

UNDP-GEF and GCF Midterm Review Terms of Reference

Standard Template 1: Formatted for attachment to [UNDP Procurement Website](#)

Project Titles:

GEF: Sustainable Development of the Ecuadorian Amazon: integrated management of multiple use landscapes and high value conservation forests

GCF: Priming Financial and Land Use Planning Instruments to Reduce Emissions from Deforestation

Functional Title: Consultancy for Independent Mid-term Review

Duration: 137 days

1. INTRODUCTION

This document constitutes the Terms of Reference (ToR) for the Midterm Review (MTR) that will be undertaken in 2019/2020 for two inter-related projects:

1. The full-sized GEF project titled *Sustainable Development of the Ecuadorian Amazon: integrated management of multiple use landscapes and high value conservation forests* (PIMS #5606) and;
2. The GCF funded project *Priming Financial and Land Use Planning Instruments to Reduce Emissions from Deforestation* (PIMS #5768)

Together, these projects make up the PROAmazonia Programme, implemented through the Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock for the GEF project and the Ministry of Environment for the GCF project.

The projects started on the Project Documents signature date 23/05/2017 for both GEF and GCF and both projects are now in their third year of implementation. In accordance with the UNDP-GEF Guidance on MTRs, the MTR process must be completed before the submission of the third Project Implementation Report (PIR). As defined in the FAA signed between UNDP and GCF, the Interim Independent Evaluation Report must be submitted in English within nine (9) months after Year two (2) from the Effective Date (22/05/2017). For the GEF project, the MTR process must follow the guidance outlined in the document [Guidance for Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects](#) and the UNDP Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results, Chapter 7, pg. 171. The GCF has not released official guidance on the MTR.

2. PROJECT BACKGROUND INFORMATION

The PROAmazonía Programme is a five-year collaborative initiative funded by the GEF and GCF to transform the agriculture and forestry sectors in the Amazon region to more sustainable management and production practices, in order to reduce GHG emissions from deforestation, forest degradation, and to protect and enhance carbon sinks in forested areas. It is an inclusive, cross-sectoral and multi-stakeholder initiative seeking a just transition to sustainable land-use practices to significantly reduce deforestation and restore degraded ecosystems, improve the livelihoods of some of the most impoverished communities in Ecuador, and establish viable economic markets for sustainably produced, deforestation-free products.

PROAmazonia is unique among UNDP projects as it is co-funded by both the GCF and GEF and is delivered under NIM modality in collaboration with the Ministry of Environment and the Ministry of Agriculture. This adds to the complexity of the review process as it is the first MTR of this kind to be completed. Therefore, this MTR will serve as a reference for future evaluations where there are multiple donors, and it is expected that the consultants will provide advice regarding the implementation of a Program that involves two Ministries.

Table 1: PROAmazonía Programme/Country general information

Country/Facilitating Agency	Contract Modality	National Authority/Implementing Partner	Date of ProDoc cover page signature	Date of Project Implementation Start	Budget
GEF	National Implementation Modality (NIM) with UNDP Support	Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock	23/05/2017	01/06/2017	USD 12,462,550
GCF	National Implementation Modality (NIM) with UNDP Support	Ministry of Environment	23/05/2017	22/05/2017	USD 41,172,739

The GEF project - *Sustainable Development of the Ecuadorian Amazon: integrated management of multiple use landscapes and high value conservation forests* (PIMS #5606)

Background: Ecuador has an extraordinary biological richness that makes it one of the 17 megadiverse countries in the world. The Amazon region (also known as the Special Amazonian Territorial Circumscription - CTEA from its Spanish initials) represents 116,588 km² and is the intervention area of the project. Ecuador has undertaken significant institutional changes in recent years, from a new political constitution including the rights of nature to decentralization of development and land-use planning. This provides an opportunity to manage the CTEA through an effective decentralized system. The government proposes a change in the country’s production matrix that involves simultaneous and progressive changes of the current production models moving towards a diversified economy guided by knowledge and innovation.

The objective of the GEF project is to catalyze the transformation of land use planning and management in the Amazon by building a governance and sustainable production framework based on a landscape approach and optimizing ecosystem services and livelihoods. The project has been structured into four outcomes:

- 1) Strengthened multi-level governance framework for sustainable management and production in multiple use landscapes (MUL) and high value conservation forests (HVCF) in the CTEA;
- 2) Access to markets, credit and incentives for sustainable production of the main products in multiple use and high conservation value landscapes of the CTEA;
- 3) Landscape level implementation of sustainable practices in commercial production and livelihoods systems, aligned with the conservation and restoration of HVCF;
- 4) Dissemination of lessons learned, monitoring & evaluation.

To achieve the stated objective, the project will develop an enabling framework for an integrated approach to sustainable management and production in MULs of the CTEA. This will be done through mainstreaming of the landscape approach at different government levels; capacity building for multi-level coordination; mainstreaming of the landscape approach and environmental sustainability criteria in land use planning and development; strengthening local enforcement of regulations; and knowledge management to support sustainable production and landscape management. This will create the conditions for undertaking interventions at the landscape level and promoting replication, ensuring that the future expansion of production does not compromise biodiversity and ecosystem function and contributes to the establishment of deforestation free supply chains.

Table 1: GEF Project Components and Outcomes

Component	Outcome
<p>Component 1. Strengthened multi-level governance framework for sustainable management and production in multiple use landscapes (MUL) and high value conservation forests (HVCF) in the CTEA</p>	<p>Output 1.1: National multi-sectorial coordination and policy strengthened to support sustainable production in MULs.</p> <p>Output 1.2: Decentralized institutional structures strengthened for management and surveillance of sustainable production in MULs.</p> <p>Output 1.3: Land-use planning strengthened with multi-sectorial dialogue and decision-making mechanisms.</p> <p>Output 1.4: Local surveillance and monitoring systems.</p> <p>Output 1.5: Knowledge management program for sustainable production and landscape management.</p>
<p>Component 2. Access to markets, credit and incentives for sustainable production of the main products in multiple use and high conservation value landscapes of the CTEA</p>	<p>Output 2.1: Regional Platforms for Sustainable Supply Chains of coffee, cocoa, oil palm and livestock in northern and southern Amazon for multi-stakeholder dialogue and consensus and connecting buyers of sustainable products with producer.</p> <p>Output 2.2: Regional Action Plans for Sustainable Supply Chains coffee, cocoa, oil palm and livestock to access markets for deforestation free products.</p> <p>Output 2.3: Market access for wood, non-wood, and biodiversity products in central and southern Amazon.</p> <p>Output 2.4: Incentives strengthened for SFM and SLM.</p> <p>Output 2.5: Strengthened credit systems for deforestation free production in HCVFs.</p>
<p>Component 3. Landscape level implementation of</p>	<p>Output 3.1: Sustainable production and environment-friendly practices in coffee and oil palm to improve connectivity in MUL and HCVFs and complementary livelihood options in the northern Amazon landscape.</p>

sustainable practices in commercial production and livelihoods systems, aligned with the conservation and restoration of HVCF	<p>Output 3.2: Sustainable use of biodiversity including NTFPs in the central Amazon landscape, sustainable forest management in the central Amazon portion of the Kutuku Shaimi Reserve and complementary livelihood options.</p> <p>Output 3.3: Sustainable livestock and environment-friendly practices to improve connectivity and restore degraded lands in MUL and HCVMs in the southern Amazon and sustainable forest and NTFP management in the Kutuku Shaimi Protective Forest</p> <p>Output 3.4: Producers-support systems for upscaling at watershed level</p>
Component 4. Dissemination of lessons learned, monitoring & evaluation	<p>Output 4.1: Project M&E system operational and generating periodic reports</p> <p>Output 4.2: Mid-term review and final evaluation completed</p> <p>Output 4.3: Knowledge products, best practices and lessons learned published and disseminated.</p>

The GCF project *Priming Financial and Land Use Planning Instruments to Reduce Emissions from Deforestation* (PIMS #5768)

The project will implement the priority policies and measures identified in Ecuador’s REDD+ Action Plan. This REDD+ AP will contribute to reduce emissions from the land use, land use change and forestry (LULUCF) sector, which represents 30% of GHG emissions of the country. More specifically, it will contribute to achieve the objectives of the government which are: 1) a reduction in gross emissions by at least 20% by 2025 compared to Forest Reference Emission Levels (FREL) 2000-2008; 2) reforestation of 210,000 hectares of cleared land; 3) maintain climate regulation services (carbon) and others such as water regulation and associated biodiversity. Through the present project, the GCF provides approximately 26% of the budget requested for the implementation of the REDD+AP from 2016-2025. This Action Plan presents the policies and measures prioritized to address the drivers of deforestation. It has national scope and includes the 5 eligible REDD+ activities.

The project forms a sub-set of this Action Plan, and will co-finance it through 4 components:

1. Invest in enabling policies to reduce the drivers of deforestation and their associated emissions. More specifically, it will support the coordination of initiatives to mainstream climate change and REDD+ in national public policies, and in the main instruments of land-use planning undertaken by local governments and communities, indigenous peoples and nationalities.
2. Implement financial and economic incentives in non-forest areas to control agricultural expansion into forest areas and support the transition to sustainable “deforestation-free” agricultural production systems. It will do so by optimizing existing financial, economic, and market mechanisms, credit lines and tax incentives to implement agricultural and livestock production practices that reduce deforestation, and by strengthening purchasing policies for deforestation-free commodities, their certification and traceability.
3. Implement financial and non-financial mechanisms for restoration, conservation and connectivity.
4. Implement instruments related to the UNFCCC Warsaw Framework, such as the NFMS and the SIS, and operationalize the financial architecture of the REDD+AP to receive and channel future results-based payments.

The emission reductions that Ecuador will achieve by implementing the REDD+AP during the GCF project's lifetime (2017-2022) will be assessed in 2018, 2020, 2022, through the Biennial Update Reports to the UNFCCC.

Table 3: GCF Project Components and Outputs

Outputs	Activities
<p>Component 1. Investment in enabling policies to reduce the drivers of deforestation and its associated emissions.</p>	<p>Output 1.1: Land use plans updated taking into account climate change mitigation and adaptation dimensions, and implemented.</p> <p>Output 1.2: Local capacity building for supervision of land-use planning and zoning.</p> <p>Output 1.3: Strengthening forest control</p> <p>Output 1.4: Formal inter-institutional coordination structures within the framework of land-use plans, life plans and land-use zoning.</p>
<p>Component 2. Implementation of financial and economic incentives towards the transition to sustainable production systems in non-forest areas.</p>	<p>Output 2.1: Provision of incentives to support transition towards sustainable agriculture production through ATPA in the amazon area.</p> <p>Output 2.2: Promote the coordination and implementation of existing tax incentives that will foster the transition to sustainable production systems.</p> <p>Output 2.3: Adjustment of public credit lines dedicated to agricultural production, in order to promote more productive and sustainable agriculture and reduce impacts on deforestation.</p> <p>Output 2.4: Promote public and private procurement of deforestation-free products.</p> <p>Output 2.5: Certification and traceability of deforestation free products.</p>
<p>Component 3. Financial and non-financial mechanism for restoration, conservation and connectivity.</p>	<p>Output 3.1: Strengthen conservation, restoration and forest management processes driven through the Socio Bosque Programme</p> <p>Output 3.2: Strengthen mechanisms for integrated water resource management in the watershed located within prioritized areas.</p>
<p>Component 4. Implementation of enabling instruments to reduce the drivers of deforestation its associated emissions.</p>	<p>Output 4.1: Support the implantation of the Warsaw Framework for REDD+ and other operational processes.</p> <p>Output 4.2: Operationalization of the financial architecture of REDD+ AP</p>

3. OBJECTIVES OF THE MTR

The MTR will assess progress towards the achievement of the projects (GEF and GCF) objectives and outcomes as specified in the Project Documents 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.

The MTR is expected to review the project's progress with the main stakeholders: MAE, MAG and main partners: Socio Bosque Programme, ATPA, Water Funds (FONAG, FONAPA, FORAGUA), UN Women, FAO.

This MTR is considered as a significant opportunity to provide donors, government and project partners with an independent assessment of relevance and achievement of outcomes. We expect the MTR results to prompt midterm adjustments and to draw lessons that can improve the sustainability of benefits from both projects implemented in coordination with the two Ministries, and aid in the overall enhancement of UNDP programming.

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 Documents, project reports including Annual Project Review (APRs)/PIRs, project budget revisions, lesson learned reports, national strategic and legal documents, and any other materials that the team considers useful for this evidence-based review). And others prepared during the implementation phase, such as: UNDP Gender Equality Global Strategy, UNDP Ecuador Gender Strategy. 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 approach¹ ensuring close engagement with the Project Team, government counterparts (the GEF Operational Focal Point, the REDD+ focal point and the GCF NDA), the UNDP Country Office, UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Advisers, GCF Regional Technical Advisers, and other key stakeholders.

Engagement of stakeholders is vital to a successful MTR.² 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, academia, local government and CSOs, etc. Additionally, the MTR consultant is expected to conduct field missions to the six Ecuadorian Amazon provinces, el Oro and Loja provinces.

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. One report for each project (GEF and GCF) should be presented in Spanish and English.

Table 2: Key stakeholders of the PROAmazonía Programme

Stakeholders	Site/ Distance from the project office/means of mobilization	Interviews will be held with the following stakeholders at a minimum
· UNDP Country Office (CO) and Regional Hub	· Quito / Panama*	· Program Officer, Program Associate · Regional GEF and GCF advisors,

*UNDP Regional Hub is located in Panamá and the consultant should arrange a call to talk to the Regional Advisors, there is no travel to Panama.

¹ For ideas on innovative and participatory Monitoring and Evaluation strategies and techniques, see [UNDP Discussion Paper: Innovations in Monitoring & Evaluating Results](#), 05 Nov 2013.

² 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.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Regional Procurement Specialist
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project Team 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Quito 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Coordinators, Manager, Administrative Financial Assistant, Monitoring and Evaluation Technician, Gender Specialist
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> MAG 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Quito 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project National Director
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> MAE 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Quito 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project National Director
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> FAO 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Quito 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agreement Coordinator
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> UN Women (only GEF) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Quito 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agreement Coordinator
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Water Funds (FONAG, FORAGUA, FONAPA, only GCF) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Pichincha, Azuay, Napo, Loja and Zamora provinces 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Directors
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> CONFENIAE 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Amazonia 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project Representative
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ATPA 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Amazonia 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Manager, technicians
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Socio Bosque Programme 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Amazonia 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Manager, technicians
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mancomunidad Bosque Seco (only GCF) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Loja and Oro provinces 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Director
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SCTEA 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Amazonia 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Authorities
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> GADs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Amazonia 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Technicians, Planning Directors Authorities
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Secretaría Técnica Planifica Ecuador 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Quito 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Authorities
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> INIAP 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Amazonia 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Director
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> UTPL 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Loja 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agreement Coordinator
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dirección Nacional Forestal 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Quito 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Director
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Programa Nacional de Reforestación (convenios comunidades) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Quito 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Manager

At least three workshops must be carried out: one at the beginning of the consultancy and one at the end of the consultancy in Quito for the Management Committee. A third workshop with final results to be carried out in the Amazon with key stakeholders³.

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.

³ The cost of mobilization and travel expenses of the consultant must be included in the proposal. However, the cost of the workshops (rental of space and snacks will be paid directly by ProAmazonia).

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* for extended descriptions.

i. Projects Strategy

Projects design:

- Review the problem addressed by the projects and the underlying assumptions. Review the effect of any incorrect assumptions or changes to the context to achieving the projects results as outlined in the Project Documents.
- Review the relevance of the projects strategy and assess whether it provides the most effective route towards expected/intended results. Were lessons from other relevant projects properly incorporated into the projects design?
- Review how the projects address country priorities. Review country ownership. Were the project concepts 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 projects decisions, those who could affect the outcomes, and those who could contribute information or other resources to the process, taken into account during projects design processes?
- Review the extent to which relevant gender issues were raised in the projects design. See Annex 9 of *Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects* for further guidelines. And UNDP Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results, Chapter 7, pg. 171.
- If there are major areas of concern, recommend areas for improvement.

Results Frameworks/Logframes:

- Undertake a critical analysis of the projects' logframes 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 projects' 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 projects results frameworks and monitored on an annual basis.
- Ensure broader development and gender aspects of the projects are being monitored effectively. Develop and recommend SMART 'development' indicators, including sex-disaggregated indicators and indicators that capture development benefits.

ii. Relevance, Effectiveness and Efficiency

- Were the context, problem, needs and priorities well analysed and reviewed during the projects initiations?
- Are the planned projects objectives and outcomes relevant and realistic to the situation on the ground?
- Are the projects Theories of Change (ToC) and intervention logics coherent and realistic? Do the ToC and intervention logics hold, or do they need to be adjusted?
- Do outputs link to intended outcomes which link to broader paradigm shift objectives of the projects?
- Are the planned inputs and strategies identified realistic, appropriate and adequate to achieve the results? Were they sequenced sufficiently to efficiently deliver the expected results?
- Are the outputs being achieved in a timely manner? Is this achievement supportive of the ToC and pathways identified?

- What and how much progress has been made towards achieving the overall outputs and outcomes of the projects (including contributing factors and constraints)?
- To what extent is the project able to demonstrate changes against the baseline (assessment in approved Funding Proposal) for the GCF investment criteria (including contributing factors and constraints)?
- How realistic are the risks and assumptions of the projects?
- How did the projects deal with issues and risks in implementation?
- To what extent did the projects M&E data and mechanism(s) contribute to achieving projects results?
- Have project resources been utilized in the most economical, effective and equitable ways possible (considering value for money; absorption rate; commitments versus disbursements and projected commitments; co-financing; etc.)?
- Are the projects' governance mechanisms functioning efficiently?
- To what extent did the design of the projects help or hinder achieving their own goals?
- Were there clear objectives, ToC and strategies? How were these used in performance management and progress reporting?
- Were there clear baselines indicators and/or benchmark for performance measurements? How were these used in project management? To what extent and how the projects apply adaptive management?
- What, if any, alternative strategies would have been more effective in achieving the projects objectives?

iii. Progress Towards Results

Progress Towards Outcomes Analysis:

- Review the logframes 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). One table for each project.

Table 5. Progress Towards Results Matrix (Achievement of outcomes against End-of-project Targets)

Project Strategy		Indicator ⁴	Baseline Level ⁵	Level in 1 st PIR (self-reported)	Midterm Target ⁶	End-of-project Target	Midterm Level & Assessment ⁷	Achievement Rating ⁸	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.

⁴ Populate with data from the Logframe and scorecards

⁵ Populate with data from the Project Document

⁶ If available

⁷ Colour code this column only

⁸ Use the 6-point Progress Towards Results Rating Scale: HS, S, MS, MU, U, HU

- Identify remaining barriers to achieving the projects objectives in the remainder of the projects.
- By reviewing the aspects of the projects that have already been successful, identify ways in which the projects can further expand these benefits.

iv. Project Implementation and Adaptive Management

Management Arrangements:

- Review overall effectiveness of project management as outlined in the Projects Documents. 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 and GCF Partner Agencies (UNDP) and recommend areas for improvement.

Work Planning:

- Review any delays in projects 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 projects' results frameworks/ logframes as a management tool and review any changes made to it since project start.

Finance and co-finance:

- Consider the financial management of the projects, 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.
- Do the projects 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 projects? Is the Project Team meeting with all co-financing partners regularly in order to align financing priorities and annual work plans?

Coherence in climate finance delivery with other multilateral entities (only GCF project)

- Who are the partners of the project and how strategic are they in terms of capacities and commitment?
- Is there coherence and complementarity by the project with other actors for local other climate change interventions?
- To what extent has the project complimented other on-going local level initiatives (by stakeholders, donors, governments) on climate change adaptation or mitigation efforts?
- How has the project contributed to achieving stronger and more coherent integration of shift to low emission sustainable development pathways and/or increased climate resilient sustainable development (GCF RMF/PMF Paradigm Shift objectives)? Please provide concrete examples and make specific suggestions on how to enhance these roles going forward.

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?

- How are perspectives of women and men involved and affected by the projects monitored and assessed? How are relevant group's (women, indigenous, others) involvement with the projects and impact on them monitored?
- Examine the financial management of the projects monitoring and evaluation budgets. Are sufficient resources being allocated to monitoring and evaluation? Are these resources being allocated effectively?
- Identify activities related to the respective gender markers of the projects.

Stakeholder Engagement:

- Project management: Have the projects 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 projects? Do they continue to have an active role in project decision-making that supports efficient and effective projects implementation?
- Participation and public awareness: To what extent has stakeholder involvement and public awareness contributed to the progress towards achievement of projects 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 and GCF reporting requirements (i.e. how have they addressed poorly-rated PIRs or APRs, 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 projects 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 projects progress and intended impact to the public (is there a web presence, for example? Or did the projects implement appropriate outreach and public awareness campaigns?)
- For reporting purposes, write one half-page paragraph that summarizes the projects progress towards results in terms of contribution to sustainable development benefits, as well as global environmental benefits.

v. Sustainability

- Validate whether the risks identified in the Project Document, APRs and 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 and GCF 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 projects 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 projects outcomes/benefits to be sustained? Do the various key stakeholders see that it is in their interest that the projects benefits continue to flow? Is there sufficient public / stakeholder awareness in support of the long-term objectives of the projects? Are lessons learned being documented by the Project Team on a continual basis and shared/transferred to appropriate parties who could learn from the projects 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 projects 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 projects outcomes?

vi. Country Ownership

- To what extent are the projects aligned with national development plans, national plans of action on climate change, or sub-national policy as well as projects and priorities of the national partners?
- How well is country ownership reflected in the project governance, coordination and consultation mechanisms or other consultations?
- To what extent are country level systems for project management or M&E utilized in the projects?
- Are the projects as implemented responsive to local challenges and relevant/appropriate/strategic in relation to SDG indicators, National indicators, GCF and GEF RMF/PMF indicators, AE indicators, or other goals?
- Were the modes of deliveries of the outputs appropriate to build essential/necessary capacities, promote national ownership and ensure sustainability of the result achieved?

vii. Gender equity

- Do the projects only rely on sex-disaggregated data per population statistics?
- Are financial resources/project activities explicitly allocated to enable women to benefit from projects interventions?
- Do the projects account in activities and planning for local gender dynamics and how projects interventions affect women as beneficiaries?
- Do women as beneficiaries know their rights and/or benefits from project activities/interventions?
- How do the results for women compare to those for men?
- Is the decision-making process transparent and inclusive of both women and men?
- To what extent are female stakeholders or beneficiaries satisfied with the project gender equality results?
- Did the projects sufficiently address cross cutting issues including gender?

viii. Innovativeness in results areas

- What role have the projects played in the provision of "thought leadership," "innovation," or "unlocked additional climate finance" for climate change adaptation/mitigation in the projects and country context? Please provide concrete examples and make specific suggestions on how to enhance these roles going forward.

ix. Unexpected results, both positive and negative

- What has been the projects’ ability to adapt and evolve based on continuous lessons learned and the changing development landscape? Please account for factors both within the AE/EE and external.
- Can any unintended or unexpected positive or negative effects be observed as a consequence of the projects’ interventions?
- What factors have contributed to the unintended outcomes, outputs, activities, results?

x. Replication and Scalability

- What are project lessons learned, failures/lost opportunities to date? What might have been done better or differently?
- How effective were the exit strategies and approaches to phase out assistance provided by the projects including contributing factors and constraints.
- What factors of the projects’ achievements are contingent on specific local context or enabling environment factors?
- Are the actions and results from both project interventions likely to be sustained, ideally through ownership by the local partners and stakeholders?
- What are the key factors that will require attention in order to improve prospects of sustainability, scalability or replication of projects outcomes/outputs/results?

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 (Table with columns: Findings, conclusions and recommendations).⁹

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 (Table according to Annex 13. Management Response Template).

The MTR consultant should make no more than 15 recommendations total.

Ratings

The MTR consultant will include its ratings of the projects’ results and brief descriptions of the associated achievements in a *MTR Ratings & Achievement Summary Table* in the Executive Summary of the MTR reports. See Annex E for ratings scales. No rating on Project Strategy and no overall project rating is required. A separate table for each project (GEF and GCF) should be presented.

Table 6. MTR Ratings & Achievement Summary Table for (*Project Title*).

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)	

⁹ Alternatively, MTR conclusions may be integrated into the body of the report.

	Outcome 3 Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale)	
	Etc.	
Project Implementation & Adaptive Management	(rate 6 pt. scale)	
Sustainability	(rate 4 pt. scale)	

6. TIMEFRAME

The total duration of the MTR will be approximately 136 days over a time period of 19 weeks. The tentative MTR timeframe is as follows:

Table 7. GCF and GEF Timeframe

ACTIVITY	NUMBER OF WORKING DAYS	COMPLETION DATE
Management Committee Presentation (based on document review for preparation of the MTR Inception Reports)	One week after handover of project documents	October 22, 2019
MTR Inception Report Draft Submission (GCF)	One week after management committee presentation	October 29, 2019
MTR Inception Report Final Submission (GCF)	One week after Inception Report Draft Submission (GCF)	November 5, 2019
MTR Inception Report Draft Submission (GEF)	One week after Final Inception Report Submission (GCF)	November 12, 2019
MTR mission starts: stakeholder meetings, interviews, field visits (GEF and GCF)	One week after Draft Inception Report Submission (GEF)	November 19, 2019
MTR Inception Report Final Submission (GEF). MTR mission ends.	One month after MTR mission (GEF and GCF)	December 19, 2019
Submission of MTR Draft Report (GCF)	20 days after submission of Final Inception Report (GEF)	January 8, 2020
Management Committee Presentation (GCF and GEF)	One week after submission of Draft Report GCF	January 14, 2020
Submission of MTR Draft Report (GEF)	One week after Management Committee Presentation	January 28, 2020
Final Stakeholder Workshop (GEF and GCF) considering the list provided in table No. 4	One week after GEF MTR Draft Report submission	February 4, 2020
Expected date of full GCF MTR completion including systematization of stakeholder workshop and lessons	One week after the stakeholder workshop	February 11, 2020

learned. Incorporating audit trail from feedback on draft reports.		
Expected date of full GEF MTR completion including systematization of stakeholder workshop and lessons learned. Incorporating audit trail from feedback on draft reports.	Two weeks after the full GCF MTR final report submission.	February 27, 2020

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

7. MIDTERM REVIEW DELIVERABLES

Table 8. Deliverables for both projects with independent reports (GEF and GCF)¹⁰

#	Deliverable	Description	Timing	Responsibilities
1	Management Committee Presentation	Initial Findings, consultant clarifies objectives and methods of Midterm Review	Oct 22, 2019. One week after handover of project documents.	MTR consultant presents to project management and the Commissioning Unit
2	MTR Final Inception Reports (English and Spanish)		GCF: November 5, 2019. One week after Inception Report Draft Submission. GEF: December 19, 2019. One month after MTR mission.	MTR consultant submits to the Commissioning Unit and project management
3	GCF Draft Report (only in Spanish)	Full report (using guidelines on content outlined in Annex B) with annexes	January 8, 2020. 20 days after submission of Final Inception Report (GEF)	Sent to the Commissioning Unit, reviewed by RTA, Project Coordinating Unit, GEF OFP
4	Management Committee Presentation	Presentation of findings from the MTR mission, feedback on GCF draft report.	January 14, 2010. One week after submission of Draft Report GCF	MTR consultants presents to project management and the Commissioning Unit
5	GEF Draft Report (only in Spanish)	Full report (using guidelines on content outlined in Annex B) with annexes	January 28, 2020. One week after Management Committee Presentation	Sent to the Commissioning Unit, reviewed by RTA, Project Coordinating Unit
6	Final GCF Report (English and Spanish)	Revised report with audit trail detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final MTR report including systematization of	February 11, 2020. One week after the stakeholder workshop	Sent to the Commissioning Unit

¹⁰ Please note that this table doesn't include the final stakeholder workshop which will happen after the GEF Draft Report to incorporate comments from the different stakeholders into the final reports.

		stakeholder workshop and lessons learned.		
7	Final GEF Report (English and Spanish)	Revised report with audit trail detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final MTR report including systematization of stakeholder workshop and lessons learned.	February 27, 2020. Two weeks after the full GCF MTR final report submission.	Sent to the Commissioning Unit

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 Country Office.

The Commissioning Unit will contract the consultant. Per diem and travel costs for the MTR field mission to Ecuador is included in the consultant fee. Air fare should consider the most direct and economic route to the place and country, and the consultant must include in its economic proposal a daily expense allowance that does not exceed the United Nations rate for the place and country in which the MTR mission will be performed.

The Project Team will be responsible for liaising with the MTR consultant to provide all relevant documents, set up stakeholder interviews, arrange field visits and revise the documents produced by the consultant.

8. COMPOSITION

The MTR consultant should have previous experience and exposure to projects and evaluations from UNDP, GEF and/or GCF. 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. Due to the complexity of the work involved, the consultant should include support from a professional with work experience in gender mainstreaming, and gender indicators measurement and evaluation. The consultant should also have support from a professional with a technical background during the MTR mission.

The selection of the consultant will be aimed at maximizing the overall qualities in the following areas:

Consultant

- Led at least 5 project/program evaluations utilizing a result-based management methodology.
- 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, GEF or GCF project evaluation processes, either midterm or final reviews, in the last five years.
- Experience working in the Amazon Region;
- Five years of work experience in sustainable agriculture, forest management and conservation, natural resources policies and governance, biodiversity and climate change or REDD+ initiatives
- Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender and ecosystems; experience in gender sensitive evaluation and analysis in a development project;
- Excellent communication skills in English and Spanish (reading, writing, speaking).

- Project evaluation/review experiences within United Nations system will be considered an asset;
- A Master's degree in Natural Resources Management, Environmental Sciences, Agroecology, Environmental Policy, Climate Change or other closely related field.

9. PAYMENT MODALITIES AND SPECIFICATIONS

30% payment upon approval of final MTR Inception Report (GCF)

30% upon submission of MTR Draft Report (GCF)

40% upon finalization of the GEF full MTR Report (English and Spanish version)

10. APPLICATION PROCESS¹¹

Recommended Presentation of Proposal:

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

All application materials should be submitted by email at the following address **ONLY**: aplicaciones.ec@undp.org. Incomplete applications will be excluded from further consideration.

Criteria for Evaluation of Proposals: 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.

- The educational background and experience on similar assignments will be weighted a max. of 70%;
- The price proposal will weigh as 30% of the total scoring.

The evaluation criteria are the following:

Criteria	Points	Percentage
CV	30	30%
Technical proposal	40	40%
Economic proposal	30	30%
TOTAL		100%

¹¹ 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 and experience:</i>		30%
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Master’ degree in Natural Resources Management, Environmental Sciences, Agroecology, Environmental Policy, Climate Change or other closely related field. 	3	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Excellent communication skills in English and Spanish (written, reading and spoken) 	3	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has carried out at least 5 project/program evaluations utilizing a result-based management methodology 	4	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender and ecosystems; experience in gender sensitive evaluation and analysis in a development project; 	3	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Verifiable experience of participation in at least two (2) UNDP, GEF or GCF project evaluation processes, either midterm or final reviews, in the last five years. 	4	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Five years of work experience in sustainable agriculture, forest management and conservation, natural resources policies and governance, biodiversity and climate change or REDD+ initiatives. 	4	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Experience working in the Amazon Region 	3	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Experience in at least one (1) process applying SMART indicators and reconstructing and validating baseline scenarios in the last five years. 	4	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project evaluation/review experiences within United Nations system will be considered an asset 	2	
<i>TOTAL</i>		30	

Technical Proposal	<i>Methodology, agenda and implementation schedule:</i>		40%
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appropriate understanding the nature of work and understanding of the ToR. 	5	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development of the relevant aspects of the work with a sufficient level of detail. 	10	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development of stakeholder engagement/involvement approach in the field 	10	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development of appropriate conceptual and methodological framework for the work to be performed. 	10	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appropriate sequence of activities and planning. 	5	
<i>TOTAL</i>		40	

<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.	30	30%
Only the technical proposals that achieve a score of at least 49/70 will proceed to the economic proposal review stage.		

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

1. PIF GCF & GEF
2. UNDP Initiation Plan
3. GCF & GEF Project Documents
4. GCF & GEF Environmental and Social Screening results
5. PROAmazonia Project Inception Report
6. All Project Implementation Reports (PIR's) and Annual Project Reports (APRs)
7. Finalized GEF Tracking Tools at CEO endorsement and midterm / GEF Core Indicators
8. Quarterly progress reports and work plans of the various implementation task teams
9. GCF Audit report
10. Oversight mission reports
11. All monitoring reports prepared by the project
12. Financial and Administration guidelines used by Project Team
13. GEF and GCF Indicators Matrix

The following documents will also be available:

14. Project operational guidelines, manuals and systems
15. UNDP country/countries programme document(s)
16. Minutes of the Project Steering Committee Meetings and other meetings (i.e. Project Appraisal Committee meetings)
17. UNDP Ecuador Gender Equality Strategy

Please access the link for the annexes listed above: [Anexos MT Evaluation](#)

ToR ANNEX B: Guidelines on Contents for the Midterm Review Reports¹²

- i. Basic Report Information (*for opening page or title page*)
 - Title of UNDP supported GEF and GCF financed projects
 - UNDP PIMS# and GEF and GCF project ID#
 - MTR time frame and date of MTR report for both GCF and GEF projects
 - Region and country included in the projects
 - GEF Operational Focal Area/Strategic Program
 - Executing Agencies/Implementing Partners and other project partners
 - MTR Consultant
 - Acknowledgements
- ii. Table of Contents
- iii. Acronyms and Abbreviations
1. Executive Summary (*3-5 pages*)
 - Projects Information Table
 - Projects Description (brief)
 - Projects 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 reports

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

3. Projects Description and Background Context *(3-5 pages)*
 - Development context: environmental, socio-economic, institutional, and policy factors relevant to the projects objective and scope
 - Problems that the projects sought to address: threats and barriers targeted
 - Projects Description and Strategy: objective, outcomes and expected results, description of field sites (if any)
 - Projects Implementation Arrangements: short description of the Projects Board, key implementing partner arrangements, etc.
 - Projects timing and milestones
 - Main stakeholders: summary list
4. Findings *(12-14 pages)*
 - 4.1 Project Strategy
 - Projects Design
 - Results Framework/Logframe
 - 4.2 Relevance
 - 4.3 Effectiveness and Efficiency
 - 4.4 Progress Towards Results
 - Progress towards outcomes analysis
 - Remaining barriers to achieving the projects objective
 - 4.5 Projects Implementation and Adaptive Management
 - Management Arrangements
 - Work planning
 - Finance and co-finance
 - Coherence in climate finance delivery with other multilateral entities
 - Project-level monitoring and evaluation systems
 - Stakeholder engagement
 - Reporting
 - Communications
 - 4.6 Sustainability
 - Financial risks to sustainability
 - Socio-economic to sustainability
 - Institutional framework and governance risks to sustainability
 - Environmental risks to sustainability
 - 4.7 Country Ownership
 - 4.8 Innovativeness in results areas
 - 4.9 Unexpected results, both positive and negative
 - 4.10 Replication and Scalability
 - 4.11 Gender Equity
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 for GCF and GEF projects (one table for each project)

Evaluative Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
Project Strategy: To what extent is the project strategy relevant to country priorities, country ownership, and the best route towards expected results?			
(include evaluative question(s))	(i.e. relationships established, level of coherence between project design and implementation approach, specific activities conducted, quality of risk mitigation strategies, etc.)	(i.e. project documents, national policies or strategies, websites, project staff, project partners, data collected throughout the MTR mission, etc.)	(i.e. document analysis, data analysis, interviews with project staff, interviews with stakeholders, etc.)
Progress Towards Results: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved thus far?			
Project Implementation and Adaptive Management: Has the project been implemented efficiently, cost-effectively, and been able to adapt to any changing conditions thus far? To what extent are project-level monitoring and evaluation systems, reporting, and project communications supporting the project's implementation?			
Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, socio-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?			

Evaluators/Consultants:

1. Must present information that is complete and fair in its assessment of strengths and weaknesses so that decisions or actions taken are well founded.
2. Must disclose the full set of evaluation findings along with information on their limitations and have this accessible to all affected by the evaluation with expressed legal rights to receive results.
3. Should protect the anonymity and confidentiality of individual informants. They should provide maximum notice, minimize demands on time, and respect people's right not to engage. Evaluators must respect people's right to provide information in confidence, and must ensure that sensitive information cannot be traced to its source. Evaluators are not expected to evaluate individuals, and must balance an evaluation of management functions with this general principle.
4. Sometimes uncover evidence of wrongdoing while conducting evaluations. Such cases must be reported discreetly to the appropriate investigative body. Evaluators should consult with other relevant oversight entities when there is any doubt about if and how issues should be reported.
5. Should be sensitive to beliefs, manners and customs and act with integrity and honesty in their relations with all stakeholders. In line with the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights, evaluators must be sensitive to and address issues of discrimination and gender equality. They should avoid offending the dignity and self-respect of those persons with whom they come in contact in the course of the evaluation. Knowing that evaluation might negatively affect the interests of some stakeholders, evaluators should conduct the evaluation and communicate its purpose and results in a way that clearly respects the stakeholders' dignity and self-worth.
6. Are responsible for their performance and their product(s). They are responsible for the clear, accurate and fair written and/or oral presentation of study limitations, findings and recommendations.
7. Should reflect sound accounting procedures and be prudent in using the resources of the evaluation.

MTR Consultant Agreement Form

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

Name of Consultant: _____

Name of Consultancy Organization (where relevant): _____

I confirm that I have received and understood and will abide by the United Nations Code of Conduct for Evaluation.

Signed at _____ (*Place*) on _____ (*Date*)

Signature: _____

¹³ www.undp.org/uneqcodeofconduct

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 Team to show how the received comments on the draft MTR report have (or have not) been incorporated into the final MTR report. This audit trail should be included as an annex in the final MTR report.

To the comments received on (*date*) from the Midterm Review of (*project name*) (UNDP Project ID-*PIMS #*)

The following comments were provided in track changes to the draft Midterm Review report; they are referenced by institution (“Author” column) and track change comment number (“#” column):

Author	#	Para No./ comment location	Comment/Feedback on the draft MTR report	MTR team response and actions taken