**TE R M S O F R E F E R E N C E**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Location</strong></th>
<th>Honiara</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Application deadline</strong></td>
<td>24 February 2023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type of Contract</strong></td>
<td>Individual Contract</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Post Level</strong></td>
<td>National Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Consultancy Title</strong></td>
<td>SPIRES MTR National Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Languages required:</strong></td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Duration of Initial Contract:</strong></td>
<td>35 Days (13 March 2023 – 19 May 2023)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**BACKGROUND**

**Project Title:**
Stimulating Progress towards Improved Rural Electrification in Solomon Islands Project (SPIRES)

**Project Description:**
This is the Terms of Reference for the UNDP-GEF Midterm Review (MTR) of the full-sized project titled Stimulating Progress towards Improved Rural Electrification in Solomon Islands Project (PIMS#6089) implemented through the Ministry of Mines, Energy and Rural Electrification, which is to be undertaken in 2023. The project started on the 12 November 2020 and is in its third year of implementation. This ToR sets out the expectations for this MTR. The MTR process must follow the guidance outlined in the document *Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects* (*MTR Guidance*).

The SPIRES Project’s goal is reduced annual growth rate of GHG emissions in the energy and energy end use sector of the Solomon Islands. Its objective is the facilitation of the achievement of increased access to electricity in rural communities in the country. The project follows these four approaches a) Review, improvement, approval and enforcement of appropriate policy, planning and regulatory frameworks that will support enhanced and accelerated electrification of the off-grid areas in the country; (b) Development and enforcement of suitable institutional and financial mechanisms in the integrated planning and implementation of rural electrification in the country; (c) Development and implementation of cost-effective demonstrations of various schemes for rural electrification in the off-grid areas involving the private sector, CSOs, NGOs and local communities; and, (d) Design and conduct of information communication and education activities to improve levels of awareness and knowledge of the government, private sector and citizenry on climate resilient and low carbon development of off-grid areas. It is expected that these project’s outcomes will be achieved: a) Enforcement of approved policies, and rules and regulations to support enhanced application of cost-effective RE technologies for electricity generation in the off-grid areas in Solomon Islands; b) Enforced improved institutional and financial mechanisms in the integrated planning and implementation of rural electrification and RE-based energy production in the off-grid areas; c) Adoption and implementation of climate resilient and low carbon electricity applications in increasing access to electricity in off-grid areas;
d) Increased confidence in, and application of, RE technologies and RE-based power generation to support socio-economic development in off-grid areas; and e) Enhanced awareness and knowledge of the government, private sector and communities on the cost-effective application of RE and EE technologies/practices.

The Solomon Islands had experienced the global pandemic in 2020 and has its first community transmissions in early 2022. One of the impacts of this pandemic was travel restrictions were imposed at both international and domestic airports and seaports. This has led to delays in project implementation in 2022. Prior to that it is noteworthy to mention the recruitment challenges faced by the Implementing partner who only managed to get the full project team was only recruited in Quarter 3 of 2021. This has slowed down project implementation. Furthermore, travel restrictions have also impeded the procurement and installation of solar PV systems as majority of the solar panels and systems were procured outside the country. These challenges have led to the further delay of installation of the renewable energy infrastructures in the 8 designated demonstration sites. Another challenge was that some key activities such as techno economical assessments, and policy reforms were impacted due to travel restrictions as limited technical people from outside the country were permitted to enter the country and there is limited pool of energy experts in the country.

**MTR Purpose:**
The MTR will assess progress towards the achievement of the project objectives and outcomes as specified in the Project Document and assess early signs of project success or failure with the goal of identifying the necessary changes to be made in order to set the project on-track to achieve its intended results. The MTR will also review the project’s strategy and its risks to sustainability. MTR is primarily a monitoring tool to identify challenges and outline corrective actions to ensure that a project is on track to achieve maximum results by its completion. MTRs are a mandatory requirement for all GEF-financed full-sized projects (FSP). MTRs are not mandatory for GEF-financed medium-sized projects (MSP) but should be undertaken, at the discretion of the Project Board, when the project is not performing well and could therefore benefit from an independent review. The project document outlines that an independent MTR will be conducted and submitted to GEF. The MTR findings and responses outlined in the management response will be incorporated as recommendations for enhanced implementation during the final half of the project’s duration. The terms of reference, the review process and the MTR report will follow the standard templates and guidance prepared by the UNDP IEO for GEF-financed projects available on the UNDP Evaluation Resource Center (ERC). As noted in this guidance, the evaluation will be ‘independent, impartial and rigorous’. The consultants that will be hired to undertake the assignment will be independent from organizations that were involved in designing, executing, or advising on the project to be evaluated.

The aims of the MTR are the following:

- Assess the progress towards the achievements of the project objectives and outcomes as specified in the Project Document
- Assess the extent of barrier removal that has been achieved as of the mid-term, and the prospects of full barrier removal by end-of-project.
- Assess early signs of project success or failure, and recommend corrective and adaptive measures
- Assess the progress towards advancing gender equality and women’s empowerment
- On the basis of the MTR findings, identify and propose the necessary changes to set the project on-track to achieve its intended results.
- Review the project’s strategy and its risks to sustainability

DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

MTR Approach & Methodology

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

The National Consultant is responsible for the gathering, processing, and analysis of data/information that are to be gathered from the local project stakeholders. He/she must advise the International Consultant on the veracity of the documents and information provided by the project stakeholders and beneficiaries, the implementing partner (IP), and the project team. Together with the IC, the gathered data/information, review findings shall be documented, verified, and confirmed for use in drawing conclusions about the project performance during mid-term; and to come up with relevant recommendations that are intended to help the IP and the project team to enhance their performance and successfully complete and achieve the project objective by the planned project completion date.

Particularly the National Consultant will be responsible to contributing to the development of the review plan & methodology; conducting those elements of the evaluation as determined jointly with the international consultant and UNDP; contributing to the interviews, meetings during the project demonstration evaluations; contributing to presentation of the review findings and recommendations at the wrap-up meeting and contributing to the drafting and finalization of the review report.

The MTR team 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), the Nature, Climate and Energy (NCE) Regional Technical Advisor, direct beneficiaries, 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; executing agencies, senior officials and task team/component leaders, key experts and consultants.

1 The MTR is expected to provide guidance on how to expedite the implementation the delayed project activities and those that are planned for implementation during the PIR 2023 reporting period, as well as guidance to the PMU on how to put back the project implementation on track, and how to carry out the planned project activities to be able to generate the necessary data/information that will be used in gauging the level of achievement of each Outcome indicator in each project component.
2 For ideas on innovative and participatory Monitoring and Evaluation strategies and techniques, see UNDP Discussion Paper: Innovations in Monitoring & Evaluating Results, 05 Nov 2013.
3 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.
in the subject area, Project Board, project stakeholders, academia, local government and CSOs, etc. Additionally, the MTR team is expected to conduct field missions to Solar PV system demonstration sites, including the following project sites Hunanawa Community and Rokera Provincial Secondary School, Malaita Provinces.

The specific design and methodology for the MTR should emerge from consultations between the MTR team and the above-mentioned parties regarding what is appropriate and feasible for meeting the MTR purpose and objectives and answering the evaluation questions, given limitations of budget, time and data. The MTR team must, however, use gender-responsive methodologies and tools and ensure that gender equality and women’s empowerment, as well as other cross-cutting issues and SDGs are incorporated into the MTR report.

The final methodological approach including interview schedule, field visits and data to be used in the MTR should be clearly outlined in the Inception Report and be fully discussed and agreed between UNDP, stakeholders, and the MTR team.

The final MTR report must 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.

A short validation mission may be considered if it is confirmed to be safe for staff, consultants, stakeholders and if such a mission is possible within the MTR schedule. Equally, qualified and independent national consultants can be hired to undertake the MTR and interviews in country as long as it is safe to do so.

**Detailed Scope of the MTR**

The MTR team 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 how the project addresses country priorities. Review country ownership. Was the project concept in line with the national sector development priorities and plans of the country (or of participating countries in the case of multi-country projects)?
- Review decision-making processes: were perspectives of those who would be affected by project decisions, those who could affect the outcomes, and those who could contribute information or other resources to the process, taken into account during project design processes?
- Review the extent to which relevant gender issues were raised in the project design. See Annex 9 of *Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects* for further guidelines.
Were relevant gender issues (e.g. the impact of the project on gender equality in the programme country, involvement of women’s groups, engaging women in project activities) raised in the Project Document?

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

**Results Framework/Log frame:**

- Undertake a critical analysis of the project’s log frame indicators and targets, assess how “SMART” the midterm and end-of-project targets are (Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Relevant, Time-bound), and suggest specific amendments/revisions to the targets and indicators as necessary.
- Are the project’s objectives and outcomes or components clear, practical, and feasible within its time frame?
- Examine if progress so far has led to, or could in the future catalyse beneficial development effects (i.e. income generation, gender equality and women’s empowerment, improved governance etc...) that should be included in the project results framework and monitored on an annual basis.
- Ensure broader development and gender aspects of the project are being monitored effectively. Develop and recommend SMART ‘development’ indicators, including sex-disaggregated indicators and indicators that capture development benefits.

2. **Progress Towards Results**

- Review the log frame indicators against progress made towards the end-of-project targets; populate the Progress Towards Results Matrix, as described in 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 the project objective and each outcome; make recommendations from the areas marked as “not on target to be achieved” (red).
- Compare and analyse the GEF Tracking Tool/Core Indicators at the Baseline with the one completed right before the Midterm Review.
- Identify remaining barriers to achieving the project objective in the remainder of the project.
- By reviewing the aspects of the project that have already been successful, identify ways in which the project can further expand these benefits.

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?

Work Planning
- Review any delays in project start-up and implementation, identify the causes and examine if they have been resolved.
- Are work-planning processes results-based? If not, suggest ways to re-orientate work planning to focus on results?
- Examine the use of the project’s results framework/logframe as a management tool and review any changes made to it since project start.

Finance and co-finance
- Consider the financial management of the project, with specific reference to the cost-effectiveness of interventions.
- Review the changes to fund allocations as a result of budget revisions and assess the appropriateness and relevance of such revisions.
- Does the project have the appropriate financial controls, including reporting and planning, that allow management to make informed decisions regarding the budget and allow for timely flow of funds?
- Informed by the co-financing monitoring table to be filled out by the Commissioning Unit and project team, 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? Please make sure that evidentiary documents of the actual co-financing that was realized are available, including report on the results of co-financed activities that were carried out by the co-financers or project partners.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sources of Co-financing</th>
<th>Name of Co-financer</th>
<th>Type of Co-financing</th>
<th>Co-financing amount confirmed at CEO Endorsement (US$)</th>
<th>Actual Amount Contributed at stage of Midterm Review (US$)</th>
<th>Actual % of Expected Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Include the separate GEF Co-Financing template (filled out by the Commissioning Unit and project team) which categorizes co-financing amounts by source as ‘investment mobilized’ or ‘recurrent expenditures’. (This template will be annexed as a separate file).

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? Are additional tools required? How could they be made more participatory and inclusive? Make sure that
evidentiary documents about the reported results of the co-financed and subsumed baseline activities as well as of the incremental activities are available for the review.

- 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.

**Stakeholder Engagement**

- Project management: Has the project developed and leveraged the necessary and appropriate partnerships with direct and tangential stakeholders?
- Participation and country-driven processes: Do local and national government stakeholders support the objectives of the project? Do they continue to have an active role in project decision-making that supports efficient and effective project implementation?
- Participation and public awareness: To what extent has stakeholder involvement and public awareness contributed to the progress towards achievement of project objectives?
- 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\(^4\) (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**

\(^4\) Risks are to be labeled 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; Labor and Working Conditions; Community Health, Safety and Security.
• 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 & Knowledge Management
• 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).

4. Sustainability

• Validate whether the risks identified in the Project Document, Annual Project Review/PIRs and the ATLAS Risk Register are the most important and whether the risk ratings applied are appropriate and up to date. If not, explain why.
• In addition, assess the following risks to sustainability.

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

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

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

Environmental risks to sustainability:

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

Conclusions & Recommendations

The MTR consultant/team will include a section in the MTR report for evidence-based conclusions, in light of the findings. The MTR Team must make sure that evidentiary documents are checked and verified to support the conclusions and the ratings that it will make regarding the mid-term accomplishments of the SPIRES Project.

Based on the MTR findings and data/information gathered, the MTR Team shall update the GEF Core Indicator values by including the estimated mid-term value of Indicators 6.0, 6.2, 6.3, 6.4 and 11.

Additionally, the MTR consultant/team is expected to make recommendations to the Project Team. Recommendations should be succinct suggestions for critical intervention that are specific, measurable, achievable, and relevant. The MTR Team must include the relevant steps to be taken (as well requirements) to implement each recommendation. A recommendation table should be put in the report’s executive summary. The MTR consultant/team should make no more than 15 recommendations total.

Ratings

The MTR team will include its ratings of the project’s results and brief descriptions of the associated achievements in a MTR Ratings & Achievement Summary Table in the Executive Summary of the MTR report. See the TOR Annexes for the Rating Table and ratings scales.

Expected Outputs and Deliverables

The National Consultant shall provide the necessary data/information that he/she has gathered, processed and analyzed on behalf of the MTR Team for use in the preparation of the MTR Report. He/She shall assist the International Consultant in the preparation and submission of the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deliverable</th>
<th>Due Date</th>
<th>Certifying Officer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MTR Inception Report: MTR team clarifies objectives and methods of the Midterm Review no later than 2 weeks before the MTR mission. To be sent to the Commissioning Unit and project management.</td>
<td>14 March 2023</td>
<td>Team Leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation: MTR team presents initial findings to project management and the Commissioning Unit at the end of the MTR mission</td>
<td>4 April 2023</td>
<td>Team Leader</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Draft MTR Report**: MTR team submits the draft full report with annexes within 3 weeks of the MTR mission.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14 April</td>
<td>Team Leader</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Final Report**: MTR team submits the revised report with annexed and completed Audit Trail detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final MTR report. To be sent to the Commissioning Unit within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 May</td>
<td>Team Leader</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Institutional Arrangement**

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

The Commissioning Unit will contract the consultants and ensure the timely provision of per diems and travel arrangements within the country for the MTR team. The Project Team will be responsible for liaising with the MTR team to provide all relevant documents, set up stakeholder interviews, and arrange field visits.

**Duration of the Work**

The total duration of the MTR will be approximately 35 of days over a period of 8 of weeks starting 6 March 2023, and shall not exceed five months from when the consultant(s) are hired. The tentative MTR timeframe is as follows:

- 24th February 2023: Application closes
- 27th to 3rd February 2023: Selection of MTR Team
- 6th to 8th March 2023: Prep the MTR Team (handover of project documents)
- 9th to 14th March 2023: Up 4 days: Document review and preparing MTR Inception Report
- 15th to 16th March 2023: Up 2 days: Finalization and Validation of MTR Inception Report- latest start of MTR mission
- 20th to 31st March 2023: Up 10 days: MTR mission: stakeholder meetings, interviews, field visits
- 3rd to 4th April 2023: Mission wrap-up meeting & presentation of initial findings- earliest end of MTR mission
- 10th to 14th April 2023: Up 5 days: Preparing draft report.
- 17th to 18th April: Up 2 days: Incorporating audit trail on draft report/Finalization of MTR report (note: accommodate time delay in dates for circulation and review of the draft report)
- 19th to 21st April 2023: Preparation & Issue of Management Response
- 5th May 2022: Expected date of full MTR completion.

The date start of contract is 13th March 2023.

**Duty Station**

- Honiara,
Travels related to this assignment

- Domestic travel will be required to the project demonstration sites of the SPIRES project during the MTR mission;
- The BSAFE training course must be successfully completed prior to commencement of travel; Herewith is the link to access this training: https://training.dss.un.org/courses/login/index.php. These training modules at this secure internet site is accessible to Consultants, which allows for registration with private email.
- Individual Consultants are responsible for ensuring they have vaccinations/inoculations when travelling to certain countries, as designated by the UN Medical Director.
- Consultants are required to comply with the UN security directives set forth under https://dss.un.org/dssweb/
- All related travel expenses will be covered and will be reimbursed as per UNDP rules and regulations upon submission of an F-10 claim form and supporting documents.

REQUIRED SKILLS AND EXPERIENCE

A team of two independent consultants will conduct the MTR - one team leader (with experience and exposure to projects and evaluations in other regions globally) and one team expert, usually from the country of the project. The consultants 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 consultants will be aimed at maximizing the overall “team” qualities in the following areas: (give a weight to all these qualifications so applicants know what is the max amount of points they can earn for the technical evaluation)

Educational Qualifications: (20%)

- Master’s degree with academic and professional background in energy, climate change, environmental science, development studies, public policy or other closely related field.

Experience: (50%)

- Recent experience with result-based management evaluation methodologies;
- Experience applying SMART targets and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios;
- Minimum of 5 years of supporting project evaluation, using an adaptive management approach;
- At least one year of working with development policies, programs, projects related to low carbon development, energy, climate change and public administration;
• Proven stakeholder consultation and facilitation skills in conducting evaluation interviews, focus group discussions, desktop research, qualitative and quantitative analysis;
• Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender and Climate Change; experience in gender sensitive evaluation and analysis;
• Demonstrable analytical skills;
• Some knowledge of UNDP or GEF monitoring and evaluation or other development partners will be an advantage

Language requirements
• Fluency in written and spoken English. Excellent communication skills particularly excellent command of English and Solomon Islands pidgin, both writing and spoken;

Ethics
The MTR team 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 UNEG ‘Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation’. The MTR team 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 team 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.

Schedule of Payments
• 20% payment upon satisfactory delivery of a summary report in contributions to the final MTR Inception Report and approval by the Commissioning Unit
• 40% payment upon satisfactory delivery of the draft MTR report to the Commissioning Unit
• 40% payment upon satisfactory delivery of the final MTR report and approval by the Commissioning Unit and RTA (via signatures on the TE Report Clearance Form) and delivery of completed TE Audit Trail

Criteria for issuing the final payment of 40%
• 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.

In line with the UNDP’s financial regulations, when determined by the Commissioning Unit and/or the consultant that a deliverable or service cannot be satisfactorily completed due to the impact of COVID-19 and limitations to the MTR, that deliverable or service will not be paid.

Due to the current COVID-19 situation and its implications, a partial payment may be considered if the consultant invested time towards the deliverable but was unable to complete to circumstances beyond his/her control.

Application Process
Recommended Presentation of Offer

a) **Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability** using the [template](https://intranet.undp.org/unit/bom/pso/Support%20documents%20on%20IC%20Guidelines/Template%20for%20Confirmation%20of%20Interest%20and%20Submission%20of%20Financial%20Proposal.docx) provided by UNDP;

b) **CV** and a **Personal History Form** ([P11 form](http://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/corporate/Careers/P11_Personal_history_form.doc));

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](https://intranet.undp.org/unit/bom/pso/Support%20documents%20on%20IC%20Guidelines/Template%20for%20Confirmation%20of%20Interest%20and%20Submission%20of%20Financial%20Proposal.docx). 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: lucas.toro@undp.org by **4:00 pm, 24th February 2023**. Incomplete applications will be excluded from further consideration.

**Criteria for Selection of the Best Offer**

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.

---

Annexes

- **ToR ANNEX A**: List of Documents to be reviewed by the MTR Team
- **ToR ANNEX B**: Guidelines on Contents for the Midterm Review Report
- **ToR ANNEX C**: Midterm Review Evaluative Matrix Template

---
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7 The Report length should not exceed 40 pages in total (not including annexes).
ToR ANNEX D: UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluators/Midterm Review Consultants

ToR ANNEX E: MTR Ratings Table and Ratings Scales

ToR ANNEX F: MTR Report Clearance Form

ToR ANNEX G: Audit Trail Template

ToR ANNEX H: Progress Towards Results Matrix

ToR ANNEX I: GEF Co-Financing Template (provided as a separate file)

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

(The Commissioning Unit is responsible for compiling these documents prior to the recruitment of the MTR team so that they are available to the team immediately after contract signature.)

1. PIF
2. UNDP Initiation Plan
3. UNDP Project Document
4. UNDP Social and Environmental Screening Procedure (SESP)
5. Project Inception Report
6. PIR 2022 Report
7. Quarterly progress reports and work plans of the various implementation task teams
8. Audit reports
9. Finalized GEF focal area Core Indicators at CEO endorsement and midterm
10. Oversight mission reports
11. All monitoring reports prepared by the project
12. Financial and Administration guidelines used by Project Team

The following documents will also be available:
13. Project operational guidelines, manuals and systems
14. UNDP country/countries programme document(s)
15. Minutes of the Project Board Meetings and other meetings (i.e. Project Appraisal Committee meetings)
16. Project site location maps
17. Any additional documents, as relevant.

http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/100
ToR ANNEX B: Guidelines on Contents for the Midterm Review Report

i. Basic Report Information (for opening page or title page)
   - Title of UNDP supported GEF financed project
   - UNDP PIMS# and GEF project ID#
   - MTR timeframe 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, socio-economic, institutional, and policy factors relevant to the project objective and scope
   - Problems that the project sought to address: threats and barriers targeted
   - Project Description and Strategy: objective, outcomes and expected results, description of field sites (if any)
   - Project Implementation Arrangements: short description of the Project Board, key implementing partner arrangements, etc.
   - Project timing and milestones

---

9 The Report length should not exceed 40 pages in total (not including annexes).
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.) or Core Indicators
- **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**

*(Draft questions to be filled out by the Commissioning Unit with support from the Project Team)*

This Midterm Review Evaluative Matrix must be fully completed/amended by the consultant and included in the MTR inception report and as an Annex to the MTR report.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluative Questions</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>Methodology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Strategy: To what extent is the project strategy relevant to country priorities, country ownership, and the best route towards expected results?</td>
<td>(i.e. relationships established, level of coherence between project design and implementation approach, specific activities conducted, quality of risk mitigation strategies, etc.)</td>
<td>(i.e. project documents, national policies or strategies, websites, project staff, project partners, data collected throughout the MTR mission, etc.)</td>
<td>(i.e. document analysis, data analysis, interviews with project staff, interviews with stakeholders, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(include evaluative question(s))</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progress Towards Results: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved thus far?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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? To what extent has progress been made in the implementation of social and environmental management measures? Have there been changes to the overall project risk rating and/or the identified types of risks as outlined at the CEO Endorsement stage?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, socio-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ToR ANNEX D: UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluators/Midterm Review Consultants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluators/Consultants:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Should reflect sound accounting procedures and be prudent in using the resources of the evaluation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Must ensure that independence of judgement is maintained and that evaluation findings and recommendations are independently presented.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Must confirm that they have not been involved in designing, executing or advising on the project being evaluated.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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: __________________________________________

---
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### MTR Ratings & Achievement Summary Table for *(Project Title)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>MTR Rating</th>
<th>Achievement Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Strategy</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progress Towards Results</td>
<td>Objective Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Outcome 1 Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Outcome 2 Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Outcome 3 Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Implementation &amp; Adaptive Management</td>
<td>(rate 6 pt. scale)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability</td>
<td>(rate 4 pt. scale)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Ratings for Progress Towards Results: (one rating for each outcome and for the objective)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>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”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rating</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Satisfactory (S)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Moderately Satisfactory (MS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Moderately Unsatisfactory (HU)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory (U)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Ratings for Project Implementation & Adaptive Management: (one overall rating)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Implementation Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Highly Satisfactory (HS)</td>
<td>Implementation of all seven components – management arrangements, work planning, finance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>and co-finance, project-level monitoring and evaluation systems, stakeholder engagement,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>reporting, and communications – is leading to efficient and effective project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>implementation and adaptive management. The project can be presented as “good practice”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Satisfactory (S)</td>
<td>Implementation of most of the seven components is leading to efficient and effective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>project implementation and adaptive management except for only few that are subject to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>remedial action.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Moderately Satisfactory (MS)</td>
<td>Implementation of some of the seven components is leading to efficient and effective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>project implementation and adaptive management, with some components requiring remedial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>action.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)</td>
<td>Implementation of some of the seven components is not leading to efficient and effective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>project implementation and adaptive, with most components requiring remedial action.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory (U)</td>
<td>Implementation of most of the seven components is not leading to efficient and effective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>project implementation and adaptive management.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)</td>
<td>Implementation of none of the seven components is leading to efficient and effective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>project implementation and adaptive management.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Ratings for Sustainability: (one overall rating)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Implementation Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Likely (L)</td>
<td>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</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Risk Level</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Moderately Likely (ML)</td>
<td>Moderate risks, but expectations that at least some outcomes will be sustained due to the progress towards results on outcomes at the Midterm Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Moderately Unlikely (MU)</td>
<td>Significant risk that key outcomes will not carry on after project closure, although some outputs and activities should carry on</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Unlikely (U)</td>
<td>Severe risks that project outcomes as well as key outputs will not be sustained</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ToR ANNEX F: MTR Report Clearance Form
(to be completed by the Commissioning Unit and RTA and included in the final document)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Midterm Review Report Reviewed and Cleared By:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commissioning Unit (M&amp;E Focal Point)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name: ___________________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signature: ___________________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date: ______________________________</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regional Technical Advisor (Nature, Climate and Energy)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name: ___________________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signature: ___________________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date: ______________________________</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>Para No./comment location</th>
<th>Comment/Feedback on the draft MTR report</th>
<th>MTR team response and actions taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ToR ANNEX H: Progress Towards Results Matrix

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Strategy</th>
<th>Indicator(^\text{11})</th>
<th>Baseline Level(^\text{12})</th>
<th>Level in 1(^{st}) PIR (self-reported)</th>
<th>Midterm Target(^\text{13})</th>
<th>End-of-project Target</th>
<th>Midterm Level &amp; Assessment(^\text{14})</th>
<th>Achievement Rating(^\text{15})</th>
<th>Justification for Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Objective:</td>
<td>Indicator (if applicable) :</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 1:</td>
<td>Indicator 1:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indicator 2:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 2:</td>
<td>Indicator 3:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indicator 4:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Etc.</td>
<td>Etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Indicator Assessment Key**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Green= Achieved</th>
<th>Yellow= On target to be achieved</th>
<th>Red= Not on target to be achieved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**ToR ANNEX I: GEF Co-Financing Template (provided as a separate file)**

\(^{11}\) Populate with data from the Logframe and scorecards  
\(^{12}\) Populate with data from the Project Document  
\(^{13}\) If available  
\(^{14}\) Colour code this column only  
\(^{15}\) Use the 6 point Progress Towards Results Rating Scale: HS, S, MS, MU, U, HU