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## List of acronyms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AMR</td>
<td>Annual Monitoring Report (FAO for GEF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BD</td>
<td>Biodiversity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BH</td>
<td>Budget holder (FAO)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBC</td>
<td>Climate and Environmental Division (FAO)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBIT</td>
<td>Capacity Building Initiative for Transparency (GEF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTA</td>
<td>Chief Technical Advisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSA</td>
<td>Daily subsistence allowance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EA</td>
<td>Enabling activities (GEF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EBM</td>
<td>Ecosystem based management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOD</td>
<td>Entry-on-duty (date)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESIA</td>
<td>Environmental and social impact assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESMF</td>
<td>Environmental and social management framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESMG</td>
<td>Environmental and social management guidelines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESMP</td>
<td>Environmental and social management plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESS</td>
<td>Environmental and social safeguards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAO GEF CU</td>
<td>FAO GEF Coordination Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLO</td>
<td>Funding liaison officer (FAO)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLU</td>
<td>Funding liaison unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPIC</td>
<td>Free, prior and informed consent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPMIS</td>
<td>Field Programme Management Information System (FAO)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSP</td>
<td>Full-sized projects (GEF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEB</td>
<td>Global Environmental Benefit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEF</td>
<td>Global Environment Facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEF IEO</td>
<td>GEF Independent Evaluation Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIV/AIDS</td>
<td>Human immunodeficiency virus/Acquired immunodeficiency syndrome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IEO</td>
<td>Independent Evaluation Office (GEF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDCF</td>
<td>Least Developed Countries Fund (GEF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LTO</td>
<td>Lead technical officer (FAO)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M&amp;E</td>
<td>Monitoring &amp; evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>METT</td>
<td>Management effectiveness tracking tool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR</td>
<td>Mid-term review manager (FAO)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSP</td>
<td>Medium-sized projects (GEF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTE</td>
<td>Mid-term evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTR</td>
<td>Mid-term review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPD</td>
<td>National Project Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTE</td>
<td>Not-to-exceed (date)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OECD/DAC</td>
<td>Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development/Development Assistance Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OED</td>
<td>Office of Evaluation (FAO)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acronym</td>
<td>Definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFP</td>
<td>Operational focal point (GEF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPIM</td>
<td>Operational Partners Implementation Modality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA</td>
<td>Protected Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIF</td>
<td>Project identification form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIR</td>
<td>Project implementation review (GEF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PMCU</td>
<td>Project management coordination unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PMU</td>
<td>Project management unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPG</td>
<td>Project preparation grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPR</td>
<td>Project progress report (FAO)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSC</td>
<td>Project Steering Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTF</td>
<td>Project task force (FAO)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QAR</td>
<td>Quality assessment report (FAO)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROTI</td>
<td>Review of outcomes to impacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCCF</td>
<td>Special Climate Change Fund (GEF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMART</td>
<td>Specific, measurable, achievable, relevant, and time-bound (indicators)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAP</td>
<td>Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel (GEF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWOT</td>
<td>Strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN CC: Learn</td>
<td>United Nations Climate Change Learning Partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNEG</td>
<td>United Nations Evaluation Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>United Nations Children’s Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USD</td>
<td>United States dollar</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Introduction
1.1 Purpose of this Guide

This document provides guidance on planning, formulating and conducting the mid-term reviews (MTRs) of projects and programmes implemented by the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) that have received grant financing from the Global Environment Facility (GEF) Trust Fund and other funds managed by the GEF Secretariat, such as the Least Developed Country Fund (LDCF) and the Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF).

Its main aim is to help streamline and standardize the approach to and process for undertaking MTRs of FAO–GEF projects, to improve understanding of the requirements at various stages of the MTR process and to clarify the tasks, roles and responsibilities of the various parties involved in FAO–GEF project MTRs.

This Guide is divided into five sections:

• Introduction
• Background to the MTR process, its purpose and principles and the criteria to be assessed
• Information on the overall roles and responsibilities of organizing the MTR process
• The four phases of the MTR process, timings and requirements
• The quality assurance process for the MTR report

1.2 Target audience

This document is primarily aimed at those who plan, manage, lead or participate in FAO–GEF project MTRs, principally:

• FAO project budget holders (BHs) and/or MTR managers (RMs)
• Project management units (PMUs)
• Project task force (PTF) members, including FAO project funding liaison officers (FLOs) and lead technical officers (LTOs)
• Decentralized FAO offices (regional and country) with responsibility for FAO–GEF projects
• Relevant units at FAO headquarters in Rome
• Consultants

The Guide also acts as a reference document for a wider pool of project stakeholders, including country GEF operational focal points (OFPs), project operational partners, civil society and the wider GEF community of practice on monitoring and evaluation (M&E), such as staff at other GEF agencies and their collaborators. It is also intended to act as a reference for FAO–GEF project design teams that need information on process, planning and budgeting for FAO–GEF project MTRs.

---

1 The day-to-day management of an FAO-GEF project is the responsibility of the FAO BH and the project management unit (PMU) established for each project (execution function), while technical oversight and project supervision are the responsibilities of the FAO technical officers assigned to the specific FAO–GEF projects and the FAO GEF CU as funding liaison unit (implementation function).
2. Background to the mid-term review process
2.1 Purpose, use and scope of an FAO–GEF project mid-term review (MTR)

According to the GEF Evaluation Policy, the purpose of evaluation/review includes “understanding why, how, and the extent to which intended and unintended results are accrued, and their impact on stakeholders. Evaluation is an important source of evidence on the achievement of results and institutional performance and contributes to knowledge and organizational learning. It serves as a driver of change and plays a critical role in supporting accountability. Evaluation can be used to improve the design and performance of a planned or ongoing project or programme (a formative evaluation); to make an overall judgment about the effectiveness of a completed project or program, to ensure accountability; and to generate knowledge about good practices” (GEF IEO, 2019).

The GEF evaluation policy further states that “evaluation feeds into management and decision-making processes regarding the development of policies and strategies; and the programming, implementation, and reporting of activities, projects and programmes. Thus, evaluation contributes to institutional learning and evidence-based policymaking, accountability, development effectiveness and organizational effectiveness. It informs the planning, programming, budgeting, implementation and reporting cycle. It aims to improve the institutional relevance and achievement of results, optimize the use of resources, and maximize the impact of the contribution provided” (GEF IEO, 2019).

As outlined in the GEF Evaluation Policy, MTRs or mid-term evaluations (MTEs) are mandatory for all GEF-financed full-sized projects (FSPs), including enabling activities processed as full-sized projects. MTRs are not required for medium-sized projects (MSPs), but are strongly encouraged and should be deemed mandatory if the project faces significant challenges, is behind on delivery at the mid-term point, or project managers believe it would benefit from independent review.

An MTR should take place about halfway through implementation of an FAO–GEF project, though it may be undertaken earlier if the PTF and Project Steering Committee (PSC) think it is needed. Although the GEF Independent Evaluation Office (GEF IEO) views an MTR as essentially an internal management exercise, it is conducted by a team of independent reviewers who have had no prior involvement in a project’s design or implementation.

The MTR has three primary purposes:

a. To assess progress made towards achievement of a project’s planned results in terms of its relevance, effectiveness and efficiency, sustainability and impact. Key questions include: “What results, intended and unintended, has the project achieved to date?” and “Is the project on track to achieve its planned results?”

b. To identify any problems or challenges the project is encountering, understand the causes of any underperformance and leverage project strengths and good practices to overcome them. The MTR makes recommendations for corrective measures, if needed, to overcome challenges and ensure the expected deliverables and results are achieved by the end of the project. Key questions include: “What can be done to improve project delivery and to increase the likelihood of longer-term sustainability of project results?”

c. To identify/highlight any success stories, key contributions, good practices and areas with the potential for upscaling and replication, and to promote knowledge-sharing and learning between FAO and project stakeholders, including the identification of lessons to improve future project formulation and implementation.

2 GEF-financed projects with budgets of USD 2 million or more are classified as FSPs.
3 This is a GEF-financed activity with a budget up to USD 1 million.
4 GEF-financed projects with budgets of less than USD 2 million are MSPs.
In this sense, the MTR is an important corrective and adaptive management tool and should be viewed by project teams, partners and associated stakeholders as an opportunity to identify and resolve critical issues that may be hindering or preventing implementation at the mid-term point. It is also a chance to improve project performance and bolster the impact and sustainability of results over the remainder of a project’s life, recognizing that project context may have changed since its formulation. In other words, an MTR should be viewed as an additional positive event in the life of an FAO–GEF project to complement existing monitoring tools that aim to support and enhance its operation and delivery, and not simply as an exercise to list the weaknesses or failures of a project. It is an opportunity to learn from good practices and build on project strengths. MTRs of FAO–GEF projects also provide evidence of project activities and results to meet accountability requirements (for GEF financing).

MTR recommendations can cover any areas of project design or operation deemed in need of change, such as the project framework (within reason); project execution and implementation, if the implementation context has significantly changed since formulation; measures to boost capacity to better manage the project; or recommendations to improve the efficacy of communications activities.

The primary outputs or deliverables of an MTR process are the MTR report and the subsequent MTR Management Response (see Sections 3 and 4).

2.2 Key MTR principles and GEF criteria

Although the MTR is not managed by FAO’s Office of Evaluation (OED), it should be conducted in line with the general norms and standards of the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG, 2016) – in particular, the principles of impartiality, credibility, transparency and usefulness. It should respect the ethical principles of and adhere to UNEG Ethical Guidelines, as well as the primary principles underpinning evaluation and reviews at FAO (FAO, 2010).

An MTR should be conducted as systematically, objectively and impartially as possible and provide credible evidence-based findings, useful recommendations and lessons that feed into stakeholders’ decision-making processes. Its findings should be clearly documented in the MTR report, with analysis leading to clearly elucidated opinions. Information should be triangulated (verified by different sources) as far as possible. When verification is not possible, the single source should be cited (though anonymity should be preserved, if need be). Further guidance on the analysis and presentation of MTR results can be found in Annex 12.

See Annex 1.
The MTR assesses FAO–GEF projects based on a minimum set of criteria, grouped into six categories (overleaf), in line with the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development’s Development Assistance Committee (OECD DAC) evaluation and review criteria (OECD, 2009).  

All of these criteria should be rated according to the standard GEF six-point scale, except for sustainability, which uses a different scale. Annex 12, which gives guidance on developing an MTR report, includes a section on how the various criteria should be rated and how ratings should be aggregated for the different GEF MTR criterion categories.

**Relevance** – the extent to which the intervention’s design and intended results are consistent with local, national, sub-regional and regional environmental and development priorities and policies and to GEF and FAO strategic priorities and objectives; its complementarity with existing interventions and relevance to project stakeholders and beneficiaries; its suitability to the context of the intervention over time.

**Effectiveness** – the degree to which the intervention has achieved or expects to achieve results (project outputs, outcomes, objectives and impacts, including Global Environmental Benefits) (GEF, 2019c) taking into account key factors influencing the results, including an assessment of whether sufficient capacity has been built to ensure the delivery of results by the end of project and beyond and the likelihood of mid- and longer-term impacts.

**Efficiency** – the cost-effectiveness of the project and timeliness of activities; the extent to which the intervention has achieved value for resources by converting inputs (funds, personnel, expertise, equipment, etc.) into results in the timeliest and least costly way compared with alternatives.

**Sustainability** – the (likely) continuation of positive effects from the intervention after it has ended and the potential for scale-up and/or replication; any financial, sociopolitical, institutional and governance, or environmental risks to sustainability of project results and benefits; any evidence of replication or catalysis of project results.

**Factors affecting performance** – the main factors to be considered are:

- project design and readiness for implementation (e.g. sufficient partner capacity to begin operations, changes in context between formulation and operational start);
- project execution, including project management (execution modality as well as the involvement of counterparts and different stakeholders);
- project implementation, including supervision by FAO (BH, LTO and FLO), backstopping, and general PTF input;
- financial management and mobilization of expected co-financing;
- project partnerships and stakeholder involvement (including the degree of ownership of project results by stakeholders) and political support from government, institutional support from operating partners (such as regional branches of agricultural extension services or forestry authorities);
- communication, public awareness and knowledge management; and
- application of an M&E system, including M&E design, implementation and budget.

**Cross-cutting dimensions** – considerations such as gender, indigenous-people and minority-group concerns and human rights; the environmental and social safeguards applied to a project require, among other things, a review of the Environmental and Social Safeguards (ESS) risk classification and risk-mitigation provisions identified at the project’s formulation stage.

The OECD DAC is currently reviewing the evaluation criteria in light of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs).

FAO applies an online screening system during the project design phase. This is mandatory, even if the project was approved before FAO adopted the GEF Policy on Agency Minimum Standards on Environmental and Social Safeguards (GEF, 2011) in February 2015, as FAO had already applied the Environmental Impact Assessment Guidelines in 2011 (FAO, 2012a) to screen and rate the risks of every FAO project. Consequently, the MTR team should review and confirm the ESS assessments and risk status at mid-term and any changes suggested, if needed. The most recent GEF guidance can be found in GEF (2019b). A GEF project should not cause any harm to the environment or to any stakeholder and, where applicable, will take measures to prevent and/or mitigate any adverse effects.
3. Overall responsibility for organizing FAO–GEF mid-term reviews and mid-term evaluations
The need for a mid-term assessment of project delivery and performance is included in the project document. Since January 2019, when OED decided to decentralize the mid-term evaluation of projects, all MTRs for FAO–GEF projects are managed by the project’s BH, overseen by the FAO GEF Coordination Unit (FAO GEF CU). Nevertheless, more complex or problematic projects\(^8\) may still be considered for an MTE managed by OED or for an MTR managed by the BH, but overseen by OED.

As mentioned, overall responsibility for developing an MTR and ensuring that it is conducted lies with the project BH.\(^9\) However, the BH may nominate another FAO staff member as MTR manager (RM) to manage its delivery. This includes responsibility for hiring consultants (in consultation with the FAO GEF CU) and the quality assurance of the MTR process, with backstopping support from the FAO GEF CU. Ideally, therefore, the RM should not have been involved in the design, management or operation of the FAO–GEF project under review, so as to minimize any concerns over potential conflicts of interest.

To support the development and execution of the MTR, the FAO GEF CU will appoint a specific individual – the FAO GEF CU focal point – to provide guidance on GEF issues and backstopping support and to act as the unit’s focal point for a specific FAO–GEF project MTR.

Where projects are implemented by two or more GEF agencies (UN Environment, the United Nations Development Programme, the World Bank, etc.), the MTR should be conducted jointly, as set out in the M&E arrangements of the project document. The lead agency is responsible for developing the MTR terms of reference in consultation with the other agency(ies) and for contracting the MTR team.

An outline of the functions, roles and responsibilities of the various FAO, GEF and project positions, as well as the other key stakeholders involved in a FAO–GEF project MTR, can be found in Annex 2. Information on FAO’s role and responsibility as a GEF agency under different implementation and execution modalities is given in Annex 3.

---

\(^8\) For instance, any projects with high reputational risk for FAO, projects considered high risk, as prescribed in the 2015 FAO Environmental and Social Management Guidelines (ESMG) (FAO, 2015), any projects for which a formal MTE is requested by the GEF, PMU, PTF and/or the beneficiary country, and any projects with high complexity and significant delays, as judged by the BH, FAO GEF CU and/or PTF.

\(^9\) BHs can be located in Country Offices, Regional Offices or headquarters.
4. Mid-term review phases and process
4.1 Phases of the MTR

The FAO–GEF project MTR process is divided into four phases.

- **Phase 1: Plan** covers MTR planning and the process to determine its scope, feasibility, utility, management arrangements (including the designation of the MTR manager), funding and timing.
- **Phase 2: Design and prepare** is the process of designing and launching an MTR. It provides direction on the background data to be collected, the identification and analysis of stakeholders, the preparation of the terms of reference (including preliminary methodology and a dissemination strategy and plan for the MTR results), detailed budgeting, selection of MTR team members and preparation of the inception report prior to the MTR mission(s).
- **Phase 3: Collect, analyse and report** deals with the organization of mission logistics and data collection, data analysis, debriefing (at the end of the mission to FAO and the project team), preparation of the draft MTR report and the finalization of the MTR report (including editing and peer review).
- **Phase 4: Disseminate and follow up** involves the organization of stakeholder debriefing meetings and workshops; the presentation of results at external or internal forums; the preparation of the MTR Management Response and follow-up reporting on the implementation of the Management Response in the next GEF Project Implementation Review (PIR) and FAO Project Progress Report (PPR), as well as the provision of various communication products and services through which the MTR will be disseminated, along with formatting (and, if needed, translation) of the report.

4.2 Timing and duration of the MTR

The timing of the MTR is likely to be determined by several factors and is agreed in consultation with the BH, PMU, government counterparts, LTO, FLO and FAO GEF CU. Consideration needs to be given to:

- the mid-point from the date the project became operational (the actual entry-on-duty, or EOD date in FAO’s Field Programme Management Information System, FPMIS) and the project’s completion date (actual not-to-exceed, or NTE date in FPMIS);
- the need for the MTR report to be completed before the third PIR is submitted to the GEF Secretariat;
- current progress of project activities;
- degree of disbursement of project funds;
- availability of the key stakeholders to participate in the MTR; and
- seasonality issues, such as the difficulty of undertaking field visits during the rainy season; events, such as elections; and other logistical constraints, where applicable.
It is highly recommended that MTR planning (phase 1) begin 3–4 months prior to field missions (phase 3) to allow sufficient time to develop the MTR terms of reference, inform and consult with government(s), recruit the MTR team, arrange the logistics for field visits and stakeholder interviews, coordinate with project counterparts and prepare the inception report. Generally, the planning of an FAO–GEF project MTR occurs at regular meetings between the project team, including the BH, and the FAO FAO GEF CU, which monitors the portfolio of FAO–GEF projects. The timing of the MTR should also be outlined in the project document. PTF meetings also help to keep a project’s MTR timing in focus.

The overall MTR process is expected to take 4–6 months. The required number of MTR consultant days is typically in the order of 28–35 for the team leader and 20–25 for the second (usually national) consultant for a single-country project with 2–3 field sites. More days may be required for MTRs of regional or global projects involving visits to several countries. Illustrative timing for various phases and the estimated duration of a typical single-country FAO–GEF project MTR can be found in Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase 1: Plan</th>
<th>Starts</th>
<th>Ends</th>
<th>Expected duration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plan</td>
<td>4–6 months before the third PIR</td>
<td>When the MTR is assigned to the BH/RM</td>
<td>1 month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 2: Design and prepare</td>
<td>As soon as the MTR is assigned to the BH/RM</td>
<td>When the MTR inception report is approved</td>
<td>1–2 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 3: Collect, analyse and report</td>
<td>When data collection starts</td>
<td>When all comments have been received and integrated into the final report</td>
<td>2 weeks–2 months for field missions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 4: Disseminate and follow-up</td>
<td>When the final report is ready</td>
<td>When the final report is available to wider stakeholders and any stakeholder briefings/workshops have been conducted Management Response prepared</td>
<td>2 weeks</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

 Estimated total: 4–6 months*

* Note, the figures in the fourth column do not add up to the total, as not all of the phases take the maximum expected time.

**Table 1** Summary and estimated duration of each MTR phase (for single-country FAO–GEF projects)

### 4.3 Phase 1: Plan

This phase focuses on determining the scope, feasibility and utility of the MTR. This includes defining the intervention (what is being evaluated), its typology (whether it is a project, a number of projects, or a programme), its scale and geographical coverage and its stage of implementation. This phase should also include:

- preliminary identification of the resources available and required for the MTR (both human and financial, including any in-kind support from partners, with the development of an initial budget for the MTR);
- specifying the management arrangements and responsibilities, including the designation of a manager for the MTR (if this is not the BH) in consultation with the FAO GEF CU; and
- agreeing the timing of the MTR and developing a tentative workplan/schedule.

---

*The length of this period will depend on whether the project being assessed is a simple national project with 1–3 field sites or a complex global project requiring many country missions.*
Mid-term review phases and process

28 The FAO GEF CU and BH should hold preliminary discussions with the project team and, where possible, primary stakeholders on the feasibility and utility of the MTR. This will help to define its scope, timing and needs. Details on the roles and responsibilities of key individuals involved in the planning stage are given in Annex 2.

29 The feasibility of the MTR depends on the following factors (among other things):

- What are some of the challenges that the project has faced and on which the MTR should focus, for example, those which if resolved would help improve the likelihood of achieving project results and better future impacts of the project?
- How can the MTR be most useful to you, your team and the country/countries involved?
- How are you going to use the results and recommendations of the MTR?

30 Utility is usually determined during the MTR design stage, often using the draft terms of reference for the MTR to reach consensus among stakeholders.

4.4 Phase 2: Design and prepare

32 The next step in the process is the formal launch of the MTR. Key activities in this phase are:

- final confirmation of the financial provision (GEF financing and co-financing, both in cash and in kind) and other (generally logistical) support for the MTR, with preparation of a detailed budget;
- preparation of the terms of reference for the MTR itself and for the MTR team (independent consultants);
- collection of reference and background data and materials from the project team (PMU), for example, from FPMIS and other sources;
- development of a preliminary stakeholder analysis, including the identification of key stakeholders (provided by the PMU/project coordinator), as well as the arrangements for, and their role and participation in, the MTR;
- agreement between the BH, FAO GEF CU, LTO and project team on the scope and initial key MTR questions and provisional methodology and field missions;
- selection and contracting of MTR team members;
- preparation of the inception report by the MTR team once members are contracted; and
- initial definition of a dissemination strategy for the MTR results and how results should be presented to the various stakeholder groups, for example, to local stakeholder groups and through the media.
4.4.1 Developing the terms of reference of the MTR

The RM is responsible for developing the terms of reference of the MTR (which will form the framework for the MTR), but a participatory approach should be encouraged, with feedback and inputs from the FAO GEF CU, the PTF, the PMU, other stakeholders – such as, project counterparts, or the executing agency in case of Operational Partners Implementation Modality (OPIM) arrangements – and other key national partners. A terms-of-reference template for FAO–GEF project MTRs can be found in Annex 4 and should be used for this purpose.

The key areas that need to be defined when developing the MTR terms of reference are:

- finalizing the scope of the MTR (begun under Phase 1);
- identifying key preliminary MTR questions, particularly in relation to specific issues the project team and FAO Country Office would like the MTR to examine (these could include the reasons for any project delays, the causal logic of the project, the effectiveness of the project’s capacity-building activities, co-financing and partner support, etc.);
- identifying key stakeholders the MTR team should interview;
- developing an outline of the approach and methodology for the MTR; and
- defining the composition of the MTR team (in terms of knowledge, skills and experience).

When identifying stakeholders for the MTR, key questions/criteria should include:

- Who has been involved and why?
- Who was most dependant?
- Who are the beneficiaries?
- Who has a financial stake in the project?
- What are the interests (positive or negative) of the project’s key male/female stakeholders?

The preliminary stakeholder analysis should draw on any gender-sensitive social analysis or assessment that has been undertaken during project design and/or implementation.

The methodology section should provide preliminary information on:

- what, where and how data will be collected;
- the criteria for selecting project sites and interviewees for analysis by the MTR;
- who will be interviewed and how (for instance, semi-structured interviews, focus groups, surveys, online questionnaires); and
- the identification of any other methods used to complement field-data collection (for example, desk reviews, online surveys).

As the BH or RM is unlikely to have much experience in project evaluation, the MTR team is expected to elaborate and provide a more in-depth description of the methodology and to present it in the inception report.

Clarity on roles, responsibilities, timing and costs for the logistics of the MTR should be a particular focus in the terms of reference. These should also clearly identify any aspects of
the field missions that will be paid for by partner co-financing contributions. The number of days for each consultant should be clearly indicated, as should the timeframe of the MTR, the deliverables and due dates (see paragraph 57).

40. The RM is responsible for drafting and finalizing the MTR terms of reference and the BH clears them, while the FAO GEF CU provides quality assurance on drafts. After clearance, the finalized MTR terms of reference should be shared with any additional stakeholders for information and to promote transparency. These should include the government project counterpart (the executing agency), the country’s GEF OFP and key partners/co-financiers.

41. Where appropriate and practical, or if requested by the government counterpart, the RM and PMU should arrange for the translation of the terms of reference into the official national language(s) (if not English) to facilitate the recruitment of national consultant(s) and communication about the MTR with national stakeholders. The RM, in coordination with the PMU and BH, should ensure that the government arranges translation services as part of its in-kind contribution, or that there is agreement to have the translation costs covered by the project budget.

4.4.2 Preparing a budget for the MTR

42. The level of funding available for an MTR can impact its rigour and the robustness of its findings. It is, therefore, important that adequate funding be provided for an MTR, so that sufficient data can be collected and analysis undertaken. The project BH is responsible for ensuring that sufficient funds are available for the MTR at formulation stage.

43. An indicative MTR budget is defined at the project design stage and set out in the project document. However, the figure given in the M&E section of the project document should be treated as an estimate, due to variables such as exchange-rate fluctuations and travel costs, as well as the human resources required, which cannot be accurately predicted years in advance. What’s more, it is hard to standardize MTR budgets, as project-specific factors are likely to affect funding requirements. These include project size (whether it is a full- or medium-sized GEF project), its scope, complexity and geographic coverage (whether it is country-specific or regionally/globally focused, number of field sites to be visited, etc.) and whether the project is facing problems and needs mid-term remedial action.

44. The typical cost of an MTR of a GEF single-country FSP is likely to be in the region of USD 30 000 to USD 60 000; more for a regional or global project with multiple field sites to be visited (Table 2). A budget is mandatory for MTRs (and final evaluations) of GEF projects and should be ring-fenced (made unavailable to other project activities). Because of the costs involved, the BH/RM and FAO GEF CU should explore opportunities for co-financing when defining and agreeing the budget. Project partners and stakeholders may not have cash resources available, but can offer in-kind support, such as translation, assistance with field travel, or facilitation of local stakeholder meetings. In addition to offering more options for budget-strapped MTRs, this helps to generate greater partner/stakeholder ownership of the MTR process and products. However, substantial co-financing of the MTR is unlikely and the MTR should be planned based on direct project resources as much as possible. Table 2 presents a suggested budget for MTRs based on size (GEF funds) and complexity.

45. A contingency of 5–10 percent should also be built into the MTR budget to allow for unexpected costs, security and events. MTRs are not infrequently subject to change during field missions, for example, as a result of natural or political events.

---

11 That said, it is important that the provisions for the MTR defined in the project document should remain protected (ring-fenced) until needed and not be subject to any reduction during budget revisions or viewed as a source of funds for other project activities. The budget given in the project document should be seen as the minimum available.
Table 2  Illustrative costs of FAO–GEF project MTRs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project characteristics</th>
<th>&lt;USD 2 million (no mandatory MTR for MSPs)*</th>
<th>USD 2 million to USD 10 million</th>
<th>&gt;USD 10 million</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National projects</td>
<td>30 000–40 000</td>
<td>35 000–45 000</td>
<td>40 000–60 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global projects with no sites to be visited</td>
<td></td>
<td>30 000–50 000**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional and global projects with sites to be visited</td>
<td>45 000–50 000***</td>
<td>60 000–65 000</td>
<td>60 000–80 000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Although an MTR is recommended, especially for those in need of remedial action.
** In this category, the absence or limitation of travel (perhaps to attend a PSC meeting or meet key executing partners) and the fact that it generally does not require more than two consultants should keep the MTR budget range between USD 30,000 and USD 50,000.
*** This is a rare occurrence.

A preliminary budget for the MTR should be agreed between the BH, the FAO GEF CU and PMU before drafting the terms of reference for the MTR. However, the final budget can only be agreed when the details of the MTR are finalized in the inception report, as costs are partly related to the scope and methodology of the MTR, field sites to be visited and number of stakeholders and beneficiaries to be interviewed, which will be further examined and refined by the MTR team members once they are contracted and have commenced their initial background review of the project (see Section 4.4.3).

Funds should be made available from the MTR budget to ensure local stakeholders are able to participate in interviews and focal-group discussions. This may require a specific allocation for travel, village meetings and other incidental costs. The PMU and BH should determine whether other budget lines can be accessed to cover some of the costs, but MTR costs for local stakeholder participation should be ring-fenced. The MTR budget can be used for most MTR-associated costs, such as external consultant fees, field mission costs and travel costs for local stakeholders, but cannot be used to pay for FAO staff involvement.

Annex 5 provides a sample budget, showing budget lines for a typical FAO–GEF project MTR, which can be used as a template.

4.4.3 MTR design and size of the MTR team

Depending on the type of project, there are various possibilities for the design of the MTR, which may influence the choice of the MTR team and budget. Table 3 provides some examples.

The MTR team should have a minimum of two members with complementary experience and skills for FSPs (GEF budgets over USD 2 million), typically a lead consultant and a national consultant. Smaller MSPs can sometimes be reviewed using just one experienced consultant, depending on the characteristics of the project, the local circumstances and budget. In addition, depending on a project’s size and complexity (particularly for multi-country projects), its technical nature and budget feasibility, the BH and FAO GEF CU may engage a larger team consisting of a lead consultant with demonstrated review/evaluation experience and several country or thematic experts where appropriate and feasible.
### Table 3 • Suggested MTR design and MTR team composition by FAO–GEF project type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of project/scope</th>
<th>MTR design</th>
<th>Team composition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National projects implemented in a single country</td>
<td>Data collected in the capital city (FAO Office and executing partners) and at a selection of project sites (beneficiaries and partners) Likely field mission of 10–14 days including travel, depending on number of field sites and the gravity of the problems the project is facing</td>
<td>One lead consultant who travels to the country; one or two national consultants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional projects implemented in a single region (in two or more countries)</td>
<td>Data collected in all countries, or a selection of countries (depending on the number of countries and budget) Likely field mission of 10–14 days per country, including travel, depending on number of field sites and the gravity of the problems the project is facing For each country visited, data should be collected in both the capital city and at a selection of project sites (interviewing beneficiaries and executing partners)</td>
<td>One lead consultant who travels to the selected countries and one national consultant in each country visited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interregional projects implemented in multiple regions (two or more regions) addressing national goals and regional priorities</td>
<td>Data collected in all regions and in a selection of countries in each region, possibly also at FAO headquarters Likely field mission of 10–14 days per country, including travel, depending on number of field sites and the gravity of the problems the project is facing</td>
<td>One lead consultant, one regional lead consultant in each region and one national consultant in each country visited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global projects implemented in at least one country per region, addressing national development goals and regional priorities</td>
<td>Data collected at FAO HQ or at the location where the coordination is based; visits to selected countries Likely field mission of 8–15 days per country, including travel, depending on number of field sites</td>
<td>One or two lead consultants</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4.4.4 Selecting the MTR team

51 External consultants with no previous engagement with the project, hence independent of project formulation and implementation (including backstopping supervision), should be engaged to undertake the MTR. The selection and recruitment of the MTR team should take place simultaneously with or immediately after the preparation of the terms of reference for the MTR.

52 The BH/RM, in consultation with the FAO GEF CU focal point and LTO, is responsible for selecting the external consultants. This includes preparing their job descriptions (a terms-of-reference template for both international and national consultants can be found in Annex 6), deciding on team composition, publishing a call for expressions of interest, interviewing short-listed candidates and managing contractual procedures. The BH/RM organizes the recruitment process of the independent MTR consultants. A recruitment statement should be prepared by the RM, shared with the FAO GEF CU and cleared by the BH once the candidates have been selected.

53 The BH/RM is also responsible for ensuring that the recruitment process is in line with FAO rules and procedures. The FAO GEF CU and OED should be consulted about possible project review experts that could be considered for the assignment from their respective rosters of consultants. The national consultant is contracted by the FAO Country Office, but reports to both the MTR team leader and the RM. The lead consultant is also contracted by the BH, even if she/he is already on a FAO GEF CU, OED or other FAO roster, but reports to both the RM and FAO GEF CU focal point.

---

12 In all cases, the selection of sites should be based on pre-defined criteria and should include some randomization. The inclusion of project sites outside the capital city is relevant only if the project has implemented some activities at that level, but if field sites are integral to the project, they need to be visited and local stakeholders interviewed.

13 In general, these projects contribute to global normative work.

14 The FAO GEF CU encourages the selection of teams with a minimum of two consultants.
Ideally, the MTR team members should be experienced professionals who understand the subject matter of the project under review and be familiar with the United Nations system (and preferably FAO), as well as the GEF. Where possible, mixed-gender MTR teams are encouraged (and, when appropriate, the ethnic dimension should be considered). The MTR team should also have at least one member (preferably all) with a good command of the national language(s), both written and spoken. The national consultant is generally expected to act as an interpreter. Where this is not possible, or the MTR team feels that it does not have sufficient language skills to ensure effective interviews, an interpreter/translator will need to be contracted. This needs to be financed from GEF MTR funds or co-financed by the government in question and arranged by the BH/RM and PMU for the MTR team.

It is important that none of the MTR consultants have been involved in the design of the project at any stage (concept, project identification form (PIF) or project document), or in its subsequent execution, or played any advisory role, or have benefited from the project activities in any way. This independence is to ensure objectivity, promote transparency and avoid real or perceived conflicts of interest.

### 4.4.5 Length of MTR consultant contracts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position and type of activity</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Number of days</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Team leader (international or regional consultant)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation work (document review, preliminary interviews with key individuals) and lead on drafting of the inception report</td>
<td>Home based</td>
<td>5–6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data collection/field interviews (depending on number of field sites and assuming two days for international travel) with in-country debriefing at end of mission</td>
<td>Field</td>
<td>10–14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of information collected and any follow-up interviews required, e.g. PMU, FAO Country Office and other FAO staff, and drafting of the report</td>
<td>Home based</td>
<td>10–12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorporation of stakeholder feedback</td>
<td>Home based</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of days</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>28–35</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National expert (national consultant)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation work (document review, preliminary interviews) and contribution to drafting of the inception report</td>
<td>Home based</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data collection/field interviews (depending on number of field sites) and in-country debriefing</td>
<td>Field</td>
<td>8–12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of information collected and any follow-up interviews required, e.g. PMU, FAO Country Office and other FAO staff, and drafting of the report ( aidsing the lead consultant)</td>
<td>Home based</td>
<td>6–7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorporation of stakeholder feedback</td>
<td>Home based</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of days</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>20–25</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The number of days of work expected from MTR team members depends on the specific project, but for a single-country FSP with a small number of field sites (2–3) to visit, it is likely to be in the region of 28–35 days for the lead consultant and 20–25 days for the national consultant. The number will depend on the number of field sites and their locations and take into account the typical number of days needed for preparation work (document review, preliminary interviews and drafting the inception report). A typical field mission is likely to take 10–15 days (allowing for international travel and weekends, when most government and many private-sector staff are unavailable for interview). This is followed by analysis of the information collected, follow-up interviews and debriefing, drafting of the report and the incorporation of FAO and stakeholder feedback (see Table 4).

The exact number will depend on the project being reviewed. These are just indicative. The key variable is the field mission; there is less variation in the write-up phase.
4.4.6 Documentation and briefing the MTR team

A. Documentation for the MTR

The BH/RM should provide a set of key project-related background documents to the MTR team as soon as the consultants have been chosen (the documents should have been compiled, for the most part, during the process to develop the MTR terms of reference). They can be obtained from FPMIS, from the PMU or from members of the PTF. Together, the documents comprise the MTR “project information package”. Box 1 lists the most important project-related documents to be reviewed during the MTR. The BH/RM must provide these documents to the MTR team before it begins drafting the MTR inception report.
### Box 1 - Documents to be provided to the MTR team (“project information package”)

1. GEF PIF with technical clearance
2. Comments from the GEF Secretariat, the GEF Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel (STAP) and GEF Council members on project design, plus FAO responses
3. FAO concept note and FAO Project Review Committee report
4. Request for GEF CEO endorsement
5. FAO–GEF project preparation grant document
6. GEF-approved project document and any updated approved document following the inception workshop, with latest budgets showing budget revisions
7. Project inception report
8. Six-monthly FAO PPRs
9. Annual workplans and budgets (including budget revisions)
10. All annual GEF PIR reports
11. All other monitoring reports prepared by the project
12. Documentation detailing any changes to the project framework or components, such as changes to originally designed outcomes and outputs
13. List of stakeholders
14. List of project sites and site location maps (for planning mission itineraries and fieldwork)
15. Execution agreements under OPIM and letters of agreement
16. Technical, backstopping and project-supervision mission reports, including back-to-the-office reports by project and FAO staff, including any reports on technical support provided by FAO headquarters or regional office staff
17. Minutes of the meetings of the PSC, FAO PTF and other groups
18. Any ESS analysis and mitigation plans produced during the project design period and online records on FPMIS
19. Any awareness-raising and communications materials produced by the project, such as brochures, leaflets, presentations for meetings, project web address, etc.
20. FAO policy documents in relation to topics such as FAO Strategic Objectives and gender
21. Finalized GEF focal-area tracking tools at CEO endorsement, as well as updated tracking tools at mid-term for GEF-5 projects (and for GEF-6 and GEF-7 projects with Biodiversity (BD) Focal Area Objective 2 and management of protected areas) and/or review of contribution to GEF-7 core indicators (retrofitted) for GEF-6 projects, and GEF-7 core indicators for GEF-7-approved projects, as defined in the Core Indicators Worksheet (GEF, 2019a)
22. Financial management information, including an up-to-date co-financing table, a summary report on the project’s financial management and expenditures to date, a summary of any financial revisions made to the project and their purpose, and copies of any completed audits for comment and co-financing letters submitted at endorsement stage
23. The GEF Gender Policy (GEF, 2017), GEF Gender Implementation Strategy (GEF, 2018a), GEF Guidance on Gender Equality (GEF, 2018b) and the GEF Guide to Advance Gender Equality in GEF Projects and Programmes (GEF, 2018c), or the most recent versions of these policies

The following documents should also be made available to the MTR team on request or as required:

1. FAO Country Programme Framework documents, the FAO Guide to the Project Cycle (FAO, 2012b), FAO Environment and Social Management Guidelines (FAO, 2015), FAO Policy on Gender Equity, the Guide to Mainstreaming Gender in FAO’s Project Cycle (FAO, 2017a) and the Free, Prior and Informed Consent Manual (FAO, 2016), or the most recent versions of these policies

For programmes:

1. CEO endorsement/approval of child projects under the programme
2. Programme framework documents and child project titles or concepts
B. Tracking tools and GEF core indicators

58 The MTR team should be provided with updated information on GEF corporate results-indicator monitoring tools. Under GEF-5 (the four-year GEF investment cycle from July 2010 to June 2014) and GEF-6 (from July 2014 to June 2018), these were termed “tracking tools”\(^\text{16}\) and provided in an Excel file format for each GEF focal area and each GEF Trust Fund replenishment cycle. FAO, as a GEF agency, is responsible for collecting information on indicators related to the GEF tracking tools for each FAO–GEF project and to report these to the GEF, which uses them for overall GEF portfolio-level monitoring. Information on the baseline indicators of the GEF tracking tools is collected during the project design phase (or in project year 1) and the PMU updates this information at the mid-point prior to the MTR (and also for the terminal evaluation). For projects approved under GEF-5, the relevant tracking tools should be completed by the project team as part of the MTR development process before the MTR takes place (not during the MTR), and the MTR team should verify the mid-term scores and entries under the appropriate focal-area tools.

59 However, the revised results framework for GEF-7 (July 2018 to June 2022) (GEF, 2018d) largely replaces these tracking tools with core indicators, comprising 11 main indicators, most of which have several sub-indicators. For most projects approved under GEF-6, the tracking tools are also no longer required when the mid-term or the terminal evaluation point is reached (whichever comes first). Instead, core indicators from the GEF-7 need to be identified and agreed and baselines retrofitted. The GEF indicators should then be scored.

60 Consequently, for projects approved in GEF-6, there will need to be a discussion between the PMU, the PTF and the FAO GEF CU FLO well before the MTR to identify relevant GEF-7 core indicators, their (retrofitted) baselines and project targets. These should then be reviewed by the MTR team during the MTR. For GEF-7 projects, core indicators will be agreed at the project design stage and reported on at the MTR (and terminal evaluation); as mentioned, tracking tools will no longer be applied in most cases.

61 However, there is an exception for GEF-6 and GEF-7 projects that have a component covered under BD Objective 2, which aims for “improved terrestrial or marine PA [protected area] under improved management effectiveness” (where GEF-7 sub-core indicators 1.2 and 2.2 apply) (GEF 2018d; GEF IEO, 2019). In this case, the GEF-7 Biodiversity (BD) PA Tracking Tool (GEF, 2018g) should be completed in addition to reporting on the GEF-7 core indicators.

C. Briefing the MTR team

62 The RM and FAO GEF CU should also organize a briefing with the MTR team and the project coordinator before proceeding with the data-collection phase to ensure that all relevant information has been provided and that the process, roles and responsibilities are clear to all involved. In developing the inception report (and preparing for the field missions), the MTR team may need to meet or have initial Skype interviews with key stakeholders (such as the FLO, LTO and key co-financers).

4.4.7 MTR pre-mission inception report

63 The MTR team should prepare a 7–10 page pre-mission inception report prior to the main MTR phase. The aim of the inception report is to demonstrate that the MTR team understands the rationale and aims of the project, the MTR process, what the team is expected to deliver, when and how. The inception report should contain:

\(^\text{16}\) GEF tracking tool templates and guidelines are available from the GEF Secretariat website: https://www.thegef.org/documents/tracking_tools.
A brief narrative on the context, aims and components of the project

- A brief (1–1.5 page) narrative on the context, aims and components of the project, including a statement of the project’s objectives and planned results, along with a description of the project’s causal logic, set out as a theory-of-change graphic and brief narrative (1–2 pages);

A brief stakeholder analysis

- A brief stakeholder analysis (see Annex 8) and a preliminary list of potential interviewees (this can be presented as an annex to the inception report), building on the initial analysis and list provided by the PMU for developing the MTR terms of reference;

Detailed information on methodologies

- Detailed information about the proposed approaches that will be used to undertake the MTR and the methods chosen for data collection and analysis, plus identification of proposed field sites;

A table of key questions

- A table (again, this can be presented as an annex to the inception report) that sets out the key questions the MTR team will use as the basis for collecting information (the MTR matrix – see Annex 9); and

Limitations, risks, timelines and deliverables

- A short section on limitations and risks, timeline and deliverables for the MTR.

Further guidance on developing the inception report can be found in Annex 7.

The inception report presents a theory of change for the project. This depicts the causal pathways from project outputs (goods and services delivered) through outcomes (changes resulting from key stakeholders’ use of project outputs) to impacts (long-term changes in environmental benefits and socioeconomic conditions). For GEF, the focus is on delivering longer-term, desired Global Environmental Benefits (GEB), as measured by the GEF-7 core indicators. Importantly, unlike the project’s logistical framework (logframe), the theory of change depicts any intermediate states between project outcomes and long-term impacts and defines the external factors that influence change along the major pathways (in other words, factors that affect whether one result can lead to the next). These external factors are either drivers (over which the project or partners may have a certain level of control) or assumptions (when the project, directly or through partners, has no control). The theory of change can also be used to identify the main stakeholders involved in each step of the change process and should help the MTR team to identify some key review questions, particularly in relation to the project’s impact and the sustainability of its eventual results. The draft theory of change should be viewed as a “working draft” that is regularly updated during the MTR process after discussions with stakeholders and as evidence is gathered during the MTR. Further guidance on developing and using a theory of change for an MTR is available in Annex 10.

A large portion of the desk review undertaken by the MTR team should be conducted during the inception phase, as it is important that the MTR team acquire a good understanding of project context, design and implementation before embarking on field missions and data collection (and is needed to draft the inception report). Consequently, the BH/RM and the FAO GEF CU need to ensure that the MTR team has sufficient time to become fully informed of the project before it undertakes field missions. This typically means 5–6 days for national projects (the MTR team, for instance, needs to review the documents listed in Box 1) and more time for larger, more complex regional and global projects, particularly when several consultants are involved.
The MTR team leader is responsible for developing the inception report in collaboration with the other MTR team members. Once drafted, the inception report should be sent to the BH/RM and FAO GEF CU focal point, who should approve it before any further data are collected by the team. This should ideally be done at least two weeks before any MTR field missions begin, to allow time for any consultation with external stakeholders who may be participating in the MTR (for example, the GEF Operational Focal Point) and for in-country logistic arrangements to be organized and confirmed.

**4.4.8 Development of a dissemination plan for the MTR**

A separate, focused (short) communication plan should be produced to help stakeholders understand the MTR results and use them effectively to improve project delivery and impact and for organizational learning. The RM and PMU should agree on a dissemination plan for the MTR report in consultation with the FAO GEF CU. The BH/RM and PMU should consider which audiences to target and the easiest and clearest way to communicate the key review findings and lessons. This may include some or all of the following, depending on funding: PSC meetings, consultation workshops, brochures, a webinar, conference calls with stakeholders, a 2–3 page summary of the main results of the MTR, or an interactive presentation.

**4.5 Phase 3: Collect, analyse and report**

Phase 3 involves:

- organizing field missions and logistics
- organizing interviews and other data collection
- analysing the information collected
- preparing the MTR report
- post-mission debriefings

**4.5.1 Organizing the mission logistics**

The RM, in consultation with the MTR team and the PMU, has overall responsibility for planning the mission(s) and organizing the logistics (such as transport in the field), facilitating meeting schedules and access to documentation and ensuring that mitigating action is taken in case of delay. This should be done in concert with the FAO Regional Office, which may be able to provide logistical support. The RM should develop a provisional agenda for the full MTR mission(s), which should then be reviewed and discussed with the MTR team, shared with the FAO GEF CU prior to the mission and revised based on feedback. The final itinerary and list of interviews should be agreed by the RM and MTR team.

It is important to plan the MTR mission far enough in advance to allow interviews to be properly organized, especially if meetings have been requested with senior ministry officials, and to arrange meetings with local stakeholders. The PMU, RM and the FAO Representation should assist the MTR team in setting up those interviews agreed by the RM and MTR team. It is common for some interview arrangements to change for various reasons during field missions, due to delays or cancellations, for example, or the identification of new individuals that should be included in the MTR interview process. Consequently, it is highly recommended that some flexibility and contingency time be factored into the scheduling of interviews.

**4.5.2 Organizing and conducting interviews**

Interviews should target a diverse array of stakeholders, such as government agencies, civil-society organizations, non-governmental organizations, universities, research institutions, key service providers and sub-contractors, farmers associations and village councils. A
priority should be to ensure sufficient time is devoted to meeting with local communities and groups participating in the project, as well as direct or indirect beneficiaries and those impacted by it (be it positively or negatively).

72 In terms of scheduling, the MTR team should arrange no more than 4–5 interviews a day (depending on the logistical requirements of travel, type of interview, etc.). It should allow sufficient travel time between interviews and build in some contingency for unforeseen delays (such as government officials being called to urgent meetings, widely dispersed rural workers that need to gather centrally for a group meeting, etc.). Restricting the number of interviews per day should also ensure that the MTR team has adequate time to discuss and write up interviews each day.

73 Special attention should be paid to ensuring that all key groups, including women’s and local community groups, indigenous peoples and marginalized groups, are represented in the MTR, particularly those most directly affected by an intervention. In addition, when developing and administering interviews or surveys, the MTR team should take into account any gender indicators and United Nations System-wide Action Plan gender considerations (United Nations System, 2006).

74 It is particularly important to consider at an early stage the ability of the different stakeholder groups (national, local, community level, men and women, disabled, youth and elderly groups, etc.) that will participate in the MTR and to design the timing of field visits and interviews to maximize the opportunity for all stakeholders to participate. The RM and MTR team should bear in mind literacy levels, language skills, time and logistical constraints of key stakeholders, especially of marginalized stakeholders, when planning field missions and interviews. Some may lack the capacity or recognition to participate on an equal basis, so particular efforts must be made to ensure and enable their inclusion. For instance, women take on the bulk of childcare and organizational duties in family life in many countries and cultures, so are often not freely available for interviews. Consequently, special consideration and arrangements may be needed to accommodate women in interview schedules, to ensure they have the same opportunity to fully participate in the MTR and that their views and concerns are heard and recorded. Similarly, some other groups, such as farmers and fishers, may have limited availability at certain times of the day and in certain seasons (such as rice planting season), so interviews may need to be scheduled outside of regular working hours.

75 It should also be remembered here that the MTR team, FAO and project staff are asking stakeholders to give up their own time to take part in the MTR interview process. Many interviewees have other, more important (to them) commitments and many, especially
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those in local communities, may incur a financial cost as a result of attending an MTR interview or group discussion (opportunity costs). Consequently, requests for interviews need to accommodate interviewees’ schedules as much as possible and there needs to be some scheduling flexibility.

76 To ensure independence and confidentiality, no project or FAO staff member should be present during interviews of other stakeholders, including in an observer capacity. If necessary, the RM, project manager/coordinator, other members of the PMU or FAO office focal point can accompany the MTR team and introduce them at the beginning of the meeting (key informant interview or focus-group discussions), but should leave after introductions are made.

77 It is important to inform interviewees specifically about the objective of the MTR (to avoid having different messages from other sources) and the deliverables that are being monitored and assessed by the team. They should be made aware that while the MTR is a monitoring and reporting requirement for FAO and GEF, the MTR and its consultants are independent of both FAO and GEF. It should also be specifically stated at the beginning of all interviews (individual or group) that in line with United Nations Evaluation Group best practice (UNEG, 2016), information, views and opinions given during interviews are treated as confidential. It should be stressed to interviewees that while the MTR team may take notes during interviews and the name of anyone giving information to the MTR will be recorded in an annex to the MTR report (unless the MTR team is specifically asked not to), information is anonymized, so it is not possible to trace statements or opinions to a particular interviewee. This is to reassure interviewees that they can speak freely to the MTR team about any concerns they may have without fear of reprisal. Without such a “safe space”, interviewees will be much less likely to be open about the real issues a project faces, undermining the effectiveness of the MTR.

78 Among the most important MTR interviews are those with the project manager/coordinator and other members of the PMU. It is, therefore, recommended that the MTR team spend a total of 1–2 days with them and conduct three sets of interviews: (1) preliminary interviews via Skype when drafting the inception report (probably with just the project manager/ coordinator), (2) more in-depth interviews when the MTR team first visits the PMU office in the country and (3) follow-up interviews (if needed) after the MTR team has interviewed national and local stakeholders.

79 It is important that the project manager/coordinator and members of the PMU team make themselves available for interview during the MTR and recognize that the process may involve several lengthy interviews for triangulation of information. Again, the MTR team should stress at the beginning of each interview that the aim of the MTR is to improve the impact and benefits of the project and help solve challenges that are holding back performance, not simply to criticize the project and those involved. The MTR team should emphasize that the MTR is an important adaptive management tool that should be treated as a valuable exercise by PMU staff.

80 It may not be possible to involve all project stakeholders in the MTR. However, an inclusive and transparent approach should be followed in identifying and selecting key individuals and groups, with key stakeholders informed about the process and the reasons documented for their inclusion or exclusion. Ultimately, the RM is responsible arranging the interviews, but the choice of interviewees should be a joint effort by the RM and MTR team, with advice from the PMU.

4.5.3 Interpretation and translation

81 MTR interviews should be conducted in the language of the interviewees as much as possible. If the MTR team does not have a member who is fluent in the language in question, the FAO Representation should arrange for independent interpreting services (not a member of the PMU or FAO staff) to be made available to the MTR team. This should be funded from either the MTR budget directly or from M&E co-financing contributions.
Similarly, if the MTR team’s language skills are limited, it may be necessary to have key documents, or parts thereof, translated. Again, this needs to be considered when budgeting for the MTR. Whether translation is required is for the FAO Country Office and participating government agencies to decide, but should be agreed early in the MTR process.

4.5.4 Data gathering and analysis

It is recommended that the MTR team try to standardize data collection as much as possible throughout the MTR process. Notes from interviews, focus-group discussions, etc., need to be retained. This is to assist in cases where there may be a challenge to an MTR’s findings and conclusions and where notes need to be checked independently.

Where possible, the MTR team should cross-check the information it collects with data available from the monitoring or information systems of national or international executing partners or national institutions, and/or local M&E systems. Also, where time is limited, MTR teams are encouraged to use focal-group discussions or stakeholder workshops as a data-collection tool to allow a range of opinions to be captured from stakeholder groups.

The MTR team should undertake its information analysis as soon as possible after collection. It is recommended that the MTR matrix be used as a framework for data analysis. For large GEF projects (>USD 10 million), particularly those implemented in more than one region and where different members of the team have visited different sites, the BH should consider gathering the MTR team in one location (such as Rome, an FAO Regional or Sub-regional office) for an analysis workshop (budget permitting). This could be combined with an initial debriefing and discussions with FAO staff (see Section 4.5.6).

Data collection and analysis is the responsibility of the MTR team, which ensures that data are collected independently and adequately triangulated. However, the RM should regularly monitor progress on data collection and analysis in line with the agreed MTR workplan.

4.5.6 Debriefing with the FAO Representation(s) at the end of the mission

For single-country FAO–GEF projects, a short (1–2 hour) debriefing should be organized by the MTR team with the FAO Representation, the PMU, the FAO GEF CU (linked by videoconference or Skype, if possible) and other stakeholders (including an invitation to the GEF Operational Focal Point) before the MTR team leaves the country. This means that 2–3 days will need to be built into the MTR mission to give the MTR team time to collate and analyse its data after visits to the field site(s) and prepare a presentation on its preliminary results.
The debriefing should help to ensure that all information sources have been accessed, provide an initial opportunity to verify facts, confirm the MTR’s preliminary findings and discuss and jointly elaborate on preliminary conclusions, recommendations and next steps with some of the main users of the MTR. Wherever possible, a face-to-face debriefing (rather than a remote one) is recommended, as this offers the opportunity for a more open and frank exchange of views. The debriefing also helps to develop a more comprehensive, realistic first draft MTR report, with fewer inaccuracies, which can speed up the MTR report drafting and review process. Alternatively, and depending on the timing, the MTR team can choose to give a briefing on initial findings and recommendations to the whole PSC, if a PSC meeting coincides with the end of the field mission. (As the main oversight body for a project, a special meeting of the PSC can be called, perhaps over Skype, if urgent actions need to be discussed.) Such an arrangement may be more appropriate for large-scale single-country projects, although additional logistical support (and budget, including for extra time in country for the MTR team) may need to be provided by the FAO Representation, PMU and RM. Another option is to present the MTR findings at bilateral meetings with various collaborating agencies, including with the GEF Operational Focal Point, providing an opportunity for a more focused discussion between FAO and a given agency than at a large workshop attended by many participants.

Where an immediate and direct debriefing to stakeholders is not possible (for example, on the MTR of a global project or one involving several countries and different sets of consultants), an alternative should be arranged by videoconference or (less ideally) by Skype.

### 4.5.7 Preparation of the MTR report

The main MTR report should be brief (no longer than 40 pages, excluding the executive summary and annexes) and to the point and should be laid out in line with FAO house style (FAO, 2017b). The template for the MTR report can be found in Annex 11, with further explanation on how to complete the key sections in Annex 12.
Ideally, the final report should be written in English or in the official national language of the target country (for single-country FAO–GEF projects). However, if the report is written in a national official language that is not English then, at a minimum, the report’s executive summary should be translated into English. For multi-country, regional and global projects and where multiple national languages are involved, the report should be in English (with the executive summary in the official national languages if required). The initial draft can be produced in the national language to enable its review by a wider group of stakeholders if agreed with the MTR team and funds are available for its translation into English. However, the choice of language for the draft and final reports will depend on the project circumstances and the key individuals involved. This should be decided on a case-by-case basis in close consultation with the FAO Representation.

The report must explain the purpose of the MTR, exactly what was reviewed and the methods used (including their limitations). It should present balanced, evidence-based findings, conclusions and recommendations, as well as any preliminary lessons identified at the mid-term point (most likely on the design and establishment of GEF projects, as full results are unlikely to be available at this stage). These should then be cross-referenced. The executive summary (6–8 pages) should capture all the main elements of the MTR, including information on stakeholder engagement, gender responsiveness, knowledge products and management and act as a stand-alone document that can be used for results dissemination purposes. The report should also include an annotated table of ratings on which the GEF criteria can be assessed (as set out in the terms of reference for the MTR), along with the justification for these ratings (included in the advice on the MTR report provided in Annex 12).

The MTR team leader has overall responsibility for the preparation and quality of the report, the coherence of its content, adherence to the MTR report template and meeting the deadlines agreed in the terms of reference. However, other MTR team members are expected to make contributions to the draft and final versions of the report, for example, collating information, drafting specific sections and compiling annexes. The roles and responsibilities of the various members of the MTR team should be discussed and agreed at an early stage.

In most cases, there will need to be several follow-up interviews after the field mission, for example, with FAO staff in Rome or with the project’s BH, to clarify and/or triangulate information collected during field missions or to gather additional data. However, the MTR team should submit a first draft of the MTR report to the FAO GEF CU and RM/BH for quality assurance within three weeks of the MTR mission.
The draft MTR report undergoes a review process aimed at identifying factual mistakes and inaccuracies, omissions and errors in analysis and to ensure that it meets all of the requirements of the terms of reference. There are two stages to the review process – the first internal to FAO (BH, RM, LTO, FLO, FAO GEF CU focal point) and the immediate project staff and the second for external stakeholders. Thus, the process involves the production of two draft versions (drafts 0 and 1) and a final version of the report.

The first draft report (draft 0) is sent to the RM, who, after checking that all sections are present, including annexes, forwards it to the PMU, PTF and FAO GEF CU focal point (ideally 5–10 days for review). Along with the draft report, the RM sends a comments matrix (see Annex 13) to all reviewers. This functions as an “audit trail” for the MTR report. After each review stage, the MTR team should assess the stakeholder feedback in this table and detail how the feedback has or has not been addressed in the report, indicating both accepted and rejected comments and documenting any changes made to the draft report. Comments that are clearly not relevant to the MTR or project should not be included in the matrix.

Once the first internal FAO and project team review has been undertaken and this first set of feedback integrated into the draft report, a second, improved version is produced by the MTR team (draft 1). This is then sent out to a wider group of non-FAO stakeholders (project counterparts, PSC members, key partners, etc.). Draft 1 may need to be translated at this stage (if previously agreed) to ensure local stakeholders can read the report in their own language. The RM should ask each of the wider stakeholder groups to synthesize their comments into a single comments matrix document (one comment matrix per institution, local community, etc.), which is then sent to the MTR team. In addition to making external feedback easier to collate and address, this also encourages discussion within stakeholder groups on the MTR report’s findings, conclusions and recommendations.
In the case of large, complex projects (multi-country, regional, global) with lots of stakeholder feedback, the RM should collate the feedback from the various sets of stakeholders into a final comments matrix table and forward this to the MTR team. For single-country MTRs with little feedback, the MTR team can usually collate the stakeholder feedback into a single comments matrix table.

It is suggested that 10 working days be allotted for the external stakeholder feedback. Once the MTR team has reviewed and incorporated the external feedback and made any necessary changes to the report, it becomes the final MTR report.

It is the MTR team leader’s responsibility to ensure the MTR team addresses the feedback provided by stakeholders at each review stage and the responsibility of the RM to ensure that comments from stakeholders have been adequately addressed by the MTR team.

4.5.9 Responding to stakeholder feedback

Stakeholders are encouraged to provide feedback on any factual errors in the draft report and may highlight the significance of errors in the formulation of any conclusions. They may also provide feedback on the proposed recommendations and lessons in the MTR report. The MTR team is required to correct factual errors in the draft and, in cases where comments are accompanied by revised datasets and/or new evidence, consider reviewing their findings, conclusions and recommendations. As noted, any differing opinions expressed in response to the MTR findings should be documented in the comments matrix. However, as an independent group, the MTR team has the right to develop its own conclusions, ratings and recommendations and these will not necessarily correspond to the views of FAO or other stakeholders. Consequently, where there are differences of opinion or interpretation, the MTR team is not obliged to alter the text to reflect reviewer views. Authorship of the report lies with the MTR team, though the MTR team needs to indicate where there are differing opinions.
The completed comments matrix, incorporating both the comments of reviewers and the MTR team’s response to them (whether reviewer comments are accepted or not), must be submitted to the RM (and the FAO GEF CU) with the final version of the MTR report. However, to protect the rights and confidentiality of the interviewees, the names of those interviewed should not be included in this comments matrix and must never be connected to the feedback provided. The comments matrix should also be sent back to the reviewers who commented, so that they can see the MTR team response to their points. Again, however, names should be stripped from the completed matrix for confidentiality reasons.

4.5.10 Finalizing the MTR report

The BH and the FAO GEF CU MTR focal point may suggest editing of the MTR report if the English is considered inadequate or it would improve readability, but such costs should be met from the MTR budget.

Once the final report is ready, it should be sent to the FAO GEF CU for final quality-assurance assessment. The report process and MTR performance are then rated for FAO quality-assurance purposes (see Section 5) by the FAO GEF CU and RM.

4.6 Phase 4: MTR report dissemination and follow-up

This phase, for which the BH is fully responsible, includes:

- the formatting, full translation (if needed), distribution and publishing of the MTR report
- the preparation of briefs and videos
- the organization of stakeholder workshops
- potential presentations at external or internal forums, including donor capital or FAO events
- the development of the Management Response and its associated MTR follow-up reporting within a year

The distribution of the report (once it has been cleared by the BH and the FAO GEF CU) should follow the dissemination plan agreed earlier in the planning phase (phase 1). MTR reports are uploaded to FPMIS and to the project website (where one exists). Depending on its expected use and users, consideration should be given to translating the final version of the MTR report into different languages. Any proofreading, translation, distribution and final publishing costs should be provided for in the MTR budget.

4.6.1 Translation of the MTR report

If necessary and agreed with the project partners, the RM should ensure the final report is available in the official language of the country in question to ensure broad stakeholder involvement in the follow-up process to the MTR. However, if this is not considered essential, at a minimum, it is recommended that the executive summary of the final MTR report be translated into the national language(s).

4.6.2 Dissemination of the results of the MTR

The BH should clear and then circulate the final MTR report to the project stakeholders, including the PMU, FAO GEF CU, PSC members, project partners, the country’s GEF Operational Focal Point, relevant national agencies and local stakeholder groups.

The FAO GEF CU forwards the final MTR report (in English), together with the project’s updated GEF tracking tools for GEF-5 projects (and for GEF-6 and GEF-7 projects with PA...
elements), or an assessment of its contribution to GEF-7 core indicators for FAO–GEF projects approved during GEF-6 and GEF-7, to the GEF Secretariat as part of FAO’s Annual Monitoring Report on its portfolio of FAO–GEF projects and programmes. These are uploaded through the online GEF portal. Along with general data on the project, the GEF Secretariat now requires information on stakeholder engagement, gender-response measures and results, knowledge-management activities and a summary box on the main findings of the MTR to be submitted as part of the process. The FAO GEF CU will enter this information into the GEF portal, taken from the relevant sections of the executive summary of the MTR report, in addition to uploading the MTR report and the tracking tools or GEF-7 core indicator assessments report. In addition, the FAO GEF CU focal point uploads all MTRs to FAO’s FPMIS.

While the MTR is expected to result in a comprehensive document, effective communication of its content and key messages is best presented in synthesized form using more creative and innovative multimedia approaches, such as video, photos, sound recordings, social media, short stories (for suitable cases or country studies), infographics or even comic or cartoon format. These should be discussed when developing the dissemination strategy for the MTR (in phase 2). It is also suggested that the RM and PMU, in consultation with the MTR team, produce a two-page summary of key findings, lessons and recommendations from the MTR report that can be disseminated to the wider public for general information on the project’s results and performance to date. This can also be posted as a briefing paper on the project’s website.

If not already conducted during the initial debrief to the FAO Representation, PMU and FAO GEF CU or PSC, a presentation to a wider group of stakeholders can be considered as part of the dissemination strategy at this stage, to report on and discuss the main findings, conclusions and recommendations of the MTR. This could take the form of a two-hour to half-day stakeholder workshop, depending on the objectives and number of participants (particularly if there is a large number of project stakeholders) and whether sufficient GEF funding (or co-financing) is available. If the MTR team cannot attend (due to other commitments or insufficient funding, for instance), a short presentation by the MTR team leader could be done remotely by videoconference to the PSC or the relevant FAO Office. If such a meeting is likely to be required, the MTR team leader’s presence/participation should be specified in his/her terms of reference and the budget revised accordingly.

### 4.6.3 Management Response and follow-up reporting

Once the MTR report has been quality controlled and cleared, the FAO GEF CU formally asks the BH to prepare a Management Response to the MTR, which should be delivered within four weeks of the request. The BH coordinates the preparation of the Management Response in consultation with the PMU and PSC, with input from the FAO GEF CU (the FAO GEF CU FLO). The MTR team plays no part in preparing or implementing the Management Response.

The Management Response sets out how the PMU, BH, LTO, other members of the PTF and/or other stakeholders (including the PSC) will respond to the recommendations presented in the MTR report. The template for the follow-up matrix, laying out the Management Response and actions, is presented in the OED document entitled, “Responsibilities and procedures for management responses and follow-up reports on evaluations” (FAO OED, 2015). Specifically, the matrix allows the BH, PMU, FAO GEF CU, PTF and other stakeholders to:

- express their overall opinion on the MTR and its report, conclusions and usefulness;
- respond to individual recommendations formulated by the MTR team, either by fully or partially accepting them or by rejecting them (and explaining any decision to reject); and
- describe how they will implement the recommendations that they have fully or partially accepted.

The Management Response should be written in the official national language of the target country, but also translated into English for wider understanding, uptake and information (particularly valuable for the GEF Secretariat). After the Management Response is drafted, the BH should officially share the document with members of PSC, ideally by convening
a specific PSC meeting, and request their feedback, which should be considered when finalizing the Response. Once the Management Response has been approved, the BH will disseminate the MTR report and convene a formal full PSC meeting to discuss how best to address the MTR’s recommendations, update the workplan and budgets, and confirm roles and responsibilities.

Lastly, once the MTR report has been completed, the FAO GEF CU requests the project BH to report on the implementation of the accepted and partially accepted MTR recommendations in the next GEF PIR and FAO PPR, as well as on any variation between actions decided in the Management Response and those actually implemented. Consequently, the next PIR and PPR should be used to report on the implementation of the MTR recommendations. In addition to documenting implementation, this would help to enhance accountability, transparency and lesson learning. It is also considered an important background document that will inform the terminal evaluation.
5. Quality assurance process for the mid-term review report
This section outlines the quality assurance processes for the MTR, including the procedures for ensuring adequate recording of primary data and MTR deliverables in FAO’s corporate systems (FPMIS).

The designated FAO GEF CU MTR focal point and RM assess the quality of the performance, delivery and conduct of the MTR team consultants, assign a rating to the overall quality of the MTR exercise and record their joint assessment in an FAO quality assessment report (QAR). It is important to ensure that the MTR consultants are given the opportunity to review this assessment and challenge any statements before it is lodged in FAO’s QAR database. It should be noted that this assessment can be modified after submission of a revised version of the report once the comments are taken into account. MTR reports are assessed according to criteria defined in the peer review and scoring matrix (Annex 14). OED may be requested by the FAO GEF CU to participate in the quality assurance process in exceptional cases.

An independent peer review of the MTR report can also be undertaken if deemed necessary. Such a review is not mandatory (or common) for FAO–GEF project MTRs and the decision to undertake one lies with the BH and FAO GEF CU. For complex, particularly multi-country projects, projects that have suffered significant challenges and delays at the mid-term point, an external peer review of the draft MTR report may help to improve the quality and utility of the final report. It may also be appropriate in cases where the MTR process has been problematic or controversial, or there are questions as regards the quality of the report. Depending on office capacity, the peer reviewer could be a senior FAO GEF CU colleague with experience in GEF project evaluations/reviews, an external officer or consultant from another development agency or a private firm, but it should be someone who has had no previous connection with the MTR or project in question.
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