DETAILED TERMS OF REFERENCE

FOR

INDEPENDENT MID TERM REVIEW OF THE PROJECT

Demonstrating Innovative Ocean Governance Mechanisms and Delivering Best Practices and Lessons for Extended Continental Shelf Management within the Western Indian Ocean Large Marine Ecosystems

(Short title: UNDP-Joint Management Area (JMA) Demonstration Project)

INTRODUCTION

These Terms of Reference (TOR) set out the expectations for a mid-term review (MTR) of the UNDP-supported GEF-financed project '**UNDP-Joint Management Area Demonstration Project between Mauritius and Seychelles' (PIMS # 5262.)**

The essentials of the project to be evaluated are as follows:

PROJECT SUMMARY TABLE

Project Title:	UNDP-Joint Management Area Demonstration Project			
GEF Project ID:	5513		*at endorsement (Million US$)*	*at mid-term (Million US$)*
UNDP Project ID:	00087614	**GEF financing:**	$ 2,210,391	$ 1,023,096
Country:	Mauritius and Seychelles	**IA/EA own:**	Same as Government	
Region:	Africa	**Government:**	$ 15,600	
Focal Area:	Ocean Governance	**Other:**	$ 28,800	
FA Objectives, (OP/SP):		**Total co-financing:**	$ 15,600	
Executing Agency:	Prime Minister's Office, Department for Continental Shelf, Maritime Zones Administration and Exploration, (Mauritius)	**Total Project Cost:**	$17, 839,191	

		ProDoc Signature (date project began):	11 January 2018	
Other Partners involved:	Vice President's Office, Department of Blue Economy (Seychelles)	**(Operational) Closing Date:**	Proposed: 31 December 2021	Actual: 31 December 2021

OBJECTIVE AND SCOPE

The goal of the UNDP-JMA Demonstration Project is primarily based on developing and demonstrating innovative Ocean Governance Mechanisms, and Delivering Best Practices and Lessons for Extended Continental Shelf Management within the Western Indian Ocean Large Marine Ecosystem (hereafter the Joint Management Area (JMA)) which can be replicated throughout similar areas globally.

The UNDP-JMA Demonstration Project aims at achieving its objectives through the delivery of four components as follows:

1.   Building Technical and Management Capacity in support of Marine Spatial Planning (MSP) and effective management of the Joint Management Area.

2.   Development of a data and information system along with a Programme of data capture and gap-filling as a foundation for an adaptive management strategy.

3.   Elaboration and implementation of a Marine Spatial Planning approach with the objective of improving and implementing effective decision-making for activities within the Joint Management Area.

4.   Monitoring, Evaluation, Adaptive Feedback and Sustainability using UNDP and GEF tracking tool for both annual progress and terminal evaluation.

The objective of the Mid-Term Review (MTR) is to 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.

EVALUATION APPROACH AND METHOD

The MTR must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The MTR personnel 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 quarterly reports including PIRs, project budget revisions, and any other materials that the MTR personnel considers useful for this evidence-based review). The MTR personnel will also 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 personnel must ensure that gender-responsive evaluation methodologies, tools and data analysis techniques are used. The MTR personnel is expected to follow a collaborative and participatory approach 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 MTR. Stakeholder involvement should include interviews with stakeholders who have project responsibilities, including but not limited to Department of Blue Economy (Seychelles) and the Department for Continental Shelf, Maritime Zones Administration and Exploration (Mauritius), the Joint Commissioners and the Joint Technical members. Additionally, the MTR team is expected to conduct field missions to Mauritius and Visio Conference calls with Seychelles to complete the tasks at hand.

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.

EVALUATION CRITERIA AND RATINGS

The MTR personnel 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.

1. 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 countries ownership. Was the project concept in line with the national sector development priorities and plans of the participating countries (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?
- If there are major areas of concerns, recommend areas for improvement.

Results Framework/Logframe:
- Undertake a critical analysis of the project's logframe indicators and targets, assess how "SMART" the time frame 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, improved governance etc...) that should be included in the project results framework and monitored on an annual basis.
- Ensure broader development of the project are being monitored effectively.

2. Progress Towards Results

Progress Towards Outcomes Analysis:
- Review the logframe indicators against progress made towards the time frame 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).

Table1: Progress Towards Results Matrix (Achievement of outcomes against time frame-of-project Targets)

Project Strategy	Indicator[1]	Baseline Level[2]	Level in 1st PIR (self-reported)	Midterm Target[3]	End-of-project Target	Midterm Level & Assessment [4]	Achievement Rating[5]	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 Mid-term 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.

3. Project Implementation and Adaptive Management

Management Arrangements:
- Review overall effectiveness of project management as outlined in the Project Document. Have changes been made and are they effective? Are responsibilities and reporting lines clear? Is decision-making transparent and undertaken in a timely manner? Recommend areas for improvement.
- Review the quality of execution of the Executing Agency/Implementing Partner(s) and recommend areas for improvement.
- Review the quality of support provided by the GEF Partner Agency (UNDP) and recommend areas for improvement.
- Do the Executing Agency/Implementing Partner and/or UNDP and other partners have the capacity to deliver benefits to or involve women? If yes, how?
- What is the gender balance of project staff? What steps have been taken to ensure gender balance in project staff?
- What is the gender balance of the Project Board? What steps have been taken to ensure gender balance in the Project Board?

---

[1] Populate with data from the Logframe and scorecards

[2] Populate with data from the Project Document

[3] If available

[4] Colour code this column only

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

<u>Work Planning:</u>
- 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.

<u>Finance and co-finance:</u>
- 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?

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financer	Type of Co-financing	Co-financing amount confirmed at CEO Endorsement (US$)	Actual Amount Contributed at stage of Midterm Review (US$)	Actual % of Expected Amount
		TOTAL			

- Include the separate GEF Co-Financing template (with support and input by the Commissioning Unit and project team) which categorizes each co-financing amount as 'investment mobilized' or 'recurrent expenditures'. (This template will be annexed as a separate file.)

<u>Project-level Monitoring and Evaluation Systems:</u>
- 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?
- Review the extent to which relevant gender issues were incorporated in monitoring systems. See Annex 9 of *Guidance for Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects* for further guidelines.

<u>Stakeholder Engagement:</u>
- 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?
- How does the project engage women and girls? Is the project likely to have the same positive and/or negative effects on women and men, girls and boys? Identify, if possible, legal, cultural, or religious constraints on women's participation in the project. What can the project do to enhance its gender benefits?

Social and Environmental Standards (Safeguards)
- Validate the risks identified in the project's most current SESP, and those risks' ratings; are any revisions needed?
- Summarize and assess the revisions made since CEO Endorsement/Approval (if any) to:
  - The project's overall safeguards risk categorization.
  - The identified types of risks[6] (in the SESP).
  - The individual risk ratings (in the SESP) .
- Describe and assess progress made in the implementation of the project's social and environmental management measures as outlined in the SESP submitted at CEO Endorsement/Approval (and prepared during implementation, if any), including any revisions to those measures. Such management measures might include Environmental and Social Management Plans (ESMPs) or other management plans, though can also include aspects of a project's design; refer to Question 6 in the SESP template for a summary of the identified management measures.

A given project should be assessed against the version of UNDP's safeguards policy that was in effect at the time of the project's approval.

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.
- List knowledge activities/products developed (based on knowledge management approach approved at CEO Endorsement/Approval).

---

[6] Risks are to be labelled with both the UNDP SES Principles and Standards, and the GEF's "types of risks and potential impacts": Climate Change and Disaster; Disadvantaged or Vulnerable Individuals or Groups; Disability Inclusion; Adverse Gender-Related impact, including Gender-based Violence and Sexual Exploitation; Biodiversity Conservation and the Sustainable Management of Living Natural Resources; Restrictions on Land Use and Involuntary Resettlement; Indigenous Peoples; Cultural Heritage; Resource Efficiency and Pollution Prevention; Labour and Working Conditions; Community Health, Safety and Security.

4. 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 personnel will include a section of the report setting out the MTR's evidence-based conclusions, in light of the findings.[7]

Additionally, the MTR personnel is expected to make recommendations to the Project team. 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 personnel should make no more than 15 recommendations in total.

Ratings

The MTR personnel will include its ratings of the project's results and brief descriptions of the associated achievements in an *MTR Ratings and 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.

---

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

Table 2: MTR Ratings and Achievement Summary Table for 'UNDP-JMA Demonstration Project.

Measure	MTR Rating	Achievement Description
Project Strategy	N/A	
Progress Towards Results	Objective Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale)	
	Outcome 1 Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale)	
	Outcome 2 Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale)	
	Outcome 3 Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale)	
	Etc.	
Project Implementation & Adaptive Management	(rate 6 pt. scale)	
Sustainability	(rate 4 pt. scale)	

MID-TERM REVIEW TIMEFRAME

The total duration of the MTR will be approximately *35 working days* over a time period of *10 weeks* starting 02 October *2020 and* shall not exceed three months from when the consultant is hired. The tentative MTR timeframe is as follows:

TIMEFRAME	ACTIVITY	ESTIMATED NUMBER OF WORKING DAYS
16 September 2020	Application closes	n/a
02 October 2020	Select MTR Personnel (Starting of contract)	n/a
5 October 2020	Prep the MTR Personnel (handover of Project Documents)	n/a
7 October 2020 - 12 October 2020	Document review and preparing MTR Inception Report	4 days
14 October 2020 – 21 October 2020	Finalization and Validation of MTR Inception Report- latest start of MTR mission	6 days
26 October 2020 – 12 November 2020	MTR mission: stakeholder meetings, interviews, field visits, Visio Conferencing	14 days
13 November 2020	Mission wrap-up meeting and presentation of initial findings- earliest end of MTR mission	1 day

16 November 2020 – 25 November 2020	Preparing draft MTR report	8 days
26 November 2020 – 27 November 2020	Incorporating audit trail from feedback on draft report/Finalization of MTR report	2 days
30 November 2020	Preparation & Issue of Management Response	n/a
01 December 2020	Expected date of full MTR completion	n/a

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

EVALUATION DELIVERABLES

#	Deliverable	Description	Timing	Responsibilities
1	**MTR Inception Report**	MTR personnel clarifies objectives and methods of Midterm Review	No later than 2 weeks before the MTR mission (21 October 2020)	MTR personnel submits to Commissioning Unit, the project management
2	**Presentation**	Initial Findings	End of MTR mission	MTR Team presents to project management and the Commissioning Unit
3	**Draft Final Report**	Full report (using guidelines on content outlined in Annex B) with annexes	Within 3 weeks of the MTR mission: (25 November 2020)	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: (01 December 2020)	Sent to the Commissioning Unit

*The final MTR report must be in English.

MTR ARRANGEMENTS

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

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

MTR TEAM COMPOSITION

An independent consultant will conduct the MTR (with experience and exposure to projects and evaluations in other regions globally). The consultant cannot have participated in the project preparation, formulation, and/or

implementation (including the writing of the Project Document) and should not have a conflict of interest with project's related activities.

The selection of the consultants will be aimed at maximizing the overall "individual" qualities in the following areas: *Technical Criteria - 70% of total evaluation – max. 70 points:*

<u>Experience</u>
- Recent experience with result-based management evaluation methodologies; (10)
- Experience applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios; (10)
- Competence in adaptive management, as applied to water and ocean governance; (10)
- Experience evaluating environmental projects (10)
- Experience working in (*SIDS countries of the Indian Ocean particularly Mauritius and Seychelles*); (5)
- Work experience in relevant technical areas for at least 10 years; (15)
- Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender, water, and ocean governance,experience in gender sensitive evaluation and analysis (10)
- Project evaluation/review experiences within United Nations system will be considered an asset; (5)

<u>Education</u>
- A minimum master's degree in natural resource management, Ocean governance studies or other closely related field. (15)

<u>Language</u>
- Fluency in written and spoken English; Excellent communication skills in English; (10)

Financial Criteria - 30% of total evaluation – max. 30 points:

EVALUATOR ETHICS

The MTR Consultant will be held to the highest ethical standards and is required to sign a code of conduct upon acceptance of the assignment. This MTR will be conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the <u>UNEG 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluations'</u>. The MTR Consultant must safeguard the rights and confidentiality of information providers, interviewees and stakeholders through measures to ensure compliance with legal and other relevant codes governing collection of data and reporting on data. The MTR Consultant must also ensure security of collected information before and after the MTR and protocols to ensure anonymity and confidentiality of sources of information where that is expected. The information, knowledge and data gathered in the MTR process must also be solely used for the MTR and not for other uses without the express authorization of UNDP and partners.

PAYMENT MODALITIES AND SPECIFICATIONS

%	Milestone
30%	Upon satisfactory delivery of the final MTR Inception Report and approval by the Commissioning Unit
30%	Upon satisfactory delivery of the draft MTR report to the Commissioning Unit

40%	Following satisfactory delivery of the final MTR report and approval by the Commissioning Unit and Regional Technical Advisor (via signatures on the MTR Report Clearance Form) and delivery of completed MTR Audit Trail
	Criteria for issuing the final payment of 40%[8]:
	• The final MTR report includes all requirements outlined in the MTR TOR and is in accordance with the MTR guidance.
	• The final MTR report is clearly written, logically organized, and is specific for this project (i.e. text has not been cut & pasted from other MTR reports).
	• The Audit Trail includes responses to and justification for each comment listed.

APPLICATION PROCESS

Recommended Presentation of Proposal:

a) **Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability** using the template[9] provided by UNDP;

b) **CV** and a **Personal History Form** (P11 form[10]);

c) **Brief description of approach to work/technical proposal** of why the individual considers him/herself as the most suitable for the assignment, and a proposed methodology on how they will approach and complete the assignment; (max 1 page)

d) **Financial Proposal** that indicates the all-inclusive fixed total contract price and all other travel related costs (such as flight ticket, per diem, etc), supported by a breakdown of costs, as per template attached to the Letter of Confirmation of Interest template. If an applicant is employed by an organization/company/institution, and he/she expects his/her employer to charge a management fee in the process of releasing him/her to UNDP under Reimbursable Loan Agreement (RLA), the applicant must indicate at this point, and ensure that all such costs are duly incorporated in the financial proposal submitted to UNDP.

All application materials should be submitted to the address;

UNDP Mauritius and Seychelles Country Office, 6th Floor, Anglo Mauritius House, Intendance Street, P.O Box 253, Port Louis, Mauritius)

in a sealed envelope indicating the following reference "Consultant for (UNDP- Joint Management Area Demonstration Mid-term Review" or by email at the following address ONLY: (procurement.mu@undp.org) **by 16:00 hrs Mauritian Time on 16 September 2020**. Incomplete applications will be excluded from further consideration.

Criteria for Evaluation of Proposal: Only those applications which are responsive and compliant will be evaluated.

---

[8] The Commissioning Unit is obligated to issue payments to the MTR team as soon as the terms under the ToR are fulfilled. If there is an ongoing discussion regarding the quality and completeness of the final deliverables that cannot be resolved between the Commissioning Unit and the MTR team, the Regional M&E Advisor and Vertical Fund Directorate will be consulted. If needed, the Commissioning Unit's senior management, Procurement Services Unit and Legal Support Office will be notified as well so that a decision can be made about whether or not to withhold payment of any amounts that may be due to the evaluator(s), suspend or terminate the contract and/or remove the individual contractor from any applicable rosters.

[9] https://intranet.undp.org/unit/bom/pso/Support%20documents%20on%20IC%20Guidelines/Template%20for%20Confirmation%20of%20Interest%20and%20Submission%20of%20Financial%20Proposal.docx

[10] http://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/corporate/Careers/P11_Personal_history_form.doc

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.

ANNEX A: LIST OF DOCUMENTS TO BE REVIEWED BY THE EVALUATORS

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 (METT & PMAT)
10. Consultants technical 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 Steering Committee Minutes of the UNDP-JMA Demonstration Project
14. Project site location maps

TOR ANNEX B: GUIDELINES ON CONTENTS FOR THE MIDTERM REVIEW REPORT[11]

  i.   Basic Report Information *(for opening page or title page)*
        - Title of UNDP supported GEF financed project
        - UNDP PIMS# and GEF project ID#
        - MTR time frame and date of MTR report
        - Region and countries included in the project
        - GEF Operational Focal Area/Strategic Program
        - Executing Agency/Implementing Partner and other project partners
        - MTR team members
        - Acknowledgements
  ii.   Table of Contents
  iii. Acronyms and Abbreviations
  1.   Executive Summary *(3-5 pages)*
        - Project Information Table
        - Project Description (brief)
        - Project Progress Summary (between 200-500 words)
        - MTR Ratings & Achievement Summary Table
        - Concise summary of conclusions
        - Recommendation Summary Table
  2.   Introduction *(2-3 pages)*
        - Purpose of the MTR and objectives
        - Scope & 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, 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)

---

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

- Project Implementation Arrangements: short description of the Project Board, key implementing partner arrangements, etc.
- Project timing and milestones
- Main stakeholders: summary list

4. Findings *(12-14 pages)*
  4.1 Project Strategy
  - Project Design
  - Results Framework/Logframe

  4.2 Progress Towards Results
  - Progress towards outcomes analysis
  - Remaining barriers to achieving the project objective

  4.3 Project Implementation and Adaptive Management
  - Management Arrangements
  - Work planning
  - Finance and co-finance
  - Project-level monitoring and evaluation systems
  - Stakeholder engagement
  - Social and Environmental Standards (Safeguards)
  - Reporting
  - Communications & Knowledge Management

  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.)*
- *Annexed in a separate file:* GEF Co-financing template (categorizing co-financing amounts by source as 'investment mobilized' or 'recurrent expenditure')

TOR ANNEX C: MIDTERM REVIEW EVALUATIVE MATRIX TEMPLATE

Evaluative Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
Project Strategy: To what extent is the project strategy relevant to country priorities, country ownership, and the best route towards expected results?			
(include evaluative 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, 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.
8. Must ensure that independence of judgement is maintained and that evaluation findings and recommendations are independently presented.
9. Must confirm that they have not been involved in designing, executing or advising on the project being evaluated.

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] www.undp.org/unegcodeofconduct

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

Midterm Review Report Reviewed and Cleared By:

Commissioning Unit (M&E Focal Point)

Name: _____

Signature: _____   Date: _____

Regional Technical Advisor (Nature, Climate and Energy)

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 not by the person's name, and track change comment number ("#" column):

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

This TOR is approved by: <u>Mr. Satyajeet Ramchurn, Head of Environment Unit</u>

Signature   : …………………………………………………………………………

Date   : …………………………………………………………………………