

TERMS OF REFERENCE

I. International Consultant to Conduct Midterm Review

II. Project Information

Assignment Title	International Consultant – Project Midterm Review in Cambodia
Organization	UNDP Cambodia
Post Level	International Consultant, Individual Contract
Cluster/Project	Programme Unit
Duty Station	Home based with mission to Provinces
Duration	22 working days total from 4 th week of February to 4 th week of April 2019, with travelling to provinces, including 8 days mission to Cambodia

III. Background and Project Description

This is the Terms of Reference (ToR) for the UNDP-GEF Midterm Review (MTR) of the full sized project titled Strengthening Climate Information and Early Warning System in Cambodia to Support Climate Resilient Development and Adaptation to Climate Change (PIMS# 5235) implemented through the UNDP Cambodia, which is to be undertaken in 2019. The project started on the 28 November 2014 and is in its fourth year of implementation. In line with the UNDP-GEF Guidance on MTRs, this MTR process was initiated before the submission of the fourth 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](http://web.undp.org/evaluation/documents/guidance/GEF/mid-term/Guidance_Midterm%20Review%20EN_2014.pdf).

([http://web.undp.org/evaluation/documents/guidance/GEF/mid-term/Guidance_Midterm%20Review%20 EN 2014.pdf](http://web.undp.org/evaluation/documents/guidance/GEF/mid-term/Guidance_Midterm%20Review%20EN_2014.pdf))

Cambodia is facing mounting development challenges due to climate change. Damage related to the October 2013 flooding alone, caused by heavy rain and the seasonal swell of the Mekong River, is estimated at \$356 million, having affected 20 out of 24 provinces¹ and 1.7 million people; 297,600 hectares of rice paddies were inundated and more than 28,100 hectares of rice were immediately destroyed². Climate change is resulting in longer dry seasons and shorter, more intense rainy seasons. This impacts both the frequency and severity of natural hazards such as floods and droughts, as well as agricultural production which is dependent on seasonal rainfall. Recovery from such events puts strain on the least developed country's (LDC's) limited resources and forces shifts in development priorities - hindering Cambodia's ability to progress and to achieve its development goals.

¹ As of 31 December 2013, the total number of provinces in Cambodia changed from 24 to 25.

² http://www.undp.org/content/cambodia/en/home/presscenter/articles/2013/10/18/cambodia_s-first-disaster-database-system-unveiled/

The Royal Government of Cambodia's (RGC) preferred situation is to implement an effective early warning system (EWS). The purpose of an EWS is to monitor climate and environmental data on a real-time basis, detect adverse trends and make reliable predictions of possible impacts in the form of early warning information. An early warning therefore refers not only to advisories in emergency situations, but also to information related to the changing climatic trends revealed after tracking and analysing climate and weather data over time. An effective EWS would thus enable timely response to natural hazards and extreme weather events, as well as informed planning in light of changing climate trends.

The RGC faces several challenges in realizing its preferred situation. With few working climate and weather observation stations, there is insufficient data to refine predictions and forecasts based on sector, geographic areas, or vulnerability. Further, limited human resources and high staff turnover make it difficult for institutions such as the Ministry of Water Resources and Meteorology (MOWRAM) to develop capacity and maintain qualified forecasters and modelers. Appropriate dissemination of information is also a challenge. MOWRAM is responsible for providing climate and weather information to the planning, line ministries to inform climate resilient planning, and for the communication of natural hazards and extreme weather events for disaster risk reduction. However, the information is often not presented in manner that can be easily understood or applied and standard operating procedures (SOPs) defining roles, responsibilities, and accountability are lacking. MOWRAM is also responsible for maintaining the EWS infrastructure such as automated weather stations and water gauge stations. Urgent needs to improve the national EWS infrastructure in light of imminent climate risks has prompted some donors to assist the Government in rehabilitating old or installing new weather stations. However, there is a significant risk of unsustainability of the newly built infrastructure due to limited financial resources to cover all the O&M requirements. The National Committee for Disaster Management (NCDM) is responsible for disaster risk management and communicating disaster related information, yet there is still room for improvement so that NCDM can fulfil all its mandate.

The project "Strengthening climate information and early warning systems in Cambodia to support climate resilient development and adaptation to climate change" (henceforth "the EWS project") has been designed to help the Government overcome these gaps and challenges. Funding of approximately US\$4.9 million was approved by the Least Developed Countries Fund Council in October 2014 and the project was officially launched in May 2015. The project seeks to address the current barriers through three complementary outcomes:

1. Increased institutional capacity to assimilate and forecast weather, hydrological, climate and environmental information.
2. Climate and weather information available and utilized for national, sectoral and sub-national planning as well as for transboundary communication in the region.
3. Strengthened institutional capacity to operate and maintain EWS and climate information infrastructure, both software and hardware, in order to monitor weather and climate change.

To meet the above three outcomes, the approach adopted by the project is to 1) invest in early warning infrastructure – hydro and meteorology stations nationwide; 2) mobilize technical expertise to enhance capacity of national entities (namely MOWRAM, NCDM, and MAFF) in making

use of the information; and 3) ensure the smooth flow of information sharing both at national level and between national and provincial level.

With close collaboration with national stakeholders, the project has been in its implementation stage and made steady progress in line with the agreed project work plan. The project is going to end in May 2020; putting this in perspective, the project is currently looking for an International Consultant to conduct Mid Term Review for the project.

IV. Objectives of the MTR

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.

V. 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 considered useful for this evidence-based review). The MTR Consultant will review the baseline GEF focal area Tracking Tool submitted to the GEF at CEO endorsement, and the midterm GEF focal area Tracking Tool that must be completed before the MTR field mission begins.

The MTR Consultant is expected to follow a collaborative and participatory approach³ 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 stakeholders is vital to a successful MTR⁴. Stakeholder involvement should include interviews with stakeholders who have project responsibilities, including but not limited to executing agencies, senior officials and task team/ component leaders, key experts and consultants in the subject area, Project Board, project stakeholders (particularly Ministry of Water Resources and Meteorology (MOWRAM), Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries (MAFF), National Committee for Disaster Management (NCDM)), academia, local government and CSOs, etc. Consultation with international / regional actors would be included as well. Additionally, the MTR Consultant is expected to conduct field missions to Cambodia, including the project sites in Koh Kong, Kampot, Takeo and Kampong Speu.

³ For ideas on innovative and participatory Monitoring and Evaluation strategies and techniques, see [UNDP Discussion Paper: Innovations in Monitoring & Evaluating Results](#), 05 Nov 2013.

⁴ 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.

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.

❖ **Detail 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 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 and integrated 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).

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

Project Strategy	Indicator ⁵	Baseline Level ⁶	Level in 1 st PIR (self-reported)	Midterm Target ⁷	End-of-project Target	Midterm Level & Assessment ⁸	Achievement Rating ⁹	Justification for Rating
Objective:	Indicator (if applicable):							
Outcome 1:	Indicator 1:							
	Indicator 2:							
Outcome 2:	Indicator 3:							
	Indicator 4:							
	Etc.							
Etc.								

Indicator Assessment Key

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

In addition to the progress towards outcomes analysis:

- Compare and 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.
- Review the performance of the project in achieving the results stipulated in the UNDP Gender Marker (i.e. “GEN2”). Present the analysis in a sub-section of the MTR report dedicated to this analysis.

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

⁵ Populate with data from the Logframe and scorecards

⁶ Populate with data from the Project Document

⁷ If available

⁸ Colour code this column only

⁹ Use the 6 point Progress Towards Results Rating Scale: HS, S, MS, MU, U, HU

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 Consultant will include a section of the report setting out the MTR's evidence-based conclusions, in light of the findings.¹⁰

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 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 Strengthening Climate Information and Early Warning Systems in Cambodia to Support Climate Resilient Development and Adaptation to Climate Change

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.	

¹⁰ Alternatively, MTR conclusions may be integrated into the body of the report

Project Implementation & Adaptive Management	(rate 6 pt. scale)	
Sustainability	(rate 4 pt. scale)	

VI. Deliverables and Timeline

The total duration of the MTR will be approximately 22 working days over a time period of 9 weeks and shall not exceed five months from when the Consultant is hired. The tentative MTR timeframe is as follows:

ACTIVITY	NUMBER OF WORKING DAYS	COMPLETION DATE
Document review and preparing MTR Inception Report (MTR Inception Report due no later than 2 weeks before the MTR mission)	4 days	4 th week of Feb 2019
MTR mission: stakeholder meetings, interviews, field visits	7 days	2 nd week of March 2019
Presentation of initial findings- last day of the MTR mission	1 day	3 rd week of March 2019
Preparing draft report (due within 3 weeks of the MTR mission)	7 days	2 nd week of April 2019
Finalization of MTR report/ Incorporating audit trail from feedback on draft report (due within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on the draft)	3 days	4 th week of April 2019

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

#	Deliverable	Description	Timing	Responsibilities
1	MTR Inception Report	MTR Consultant clarifies objectives and methods of Midterm Review	No later than 2 weeks before the MTR mission	MTR Consultant submits to the Commissioning Unit and project management
2	Presentation	Initial Findings	End of MTR mission	MTR Consultant presents to project management and the Commissioning Unit
3	Draft Final Report	Full report (using guidelines on content outlined in Annex B) with annexes	Within 3 weeks of the MTR mission	Sent to the Commissioning Unit, reviewed by RTA, Project Coordinating Unit, GEF OFP
4	Final Report*	Revised report with audit trail detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final MTR report	Within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft	Sent to the Commissioning Unit

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

The principal responsibility for managing this MTR resides with the Commissioning Unit. The Commissioning Unit for this project's MTR is UNDP Cambodia office.

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

VII. MTR Consultant:

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 consultant will be aimed at maximizing the overall qualities in the following areas: (give a weight to all these qualifications so applicants know what is the max amount of points they can earn for the technical evaluation)

VIII. Duty Station

The duration of this assignment is **22 working days** spread over the period of **February to April 2019**.

The duty station for this assignment is home country and Cambodia (one trip in country mission). It is estimated that the reviewer needs to spend **8 working days** in Cambodia, with travel to the province 4 days.

During the mission in Cambodia, the transportation costs within Phnom Penh will be covered by the consultant, while the transportation cost to the province will be covered by the project.

The selected individual contractor who is expected to travel to the Country Office (CO) to undertake the assignment in the country (Cambodia) is required to undertake the BSAFE training (<https://trip.dss.un.org/dssweb/bsafe.aspx>) prior to travelling.

IX. Minimum Qualifications of the Individual Consultant

Education:	A Master's degree in natural resource management, agricultural development, climatology/meteorology, water resources management, environmental sciences, disaster management or related field, or other closely related field.
Experience:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minimum 7 years of experience in conducting evaluation for development projects and GEF funded project. Experience working in the UN system is a strong asset • Minimum of 7 years of relevant professional experience in relevant technical areas of Early Warning System. • Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender and climate resilient development and adaption to climate change; experience in gender sensitive evaluation and analysis • Experience working for development projects, with multi stakeholders including government agencies, development agencies, and UN agencies • Knowledge of UNDP and GEF monitoring and evaluation policies • Previous experience with results-based monitoring and evaluation methodologies, application of SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios
Competencies:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Competence in adaptive management, as applied to climate resilient development and adaption to climate change; • Excellent communication skills;
Language requirement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High proficient in English

X. Criteria for Evaluation of Level of Technical Compliance of Individual Contractor.

Technical Evaluation Criteria	Obtainable Score
Minimum 7 years of experience in conducting evaluation for development projects and GEF funded project. Experience working in the UN system is a strong asset;	30

Minimum of 7 years of relevant professional experience in relevant technical areas of Early Warning System.	15
Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender and climate resilient development and adaption to climate change; experience in gender sensitive evaluation and analysis	10
Experience working for development projects, with multi stakeholders including government agencies, development agencies, and UN agencies	10
Knowledge of UNDP and GEF monitoring and evaluation policies	15
Previous experience with results-based monitoring and evaluation methodologies, application of SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios	20
Total Obtainable Score:	100

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.

XI. Payment Milestone

The consultant will be paid on a lump sum basis (all-inclusive of expense relate to the above assignment including travels outside and inside the duty station and any tax obligation) under the following instalments.

No	Outputs/Deliveries	Payment Schedule	Payment Amount
1	Upon satisfactory completion of Deliverable 1	4 th week of Feb 2019	10%
2	Upon satisfactory completion of Deliverable 2	3 rd week of March 2019	30%
3	Upon satisfactory completion of Deliverable 3 and 4	4 th week of April 2019	60%

ToR ANNEX A: 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 (*fill in specific TTs 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/countries programme document(s)
15. Minutes of the Project Board Meetings and other meetings (i.e. Project Appraisal Committee meetings)
16. Project site location maps

ToR ANNEX B: Guidelines on Contents for the Midterm Review Report¹¹

- 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 Consultant
 - Acknowledgements
- ii.** Table of Contents
- iii.** Acronyms and Abbreviations
- 1.** Executive Summary (*3-5 pages*)
 - Project Information Table
 - Project Description (brief)
 - Project Progress Summary (between 200-500 words)
 - MTR Ratings & Achievement Summary Table
 - Concise summary of conclusions
 - Recommendation Summary Table
- 2.** Introduction (*2-3 pages*)
 - Purpose of the MTR and objectives
 - Scope & Methodology: principles of design and execution of the MTR, MTR approach and data collection methods, limitations to the MTR
 - Structure of the MTR report
- 3.** Project Description and Background Context (*3-5 pages*)
 - Development context: environmental, socio-economic, institutional, and policy factors relevant to the project objective and scope
 - Problems that the project sought to address: threats and barriers targeted
 - Project Description and Strategy: objective, outcomes and expected results, description of field sites (if any)
 - Project Implementation Arrangements: short description of the Project Board, key implementing partner arrangements, etc.
 - Project timing and milestones
 - Main stakeholders: summary list
- 4.** Findings (*12-14 pages*)
 - 4.1** Project Strategy
 - Project Design
 - Results Framework/Logframe
 - 4.2** Progress Towards Results
 - Progress towards outcomes analysis
 - Remaining barriers to achieving the project objective
 - 4.3** Project Implementation and Adaptive Management
 - Management Arrangements
 - Work planning

¹¹ The Report length should not exceed 40 pages in total (not including annexes).

- 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.*)

ToR ANNEX C: Midterm Review Evaluative Matrix Template

(Questions to be filled out by the Commissioning Unit)

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?			
How does the project contribute to the Cambodia priority in relation to early warning?	Link between the project result to the national priority in relation to early warning system.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project document • Project PIR • Project progress report 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Desk review • Interview with key stakeholders of the project • Field visit
How does the project respond to the need of the relevant national counterparts, MOWRAM, MAFF, NCDM, and to the impacted group?	Link between the project achievement and the actual respond to the need of the key national stakeholders of the project as per the project design	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project document • Project PIR • Project progress report • Project Result framework 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Desk review • Interview with key stakeholders of the project • Field visit
Progress Towards Results: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved thus far?			
To what extent does the project progress contributes to the expected outcomes and objectives as set in the project Result Resource Framework?	Achievement rate of the key indicators set in for the project outcomes and objectives in the project Result Resource Framework.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project document • Project PIR • Project progress report • Project Result framework 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Desk review • Interview with key stakeholders of the project • Field visit
How well are project risk and assumption are being managed?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Timeliness of the identification of risk and any change in project assumption; • Quality of response identified and implemented to address the risk 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project document • Project PIR • Project progress report • Project Result framework 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Desk review • Interview with key stakeholders of the project • Field visit
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?			
Considering the time and the input	Cost in the view of outputs/result achieved	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project document • Project PIR 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Desk review

(financial and human resources) under the project, to what extent is the project efficiently delivering the expected outputs/result?		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project progress report • Project Result framework 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interview with key stakeholders of the project
To what extent partnership with other institution who can contribute in delivering project expected outputs/outcomes were encouraged and supported?	Evidence of partnership which will sustained	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project document • Project PIR • Project progress report • Project Result framework 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Desk review • Interview with key stakeholders of the project
How effective are project human and financial resource managed?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Application of quality management and monitoring system for financial and human resources of the project; • Timeliness of reporting and work planning 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project document • Project PIR • Project progress report • Project Result framework 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Desk review • Interview with key stakeholders of the project
Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, socio-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?			
To what extent will the knowledge/result from the project sustain after the completion of the project?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extend to which the current project achievement/intervention build on existing national mechanism/system; • Extend to which the capacity of the relevant focal team was built to continue the work 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project document • Project progress report • Project PIR 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Desk review • Interview with key project stakeholder

ToR ANNEX D: UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluators/Midterm Review Consultants¹²

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: _____

¹² <http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/100>

ToR ANNEX E: MTR Ratings

Ratings for Progress Towards Results: (one rating for each outcome and for the objective)		
6	Highly Satisfactory (HS)	The objective/outcome is expected to achieve or exceed all its end-of-project targets, without major shortcomings. The progress towards the objective/outcome can be presented as “good practice”.
5	Satisfactory (S)	The objective/outcome is expected to achieve most of its end-of-project targets, with only minor shortcomings.
4	Moderately Satisfactory (MS)	The objective/outcome is expected to achieve most of its end-of-project targets but with significant shortcomings.
3	Moderately Unsatisfactory (HU)	The objective/outcome is expected to achieve its end-of-project targets with major shortcomings.
2	Unsatisfactory (U)	The objective/outcome is expected not to achieve most of its end-of-project targets.
1	Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)	The objective/outcome has failed to achieve its midterm targets, and is not expected to achieve any of its end-of-project targets.

Ratings for Project Implementation & Adaptive Management: (one overall rating)		
6	Highly Satisfactory (HS)	Implementation of all seven components – management arrangements, work planning, finance and co-finance, project-level monitoring and evaluation systems, stakeholder engagement, reporting, and communications – is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management. The project can be presented as “good practice”.
5	Satisfactory (S)	Implementation of most of the seven components is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management except for only few that are subject to remedial action.
4	Moderately Satisfactory (MS)	Implementation of some of the seven components is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management, with some components requiring remedial action.
3	Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)	Implementation of some of the seven components is not leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive, with most components requiring remedial action.
2	Unsatisfactory (U)	Implementation of most of the seven components is not leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management.
1	Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)	Implementation of none of the seven components is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management.

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

ToR ANNEX F: MTR Report Clearance Form

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

Midterm Review Report Reviewed and Cleared By:

Commissioning Unit

Name: _____

Signature: _____ Date: _____

UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Advisor

Name: _____

Signature: _____ Date: _____

ToR ANNEX G: Audit Trail Template

Note: The following is a template for the MTR Consultant 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):

[illegible]