved=0ahUKEwjS4Jek47fcAhXRtVMKHeXuAT0QFggmMAA&url=http%3A%2F%2Fweb.undp.org%2Fevaluation%2Fdocuments%2Fguidance%2FGEF%2Fmid-term%2FGuidance_Midterm%2520Review%2520_EN_2014.pdf&usg=AOvVaw2SqTXXf9AP4ytNKX8CfKrT

² ABS = Access to Genetic Resources and the Fair and Equitable Sharing of Benefits Arising from their Utilization

the rights of nature, to create conditions for sustainable development and to improve resilience and risk management against the effects of climate change and disasters of natural and anthropic origin"³.

The main outcome for Environment and Sustainable Development from the UNDP Strategic Plan establishes "inclusive and sustainable growth and development that incorporates production capacities to generate employment and a better lifestyle for the poor and excluded". The secondary outcome for Environment and Sustainable Development from the UNDP Strategic Plan states that "countries reduce the likelihood of conflict and reduce the risk from natural disasters, including climate change"⁴.

The strategies for the expected products from the UNDP Country Program Action Plan, plans, and budget instruments are formulated and applied focused on priority groups, with special emphasis on those affected by gender inequality, the conservation and sustainable management of natural resources, ecosystem goods and services, climate change, promulgation of resilience, dissemination of sustainable energy alternatives and proper handling of chemicals and contaminants.

The objective of the project is to enable Ecuador to implement integrated emergency actions for conserving the diversity of amphibians in Ecuador and to use its genetic resources in a sustainable way. The three principal expected results of the project, related to its three components of conservation, research and institutional strengthening, are: 1. Emergency actions to guarantee the survival of Ecuadorian amphibian species that are in danger of extinction, for the purposes of conservation and bioprospecting; 2. The discovery of active compounds, derived from the skin secretions of Ecuadorian amphibians, that possess potential applications in biomedicine; and 3. Institutional strengthening for the implementation of biodiversity conservation measures and the sustainable use of genetic resources in Ecuador, using amphibians as a pilot study case.

The resources allocated to the project by GEF reach US \$2,726,908 which, together with cash and in-kind counterpart resources, total US \$16,943,032, to be expended until May 2020.

In the PRODOC (p. 65, paragraph 196), it is stated that "as implementing agency of the GEF, UNDP will ultimately be responsible for delivering the results, which are subject to certification by MAE as the Principal Implementing Entity. UNDP will provide the project cycle management services defined by the GEF Council, which include the following:

- 1) Provide financial and auditing services for the project,
- 2) Supervise the project's budgetary expenditures,
- 3) Guarantee that project activities, including procurement and financial services, are carried out in strict compliance with UNDP-GEF procedures,
- 4) Ensure that the provisioning of information to the GEF is performed in accordance with GEF requirements and procedures,
- 5) Facilitate the learning process, exchange and dissemination within the GEF family,
- 6) Contract the intermediate and final evaluations of the project, and conduct additional evaluations and/or reviews when necessary and in consultation with the counterparts of the project.

In the same document (p. 76, paragraph 253), it is noted that: "The project will undergo an independent intermediate assessment at the mid-point of its implementation. The interim evaluation will determine progress towards the achievement of the results and, if appropriate, the necessary corrections; it will focus on effectiveness, efficiency and implementation opportunity; it will highlight the issues that require decisions and actions, and will present the initial knowledge learned about design, implementation and management. The results of this evaluation will be incorporated as recommendations for the improvement of implementation during the second half of the project cycle.

³ PRODOC April 2015

⁴ Ibid.

Taking into consideration that the start date of the project was October 2015, and its end date is scheduled for May 2020, the mid-term evaluation is expected to take place in the present year 2018.

With these antecedents, the Ministry of the Environment of Ecuador, by way of the Undersecretary of Natural Heritage – National Biodiversity Directorate, principle implementing entity of the project "Conservation of Ecuadorian Amphibian Biodiversity and Sustainable Use of its Genetic Resources"– PARG, with the support of the United Nations Development Program (UNDP) as implementing agency of the Global Environment Facility (GEF), require hiring a consultancy to perform the mid-term evaluation of the PARG project, from the beginning of the project (October 2015), until the mid-date of its execution.

Synoptic Table

Project Title:	Conservation of Ecuadorian Amphibian Biodiversity and Sustainable Use of its Genetic Resources			
GEF Project ID:	00094106		at endorsement (Million US\$)	At December 2015 (Million US s\$)
UNDP Project PIMS ID:	5314	GEF Financing:	2.726.908	2.726.908,00
Country	Ecuador	IA / AE own:		
Region:	Latin America	Government:	3.454.119	3.454.119
Focal Area:	Ministry of the Environment	Other:	10.762.005	10.762.005
Operational Program:		Total co-financing:	16.943.032	16.943.032
Implementing Agency:	PNUD	Total expenditure of the project:	1.639.701	
Other partners involved:	Otonga Foundation Research Center, AMARU Biopark, ETAPA Municipal Telecommunications, Water and Sewerage Company of Cuenca, Decentralized Autonomous Government of Carchi, Decentralized Autonomous Government of Guayas.	Signature of the project document (start date of the project):	Gabriel Jaramillo, Programme Specialist, UNDP Ecuador. Diego Zorrilla, Resident Representative, UNDP Ecuador April 1, 2015	
FA Objectives (OS / SP):	Ecuador will be able to implement integrated emergency actions to conserve Ecuadorean amphibian diversity and use its genetic resources in a sustainable way. The three principal outcomes expected from the project are: 1.	Closing date (operational):		May 2020

	<p>Emergency actions to ensure the survival of endangered amphibian species of Ecuador for conservation and bio-prospecting purposes;</p> <p>2. Discovery of active compounds derived from the skin secretions of Ecuadorian amphibians with potential applications in biomedicine;</p> <p>3. Institutional strengthening for the implementation of biodiversity conservation measures and sustainable use of genetic resources in Ecuador, using amphibians as a pilot case study.</p>		
--	---	--	--

3. MTR OBJECTIVE

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

4. MTR APPROACH & METHODOLOGY

The MTR must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The MTR consultant will review all relevant sources of information including documents prepared during the preparation phase (i.e. PIF, UNDP Initiation Plan, UNDP Environmental & Social Safeguard Policy, the Project Document, project reports including Annual Project Review/PIRs, project budget revisions, lesson learned reports, national strategic and legal documents, and any other materials that the PARG team considers useful for this evidence-based review). The MTR t will review the baseline GEF focal area Tracking Tool submitted to the responsible head at GEF at CEO endorsement, and the midterm GEF focal area Tracking Tool that must be completed before the MTR field mission begins.

The MTR consultant is expected to follow a collaborative and participatory approach⁵, ensuring close engagement with the Project Team, government counterparts (the GEF Operational Focal Point), the UNDP Country Office(s), UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Advisers, and other key stakeholders.

Engagement of stakeholders⁶ is vital to a successful MTR. Stakeholder involvement should include interviews with stakeholders who have project responsibilities, including but not limited to:

Ministry of the Environment of Ecuador (MAE), Secretary of Higher Education, Science, Technology and Innovation (SENESCYT), National Biodiversity Institute (INABIO), National Intellectual Rights Service (SENADI), Amazonian Regional University IKIAM, Decentralized Autonomous Governments (GAD Carchi and GAD Guayas), Municipal Public Telecommunications, Water, Sewerage and Sanitation Company (ETAPA EP), Otonga Foundation and Jambatu Center, Amaru Amphibian Rescue Center, Queen’s University Molecular Therapy Laboratory; as well as other institutions, senior officials

⁵ For ideas on innovative and participatory Monitoring and Evaluation strategies and techniques, see UNDP Discussion Paper: Innovations in Monitoring & Evaluating Results, 05 Nov 2013.

⁶ For more stakeholder engagement in the M&E process, see the UNDP Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results, Chapter 3, pg. 93.

and managerial staff, technical and task team/component leaders, key experts and the consultants in the subject area, members of the project's board of directors, academia, local governments and civil society organizations, etc.

Additionally, the MTR consultant is expected to conduct field missions and meetings with officials and/or technical/specialist teams according to the following table:

Institution / actor	Location	Number of meetings
PARG Project	Quito	3
UNDP	Quito	2
Ministry of the Environment of Ecuador (MAE)	Quito	1
Secretary of Higher Education, Science, Technology and Innovation (SENESCYT),	Quito	1
National Biodiversity Institute (INABIO)	Quito	1
National Intellectual Rights Service (SENADI)	Quito	1
Amazonian Regional University IKIAM	Tena	1
Decentralized Autonomous Government (GAD) Carchi	Tulcán	1
Decentralized Autonomous Government (GAD) Guayas	Guayaquil	1
Municipal Public Telecommunications, Water and Sewerage Company (EP ETAPA)	Cuenca	1
Otonga Foundation	Quito	1
Amaru Amphibian Rescue Center	Cuenca	1
President of the Community of Chinambí and President of the community of San Jacinto	Carchi	1
Presidents of the Irrigation, Tourism and Productive Projects Boards of the 23 de Noviembre Cooperative	23 de Noviembre Cooperative, Cantón Naranjal	1

In addition, the consultant is expected to perform field missions in Pichincha, Azuay, Carchi, and Guayas to carry out field observations in the project's intervention areas, according to the following table:

Area of intervention	Province	City	Duration of visit
Otonga Foundation / Jambatu Center	Pichincha	Sangolquí	1 morning
Cajas National Park (PNC)	Azuay	Cuenca	2 days
Chinambí	Carchi	Tulcán	2 days
Cerro de Hayas	Guayas	Guayaquil	2 days

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

5. DETAILED SCOPE OF THE MTR

The MTR consultant will assess the following four categories of project progress. See the *Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects*⁷ 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 (PRODOC).
- 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?
- 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/Log frame:

- 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:

⁷ Available at:

https://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=1&cad=rja&uact=8&ved=0ahUKEwiH5v6PhrjCahUN7FMKHRFhBj8QFggmMAA&url=http%3A%2F%2Fweb.undp.org%2Fevaluation%2Fdocuments%2Fguidance%2FGEF%2Fmid-term%2FGuidance_Midterm%2520Review%2520_EN_2014.pdf&usq=AOvVaw2SqTXXf9AP4ytNKX8CfKrT

- 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). This information is available as Annex 1

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.
- 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/ log frame 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 consulting firm will include a section of the report setting out the MTR’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 MTR consultant should make no more than 15 recommendations total.

Ratings

The MTR 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 Conservation of Ecuadorian Amphibian Biodiversity and Sustainable Use of its Genetic Resources - PARG.

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)	

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

6. TIMEFRAME

The total duration of the MTR will be 45 calendar days, starting on the date of the contract signing, and shall not exceed three months from when the consultant is hired. The tentative MTR timeframe is as follows:

TIMEFRAME	ACTIVITY
<i>Contract signing date</i>	Handover of Project documents.
<i>2 weeks</i>	Review of Project documents and preparation of MTR inception report in Spanish
<i>2 weeks</i>	Stakeholder meetings, interviews, field visits
<i>35 days after contract signing</i>	Presentation of initial findings, in Spanish
<i>45 days after contract signing</i>	MTR report in English and Spanish

*These are tentative dates.

TIMEFRAME*	ACTIVITY
<i>January 31, 2019</i>	Application closes
<i>February 8, 2019</i>	Select MTR Team
<i>February 11, 2019</i>	Prep the MTR Team (handover of Project Documents)
<i>February 12-22, 2019</i>	Document review and preparing MTR Inception Report
<i>February 25, 2019</i>	Finalization and Validation of MTR Inception Report- latest start of MTR mission
<i>February 26 – March 8, 2019</i>	MTR mission: stakeholder meetings, interviews, field visits
<i>March 11, 2019</i>	Mission wrap-up meeting & presentation of initial findings- earliest end of MTR mission
<i>March 11 - 15, 2019</i>	Preparing draft report
<i>March 18, 2019</i>	Incorporating audit trail from feedback on draft report/Finalization of MTR report (note: accommodate time delay in dates for circulation and review of the draft report)
<i>March 19, 2019</i>	Preparation & Issue of Management Response
<i>March 20, 2019</i>	(optional) Concluding Stakeholder Workshop (not mandatory for MTR team)
<i>March 21, 2019</i>	Expected date of full MTR completion

*These are tentative dates

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

7. MIDTERM REVIEW DELIVERABLES

Deliverable	Content	Timing	Responsibilities
Inception Report	Evaluator provides clarifications on timing and method, in Spanish	No later than 2 weeks before the evaluation mission.	Evaluator submits to reference group, composed by the Project's Steering Committee members.
Presentation	Initial Findings, in Spanish	End of evaluation mission.	Evaluator submits to reference group.
Draft Final Report	Full report, (per annexed template) with annexes in Spanish	Within 3 weeks of the evaluation mission.	Evaluator submits to reference group. Also, to be reviewed by RTA, PCU, GEF OFPs, others
Final Report and Management	Full report (using guidelines on content)	Within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft	Evaluator submits to reference group for final approval and prior to for uploading to UNDP ERC.

Responses in Spanish and in English *	outlined in Annex B) with annexes. Revised report with audit trail detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final MTR report, as well as the Management Response matrix, indicating how the recommendations will be addressed.		
--	--	--	--

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

8. MTR ARRANGEMENTS

The principal responsibility for managing this MTR resides with the Commissioning Unit. The Commissioning Unit for this project's MTR is the UNDP/GEF Country Office.

The Evaluator will be responsible for all logistics arrangements that his/her field visit could imply (assignment, including daily fee, per diem and travel costs). In addition, he/she will present all documents including main report and annexes in Spanish first, once they are approved, the Evaluator will translate them and present them in English.

9. TEAM COMPOSITION

An independent consultant will conduct the MTR. 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.

The selection of the consultant will be done following the next criteria:

Education

- Master's degree in environmental sciences, biology, social sciences or economics.
- Undergraduate degree in science, economics, administration, or similar fields.
- Fluency in reading, speaking and writing Spanish and English.

General experience:

- Work experience in relevant technical areas (biology) of at least 10 years.
- Recent experience of at least five (5) years on result-based management evaluation methodologies.

Specific experience:

- Experience in at least one (1) process applying SMART indicators and reconstructing and validating baseline scenarios in the last five years.
- Verifiable experience of participation in at least two (2) UNDP or GEF project evaluation processes, either midterm or final reviews, in the last five years.

10. PAYMENT MODALITIES AND SPECIFICATIONS

Payment will be made based on the presentation and approval of the products/deliverables of this consultancy. The products must be delivered, and payments made, according to the following table:

<i>Products</i>	<i>Timing</i>	<i>Value</i>
Product 1 Draft Evaluation Report	35 calendar days after contract signing	30%
Product 2 Final Report in English and in Spanish	45 calendar days after contract signing	70%

11. APPLICATION PROCESS⁹

Recommended Presentation of Proposal:

The application must be written in Spanish or English and should contain a methodological proposal to undertake the evaluation and a timeframe, as well as an economic proposal (in a separate file) including all logistics arrangements that his/her field visit could imply (assignment, including daily fee, per diem and travel costs).

UNDP applies a fair and transparent selection process that will take into account the competencies/skills of the applicants as well as their financial proposals. Qualified women and members of social minorities are encouraged to apply.

Criteria for Evaluation of Proposal:

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

Evaluation Criteria:

Technical proposals (P11 and technical offer) will weight a maximum of 70% and only the consultants that meet the technical phase with a minimum score of 49/70 or more, will continue to the review of economic proposal, which will weight a maximum of 30%.

The evaluation criteria are the following:

Criteria	Points	Percentage
CVs: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• General experience• Specific experience	100	30%
Technical proposal	100	40%
Economic proposal	100	30%
		100%

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>

<i>Rating parameter</i>	<i>Criteria</i>	<i>Score</i>	<i>Percentage</i>
CV	<i>Education:</i>		<i>30%</i>
	• Undergraduate degree in science, economics, administration, or similar fields	<i>10</i>	
	• Master’s degree in environmental sciences, biology, social sciences or economics	<i>10</i>	
	• Fluency in reading, speaking and writing Spanish and English	<i>10</i>	
	<i>General experience:</i>		
	• Recent experience (in the last 5 years) with result-based management evaluation methodologies	<i>20</i>	
	<i>Specific experience:</i>		
	• Verifiable experience of participation in at least two (2) UNDP or GEF project evaluation processes, either midterm or final reviews, in the last five years.	<i>20</i>	
	• Work experience in relevant technical areas of at least 10 years.	<i>20</i>	
	• Experience in at least one (1) process applying SMART indicators and reconstructing and validating baseline scenarios in the last five years.	<i>10</i>	
<i>TOTAL</i>	<i>100</i>		
Technical Proposal	<i>Methodology, agenda and implementation schedule:</i>		<i>40%</i>
	• Appropriate understanding the nature of work and understanding of the ToR.	<i>25</i>	
	• Development of the relevant aspects of the work with a sufficient level of detail.	<i>25</i>	
	• Development of appropriate conceptual and methodological framework for the work to be performed.	<i>25</i>	
	• Appropriate sequence of activities and planning.	<i>25</i>	
	<i>TOTAL</i>	<i>100</i>	

<i>Economical proposal</i>	<i>Score</i>	<i>Percentage</i>
The highest score (30%) will be awarded to the most economical offer and the inverse proportional to the other offers.	<i>100</i>	<i>30%</i>
Only the technical proposal that meet the technical phase with a minimum score of 49/70 or more, will continue to the review of economic proposal, which will weight a maximum of 30%.		

ToR ANNEX A: Table. Progress towards Results Matrix (Achievement of outcomes against End-of-project Targets)

Objective	Indicator	Baseline level	Level in 1st PIR (self-reported)	Midterm target	End of project Target	Midterm level and assessment ¹⁰	Achievement Rating ¹¹	Justification for Rating
Ecuador implements integrated emergency actions to conserve the diversity of amphibians of Ecuador and use its genetic resources in a sustainable way	1. Increase in additional hectares of habitat critical for conservation of target amphibian species that is under legal protection thereby closing conservation gaps.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0 ha of humid premontane forest conserved in GAD reserves. • Conservation gap is 8,328 hectares.¹² 			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2,200 ha humid premontane forest conserved in GAD reserves. • Conservation gap reduced by 25%. 			
	2. Replication of <i>in situ</i> amphibian conservation measures tested by the project in order to further reduce conservation gaps.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0 PA within SNAP • 0 Socio Bosque 			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At least 1 PA within SNAP • At least 1 Socio Bosque (hectares to be measured once replication sites are determined) 			
	3. Number of amphibian species on updated IUCN red list: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •being maintained successfully in captivity •with viable cryopreserved sperm samples for reproduction 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 18 rescued and maintained ex situ • 0 species • 0 			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 20 rescued and successfully maintained in captivity. • At least 1 sample from 2 target species. • Approx. 70 (40%) 			

¹⁰ Color code this column only

¹¹ Use the 6 point Progress Towards Results Rating Scale: HS, S, MS, MU, U, HU

¹² An analysis of critical habitat not included in the PANE system (National Protected Areas System) estimates that there are 8,328 hectares of critical habitat for the target species of the project (*A. balios*, *A. coynei* and *Atelopus* sp. aff. *longirostris*) found unprotected.

Objective	Indicator	Baseline level	Level in 1st PIR (self-reported)	Midterm target	End of project Target	Midterm level and assessment ¹⁰	Achievement Rating ¹¹	Justification for Rating
	•with skins or secretions preserved in the Ecuadorian Amphibian Genome Bank (EAGB).							
	4. Increase in the flow of resources for amphibian conservation/ABS.	• TBD based on the findings of the case study and economic valuation.			• 10% increase from baseline case study. • By midterm case study and established baselines.			
	5. Degree of compliance in environmental licensing with regards to official guidelines on amphibian conservation in sites prioritized in the National Strategic Plan.	• 0%			• 100% once official. • By guidelines defined at mid-term. • 4 guidelines per year made official in secondary norms.			
	6. % Reduction in processing times for Collection Permits, Framework Contracts, and Access Contracts	Processing times: • Collection Permits: 2 weeks to 6 months. • Framework Contracts: 2 months. • Access Contracts: more than 2 years.			Processing times: • Collection Permits: 1 week. • Framework Contracts: 1 month • Access Contracts: in compliance with established norm (approx. 6 months)			
Outcome 1	7. # of protected areas and hectares of	• 0 Provincial GAD reserves declared with			• 2 Provincial GAD reserves declared with			

Objective	Indicator	Baseline level	Level in 1st PIR (self-reported)	Midterm target	End of project Target	Midterm level and assessment ¹⁰	Achievement Rating ¹¹	Justification for Rating
Emergency actions to ensure the survival of highly endangered amphibian species of Ecuador for conservation and bio-prospecting purposes	habitat critical for amphibians with specific conservation measures for highly endangered amphibian species legally-recognized and integrated in the SNAP.	focus on amphibian conservation • 0 Management Plans include amphibian conservation measures			focus on amphibian conservation: - Carchi PA (1400 ha) - Guayas PA (800 ha) • 3 Management Plans covering a total of 2,961 ha. Critical habitat includes amphibian conservation measures: Carchi PA; Guayas PA and Cajas NP (761 hectares)			
	8. Increase in management effectiveness of 3 legally-recognized PAs with conservation measures for highly endangered amphibian species (METT).	METT Scores • Carchi PA: 0 • Guayas PA: 0 • Cajas NP: 62			METT Score • Carchi PA: TBD • Guayas PA: TBD • Cajas NP: 82			
	9. Successful captive breeding programs measured by: • # of reproductive events (egg mass) of target species • % survival of rescued individuals in captivity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • # reproductive events <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>Atelopus nanay</i>: 2 - <i>A.sp. aff palmatus</i> 0 - <i>Dendrobates condor</i>: 0 • %survival <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>Atelopus nanay</i>: 66% - <i>A. sp. aff. palmatus</i>: 0% - <i>Dendrobates condor</i>: 0% 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • # reproductive events <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>Atelopus nanay</i>: 22 - <i>A.sp. aff. palmatus</i>: 20 - <i>Dendrobates condor</i>: 20 • % survival <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>Atelopus nanay</i>: 80% - <i>A. sp. aff. palmatus</i>: 80% 					

Objective	Indicator	Baseline level	Level in 1st PIR (self-reported)	Midterm target	End of project Target	Midterm level and assessment ¹⁰	Achievement Rating ¹¹	Justification for Rating																														
					- <i>Dendrobates condor</i> : 80%																																	
Outcome 2 Discovery of active compounds derived from the skin secretions of Ecuadorian amphibians with potential applications in biomedicine	10. Active compounds ¹³ isolated and structurally characterized (peptides and native proteins sequenced) from the skin secretions of 4 amphibians: 1 <i>Agalychnis spurelli</i> 2 <i>Cruziohyla calcarifer</i> 3 <i>Hypsiboas picturatus</i> 4 <i>Atelopus nanay</i>	<table border="1"> <tr> <td></td> <td>1</td> <td>2</td> <td>3</td> <td>4</td> </tr> <tr> <td>A</td> <td>1*</td> <td>1*</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>B</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> </tr> </table> <p>A: Active compound isolated and characterized by mass spectrometry (*tropic insulin peptide) B: New peptides molecularly characterized (amino acid sequence) by molecular cloning and sequencing by mass spectrometry</p>		1	2	3	4	A	1*	1*	0	0	B	0	0	0	0			<table border="1"> <tr> <td></td> <td>1</td> <td>2</td> <td>3</td> <td>4</td> </tr> <tr> <td>A</td> <td>25</td> <td>25</td> <td>25</td> <td>1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>B</td> <td>4</td> <td>4</td> <td>1</td> <td>1</td> </tr> </table>		1	2	3	4	A	25	25	25	1	B	4	4	1	1			
		1	2	3	4																																	
	A	1*	1*	0	0																																	
	B	0	0	0	0																																	
	1	2	3	4																																		
A	25	25	25	1																																		
B	4	4	1	1																																		
11. # of new peptides synthesized and pharmacologically tested from the skin secretions of 4 amphibian species.	2			4																																		
12. # of students with Senescyt scholarships pursuing graduate studies in amphibian bio-prospecting	1 student			At least 5 students																																		
13. Ecuadorian bio-prospecting	0			At least 1 laboratory																																		

¹³ In this context, an active compound is synonymous with peptide or protein.

Objective	Indicator	Baseline level	Level in 1st PIR (self-reported)	Midterm target	End of project Target	Midterm level and assessment ¹⁰	Achievement Rating ¹¹	Justification for Rating
	laboratory equipped with appropriate technology and conducting bioprospecting research on amphibians							
	14. # of publications in peer reviewed scientific journals on bio-prospecting research on amphibian skin secretions by Ecuadorian institutions.	0			10			
	15. % of Ecuadorian amphibian species ¹⁴ with tissues preserved in the Ecuadorian Amphibian Genome Bank (EAGB).	0%			50%			

¹⁴ By January 2015, 546 amphibian species were registered in Ecuador, distributed among three groups: Anurans, 514 species (represented by frogs and toads), Salamanders, 8 species (Order Caudata) and Caecilians, 24 species (Order Gymnophiona).

Objective	Indicator	Baseline level	Level in 1st PIR (self-reported)	Midterm target	End of project Target	Midterm level and assessment ¹⁰	Achievement Rating ¹¹	Justification for Rating
Outcome 3 Institutional strengthening for the implementation of biodiversity conservation measures and sustainable use of genetic resources in Ecuador, using amphibians as a pilot case study	16. Strengthened policies and regulations measured by: • % implementation of the Strategic Action Plan for Conservation of Ecuadorian Amphibians • Nagoya Protocol ratified. • Regulation 905 aligned with national, sub-regional and international legislation. ¹⁵	• 0% (Strategic Plan project, no action plan) • Nagoya Protocol signed and under discussion in National Assembly. • Regulation 905 not aligned.			• Implementation of 20% of MAE Action Plan (plan approved by Midterm). • Nagoya Protocol ratified. • Regulation 905 updated and aligned.			
	17. Improve abilities of national agencies to implement ABS as measured by ABS Capacity Development Scores	ABS Capacity Development Score: 35 3 areas to improve: CR 1: 3 CR 2: 14 CR 5: 7 Capacity to conceptualize: The institution(s) has/have financial resources but has/have limited personnel and expertise.	ABS Capacity Development Score: 49 3 areas improved CR 1: 6 CR2: 19 CR5: 13 Capacity to conceptualize: - The policy and related instruments for ABS; In particular, to ensure that the rules are more efficient and clearer.					

¹⁵ E.g. National Plan for Buen Vivir, Decree 391, Nagoya Protocol, TIRFAA, CONVEMAR.

Objective	Indicator	Baseline level	Level in 1st PIR (self-reported)	Midterm target	End of project Target	Midterm level and assessment ¹⁰	Achievement Rating ¹¹	Justification for Rating
		<p>- Capacity to Apply: The ABS institution(s) has/have weak leadership and provides little guidance.</p> <p>- Capacity to Monitor: The institution(s) has/have financial resources but has limited personnel and knowledge.</p> <p>0% - Genetic Resources Permit Module does not exist in the National Environmental Data Base (SUIA).</p>			<p>Capacity to Implement:</p> <p>- ABS decision-making Institutions have expanded knowledge on ABS issues and ability to act on it.</p> <p>Capacity to Monitor:</p> <p>- Improved capacities of ABS Institutions to execute, monitor and evaluate requests for access to genetic resources</p> <p>100% - National Environmental Data Base (SUIA) Genetic Resources Permit Module established and producing quality updated reports</p>			
	18. % Reduction in processing times for Collection Permits, Framework Agreements/Contracts, and Access Contracts.	<p>Processing times:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Collection Permits: 2 weeks to 6 months. • Framework Agreements/contracts: 2 months • Access Contracts: more than 2 years. 			<p>Processing times:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A) Collection Permits: 1 week. • Framework Agreements/Contracts: 1 month. • Access Contracts: in compliance with established regulations (approx. 6 months). 			

Objective	Indicator	Baseline level	Level in 1st PIR (self-reported)	Midterm target	End of project Target	Midterm level and assessment ¹⁰	Achievement Rating ¹¹	Justification for Rating
	19. Increase in awareness about amphibian conservation as measured by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase in users accessing ABS-CH Platform • Increase in registers of amphibians from unofficial sources. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ABS-CH website does not have a user counter. • 317 registers of 107 species from 40 members of the Citizen Science portal. 			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • > 5% annual increase after the interconnected platform is established • > 5% annual increase after the interconnected platform is established and connected to the Citizen Science portal. 			

Indicator Assessment Key

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

ToR ANNEX B: List of Documents to be reviewed by the MTR consultant

1. PIF
2. UNDP Initiation Plan
3. UNDP Project Document
4. UNDP Environmental and Social Screening results
5. Project Inception Report
6. All Project Implementation Reports (PIR's)
7. Quarterly progress reports and work plans of the various implementation task teams
8. Audit reports
9. Finalized GEF focal area Tracking Tools at CEO endorsement and midterm (specific TT's for this project's focal area)
10. Oversight mission reports
11. All monitoring reports prepared by the project
12. Financial and Administration guidelines used by project Team

The following documents will also be available:

13. Project operational guidelines, manuals and systems
14. UNDP country programme document(s)
15. Minutes of the *Conservation of Ecuadorian Amphibian Biodiversity and Sustainable Use of its Genetic Resources - PARG* Board Meetings and other meetings (i.e. Project Appraisal Committee meetings)
16. Project site location maps.

ToR ANNEX C: Guidelines on Contents for the Midterm Review Report ¹⁶

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 and Methodology: principles of design and execution of the MTR, MTR approach and data collection methods, limitations of 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/Log frame

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

¹⁶ The Report length should not exceed 40 pages in total (not including annexes).

- Communications
- 4.4 Sustainability
- Financial risks to sustainability
 - Socio-economic risks to sustainability
 - Institutional framework and governance risks to sustainability
 - Environmental risks to sustainability
5. Conclusions and Recommendations (4-6 pages)
- 5.1 Conclusions
- Comprehensive and balanced statements (that are evidence-based and connected to the MTR's findings) which highlight the strengths, weaknesses and results of the project
- 5.2 Recommendations
- Corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project
 - Actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the project
 - Proposals for future directions underlining main objectives
6. Annexes
- MTR ToR (excluding ToR annexes)
 - MTR evaluative matrix (evaluation criteria with key questions, indicators, sources of data, and methodology)
 - Example Questionnaire or Interview Guide used for data collection
 - Ratings Scales
 - MTR mission itinerary
 - List of persons interviewed
 - List of documents reviewed
 - Co-financing table (if not previously included in the body of the report)
 - Signed UNEG Code of Conduct form
 - Signed MTR final report clearance form
 - *Annexed in a separate file:* Audit trail from received comments on draft MTR report
 - *Annexed in a separate file:* Relevant midterm tracking tools (*METT, FSC, Capacity scorecard, etc.*)

ToR ANNEX D: Midterm Review Evaluative Matrix Template

Evaluative Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
Project Strategy: To what extent is the project strategy relevant to country priorities, country ownership, and the best route towards expected results?			
(include evaluative questions)	(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?			

ToR ANNEX E: UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluators/Midterm Review for consultants¹⁷

Evaluators/The 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 rights not to engage. Evaluators must respect people's rights 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 the consultant Agreement Form

Agreement to abide by the Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN System:

Name of the 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: _____

¹⁷ www.undp.org/uneqcodeofconduct

ToR ANNEX F: 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 (MU)	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 management, with most components requiring remedial action.
2	Unsatisfactory (U)	Implementation of most of the seven components is not leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management.
1	Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)	Implementation of none of the seven components is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management.

Ratings for Sustainability: (one overall rating)		
4	Likely (L)	Negligible risks to sustainability, with key outcomes on track to be achieved by the project’s closure and expected to continue into the foreseeable future
3	Moderately Likely (ML)	Moderate risks, but expectations that at least some outcomes will be sustained due to the progress towards results on outcomes at the Midterm Review
2	Moderately Unlikely (MU)	Significant risk that key outcomes will not carry on after project closure, although some outputs and activities should carry on
1	Unlikely (U)	Severe risks that project outcomes as well as key outputs will not be sustained

ToR ANNEX G: MTR Report Clearance Form

Midterm Review Report Reviewed and Cleared By:

Commissioning Unit

Name: _____

Signature: _____ Date: _____

UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Advisor

Name: _____

Signature: _____ Date: _____