

TERMINAL EVALUATION TERMS OF REFERENCE

FOR CONSULTANCY SERVICES

INTRODUCTION

Bhutan is known to have one of the highest per capita domestic fuel wood consumption in the world, at almost 1.17 tonnes per person per year. With 70 percent of its population living in rural Bhutan, and fuel wood being the main source of energy for cooking, heating and lighting in the rural areas, there is constant and increasing pressure on the forests of Bhutan. The inefficient fuel wood consumption is contributing to deforestation/forest degradation, indoor air pollution and greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions.

To address the above problem, the Sustainable Rural Biomass Energy (SRBE) Project was established in 2013 with the support of the Global Environment Facility (GEF), the Royal Government of Bhutan (RGoB), the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), and other funding partners. The project is focused on the promotion and efficient use of biomass energy resources to enhance energy services, primarily in rural areas, and to reduce GHG emissions in Bhutan.

The SRBE project will conclude in December 2016. In accordance with UNDP and GEF monitoring and evaluation policies and procedures, all full and medium-sized UNDP-GEF projects are required to undergo a terminal evaluation upon completion of implementation. These terms of reference (TOR) sets out the expectations for a Terminal Evaluation (TE) of the Bhutan Sustainable Rural Biomass Energy (UNDP PIMS# 4181).

Projec t Title: Bhutan Sustainable Rural Biomass Energy							
GEF Project ID (PMIS#):	3844		at endorsement (Million US\$)	<u>at completion</u> (Million US\$)			
UNDP Project ID:	4181 (PIMS#) 00076640 (Atlas ID)	GEF financing:	1.70	0.00			
Country:	Bhutan	IA/EA own:	0.20	0.00			
Region:	South Asia	Government:	0.51	0.00			
Focal Area:	Climate Change	Other:	1.82	0.00			
FA Objectives, (OP/SP):		Total co-financing:	2.53	0.00			
Executing Agency:	Department of	Total Project Cost:	4.23	0.00			

PROJECT SUMMARY TABLE



	Renewable			
	Energy			
Other	BTFEC, PEI,	ProDoc Signature (date proj	ect began):	29 August, 2012
Partners	RGoB,	(Operational) Closing Date:	Proposed:	Actual:
involved:	SDC/Helvet		31 December,	31 December,
	as, ADB,		2015	2016
	Private			
	Sector			

OBJECTIVE AND SCOPE

The Terminal Evaluation (TE) will be conducted according to the guidance, rules and procedures established by UNDP and GEF as reflected in the UNDP Evaluation Guidance for GEF Financed Projects.

The objectives of the evaluation are to assess the achievement of project results, and to draw lessons that can both improve the sustainability of benefits from this project, and aid in the overall enhancement of UNDP programming.

Project Background:

The SRBE has the following Project Goal and Objective:

<u>Project Goal</u>: Reduction of GHG emissions in the rural household and industrial sectors of Bhutan through integrated and sustainable biomass resource production and utilization, and promotion of sustainable biomass energy technologies in Bhutan using market based approaches.

<u>Project Objective</u>: Removal of barriers to sustainable utilization of available biomass resources in the country; and application of biomass energy technologies that can support the economic and social development in the country's rural sector.

The Project was designed with three components, as follows:

Component 1: Mainstreaming sustainable biomass energy production, conversion and utilization; **Component 2:** Supporting innovative practices and market mechanisms for local sustainable biomass energy technology development and promotion **Component 3:** Capacity building and knowledge management

Each of the above components contributes to the project outcomes, which are articulated as follows:

Outcome 1: Implementation of strengthened support policies and regulatory frameworks and institutional capacity for adoption of sustainable practices production, conversion and use of biomass resources in Bhutan.

Outcome 2: Implementation of BET applications due to improved confidence in their feasibility, performance, environmental and economic benefits through demonstration projects, market mechanisms and increased private sector participation



Outcome 3: Improved knowledge, awareness and capacities of policy makers, financiers, suppliers and end-users on benefits and market opportunities for modern biomass energy technologies

EVALUATION APPROACH AND METHOD

An overall approach and method¹ for conducting project terminal evaluations of UNDP supported GEF financed projects has developed over time. The evaluation should include a mixed methodology of document review, interviews, and observations from project site visits, at minimum, and the evaluators should make an effort to triangulate information. The evaluators are expected to frame the evaluation effort using the criteria of **relevance**, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and impact, as defined and explained in the <u>UNDP Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-supported, GEF-financed Projects</u>. A set of questions covering each of these criteria have been drafted and are included with this TOR (<u>Annex C</u>) The evaluators are expected to amend, complete and submit this matrix as part of an evaluation inception report, and shall include it as an annex to the final report.

The evaluation must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The evaluator is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with government counterparts, in particular the GEF operational focal point, UNDP Country Office, project team, UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based in the region and key stakeholders. The evaluator is expected to conduct a field mission to project sites jointly identified with the PMU. Interviews will be held with the following organizations and individuals at a minimum: *Department of Renewable Energy, Gross National Happiness Commission, Department of Adult and Higher Education, Bhutan Trust Fund for Environment Conservation, Tarayana Foundation, Bhutan Association of Women Entrepreneurs, Non-formal Education Instructors and Social Forestry and Extension Division.*

The evaluator will review all relevant sources of information, such as the project document, project reports – including Annual APR/PIR, project budget revisions, midterm review, progress reports, GEF focal area tracking tools, project files, national strategic and legal documents, and any other materials that the evaluator considers useful for this evidence-based assessment. A list of documents that the project team will provide to the evaluator for review is included in <u>Annex B</u> of this Terms of Reference.

EVALUATION CRITERIA & RATINGS

An assessment of project performance will be carried out, based against expectations set out in the Project Logical Framework/Results Framework (see <u>Annex A</u>), which provides performance and impact indicators for project implementation along with their corresponding means of verification. The evaluation will at a minimum cover the criteria of: **relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact.** Ratings must be provided on the following performance criteria. The completed table must be included in the evaluation executive summary. The obligatory rating scales are included in <u>Annex</u> <u>D</u>.

¹ For additional information on methods, see the <u>Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development</u> <u>Results</u>, Chapter 7, pg. 163



Evaluation Ratings:			
1. Monitoring and Evaluation	rating	2. IA & EA Execution	rating
M&E design at entry		Quality of UNDP Implementation- Implementing	
		Agency	
M&E Plan Implementation		Quality of Execution - Executing Agency	
Overall quality of M&E		Overall quality of Implementation / Execution	
3. Assessment of Outcomes	rating	4. Sustainability	rating
Relevance		Financial resources	
Effectiveness		Socio-political	
Efficiency		Institutional framework and governance	
Overall Project Outcome		Environmental	
Rating			
		Overall likelihood of sustainability	

PROJECT FINANCE / COFINANCE

The Evaluation will assess the key financial aspects of the project, including the extent of co-financing planned and realized. Project cost and funding data will be required, including annual expenditures. Variances between planned and actual expenditures will need to be assessed and explained. Results from recent financial audits, as available, should be taken into consideration. The evaluator(s) will receive assistance from the Country Office (CO) and Project Team to obtain financial data in order to complete the co-financing table below, which will be included in the terminal evaluation report.

Co-financing	UNDP	own	Governm	ent	Partner A	gency	Total	
(type/source)	financing (mill. (mill. US\$)		5)	(mill. US\$)		(mill. US\$)		
	US\$)							
	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual
Grants								
Loans/Concessions								
 In-kind support 								
support								
Other								
Totals								

MAINSTREAMING

UNDP-supported, GEF financed projects are key components in UNDP country programming, as well as regional and global programmes. The evaluation will assess the extent to which the project was successfully mainstreamed with other UNDP priorities, including poverty alleviation, improved governance, the prevention and recovery from natural disasters, and gender. The evaluation will examine this project's contribution to the United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF).



IMPACT

The evaluators will assess the extent to which the project is achieving impacts or progressing towards the achievement of impacts. Key findings that should be brought out in the evaluations include whether the project has demonstrated: a) verifiable improvements in ecological status, b) verifiable reductions in stress on ecological systems, and/or c) demonstrated progress towards these impact achievements.²

CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS & LESSONS

The evaluation report must include a chapter providing a set of **conclusions**, **recommendations** and **lessons**. Conclusions should build on findings and be based in evidence. Recommendations should be prioritized, specific, relevant, and targeted, with suggested implementers of the recommendations. Lessons should have wider applicability to other initiatives across the region, the area of intervention, and for the future.

IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS

The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation resides with the UNDP Bhutan County Office (CO). The UNDP CO will contract the evaluators and ensure the timely provision of per diems and travel arrangements within the country for the evaluation team. The Project Team will be responsible for liaising with the Evaluators team to set up stakeholder interviews, arrange field visits, coordinate with the Government etc.

EVALUATION TIMEFRAME

The total duration of the evaluation will be 25 working days for the consultancy team (International & National Consultant) according to the following plan spread over a period of 11 weeks:

Activity	Timing	Completion Date
Preparation	3 days	20 May 2016
Evaluation Mission	11 days	15 June 2016
Draft Evaluation Report	7 days	28 June 2016
Final Report	4 days	20 July 2016

EVALUATION DELIVERABLES

The evaluation team is expected to deliver the following:

Deliverable	Content	Timing	Responsibilities
Inception	Evaluator provides	No later than 2 weeks	Evaluator submits to UNDP CO
Report (max.	clarifications on timing	before the evaluation	
10 pages)	and method	mission.	

² A useful tool for gauging progress to impact is the Review of Outcomes to Impacts (ROtI) method developed by the GEF Evaluation Office: <u>ROTI Handbook 2009</u>



Presentation	Initial Findings	End of evaluation	To project management,
		mission	UNDP CO
Draft Final	Full report, (per	Within 3 weeks of the	Sent to CO, reviewed by RTA,
Report	annexed template)	evaluation mission	PCU, GEF OFPs
	with annexes		
Final Report*	Revised report	Within 1 week of	Sent to CO for uploading to
		receiving UNDP	UNDP ERC.
		comments on draft	

*When submitting the final evaluation report, the evaluator is required also to provide an 'audit trail', detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final evaluation report. See Annex H for an audit trail template.

TEAM COMPOSITION - CONSULTANTS

The consultancy team are invited to submit applications along with a cover page and the technical proposal with their CV for these positions. The team leader, International Consultant is required to collaborate with a National Consultant through a signed letter of association to form the consultancy team and submit the proposal together.

The evaluation team will be composed of **1** international evaluator and **1** national evaluator. The consultants shall have prior experience in evaluating similar projects. Experience with GEF financed projects is an advantage. The evaluators selected should not have participated in the project preparation and/or implementation and should not have conflict of interest with project related activities. The International Consultant will serve as the Team Leader and will be responsible for the final deliverable of the TE inception report, draft report, and final report.

International Consultant/ Team Leader Required Experience:

Education:

• A post-secondary/advanced degree (Masters level or higher) in climate change mitigation, renewable energy, environmental sciences, evaluation, or a related subject

Experience:

- Minimum 10 years of relevant professional experience in climate change mitigation and energy
- Minimum of 5 years of experience in evaluation (experience with UNDP and/or GEF-financed projects is an advantage)
- Previous experience with results-based monitoring and evaluation methodologies
- Previous experience with gender-sensitive analysis
- Technical knowledge in the targeted focal area(s)



National Consultant/ Team Specialist Required Experience:

Education:

• A higher education degree (Bachelors level or higher) in climate change mitigation, renewable energy, environmental sciences, or a related subject

Experience:

- Minimum 3 years of relevant professional experience in climate change mitigation and energy, project evaluation or related field
- Previous experience with results-based monitoring and evaluation methodologies
- Technical knowledge in the targeted focal area(s)

EVALUATOR ETHICS

Evaluation consultants will be held to the highest ethical standards and are required to sign a Code of Conduct (Annex E) upon acceptance of the assignment. UNDP evaluations are conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the <u>UNEG 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluations'</u>.

PAYMENT MODALITIES AND SPECIFICATIONS

%	Milestone
10%	Submission of TE Inception Report
30%	Following submission and approval of the 1st draft terminal evaluation report
60%	Following submission and approval (UNDP-CO and UNDP RTA) of the final terminal
	evaluation report

APPLICATION PROCESS

Applicants are requested to apply online through <u>procurement.bt@undp.org</u> by **28 April 2016**. The consultancy team are invited to submit applications along with a cover page and the technical proposal with their CV for these positions. The team leader, International Consultant is required to collaborate with a National Consultant through a signed letter of association to form the consultancy team and submit the proposal together. If selected for the assignment, the contract will be signed with the Team Leader of the consultancy team who will be fully accountable for the execution of the work including deliverables.

Please submit the below preferred documents with your Presentation of Offer:

- a) Duly accomplished Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability;
- b) Personal CV or P11, indicating all past experience from similar projects, and at least two (2) professional reference letters of similar past assignments;



- c) Brief description of why the individual considers him/herself as the most suitable for the assignment, and a methodology including field visit (refer <u>www.bioenergy.gov.bt</u> for project sites) schedule on how they will approach and complete the assignment.
- d) Financial Proposal that indicates the all-inclusive fixed total contract price, supported by a breakdown of costs. The consultants shall submit the price offer indicating a lump sum all-inclusive cost for the assignment (including daily fee, per diem and travel costs for both consultants) together with the Technical Proposal *in separate files*.
- e) Signed letter of association as a Consultancy Team between International and National Consultants

ELECTION CRITERIA

The Combined Scoring method – where the qualifications, experiences and methodology will be weighted a max. of 70%, and combined with the price offer which will be weighted a max of 30%. A minimum score of 70% has to be achieved by individual consultant on Technical Score to be qualified for financial evaluation.

Criteria	Weight	International Consultant- Maximum Score	National Consultant – Maximum Score	Consultancy Team Maximum Score
Technical Score				
Education Qualification		10	5	15
 Specific experience in M & E and GEF Project Evaluation in a developing country context. 		30	15	45
Proposed Methodology, approach and implementation plan				25
Experience with UNDP and other donor-funded projects		10	5	15
		10	5	1.5
Sub-total (Technical)				100
Technical Score – A	70%			70
*Financial Score - B	30%			30
Total (A+B)- Combined Score	100%			100

Detailed evaluation criteria is provided below:

* The financial score = $\frac{Lowest \, quoted \, amount}{Quoted \, Amount} X \, 30$



Under experiences, the following shall be considered for evaluation of the consultancy team:

- Recent experience with result-based management evaluation methodologies;
- > Experience applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios;
- > Competence in adaptive management, as applied to (Climate Change Mitigation);
- > Experience working with the GEF or GEF-evaluations;
- Experience working in South East Asia;



ANNEX A: PROJECT LOGICAL FRAMEWORK

This project will contribute to achieving the following Country Programme Outcome as defined in CPAP or CPD: By 2012, national capacity for environmental sustainability and disaster management strengthened (MDG 7)

Country Programme Outcome Indicators: Percentage of *Gewog* level population with access to electricity; Number of male/female headed households in remote gewogs using renewable energy with increased income generation opportunities

Primary applicable Key Environment and Sustainable Development Key Result Area (same as that on the cover page, circle one):

- 1. Mainstreaming environment and energy OR
- 2. Catalyzing environmental finance OR
- 3. Promote climate change adaptation OR
- 4. Expanding access to environmental and energy services for the poor.

Applicable GEF Strategic Objective and Program: CC-SP4: Sustainable utilization of biomass for energy services.

Applicable GEF Expected Outcomes:

Applicable GEF Outcome Indicators:

Strategy	Objectively Verifiable Indicators			Source of Verification	Risks and Assumptions
	Indicators	Baseline	Targets		
Project Goal: Reduction of GHG emissions through integrated and sustainable biomass resource production and utilization,	• Quantity of GHG emissions mitigated annually by End of Project (EOP), tCO2e.	0	Up to 107,626Up to 196,668	 GHG emission mitigation calculations Statistics Reports 	 Assumptions: Recognition of the government on importance of reducing GHG emissions and



and promotion of sustainable biomass energy technologies in Bhutan using market based approaches.	 Total quantity of GHG emissions mitigated by EOP, tCO2e. Reduction of fuel wood consumption for energy use in households and industries by EOP, tonnes. 	0	• Up to 183,214		 continuing commitment towards it. Improved stoves installed are replacing older more polluting stoves and there is a demonstration effect noticed.
of barriers to sustainable utilization of available biomass resources in the country and application of biomass energy technologies that can support economic and social development in the country's rural sector, in order to reduce GHG emissions.	 Existence of a coherent and comprehensive RE Policy where biomass energy is mainstreamed by EOP. Existence of fiscal & non-fiscal incentives from the Government to facilitate acceleration of development of wider application of sustainable biomass energy resources by beginning of Year 3, month. Number of enterprises supplying clean and efficient 	Policy 0 0 0	 T coherent & comprehensive RE Policy in place Month 25 At least 10 Up to 20,000 	 Official policy document Document containing regulations on incentives Statistics Reports 	 People adopt the new technology which comes at a cost Subsidies and credit are available for purchase of stoves Government has the political will to support policies and actions that would promote clean and efficient BET applications Risk: Trained personnel leave the country as part of the 'Brain Drain' phenomenon



Component 1: Mainstreamin	 biomass energy systems and services by EOP. Number of households and industries benefiting from the energy- efficient furnaces/stoves & other BET applications & services by EOP. 	energy pro	duction, conversio	n and utilization	
Outcome 1: Coherent, adequate, clear & holistic policies on renewable and biomass energy production, conversion and utilization put in place and strong institutional linkages established	 Biomass energy mainstreamed in the RE Policy and regulations being applied by beginning of Year 2, date. Number of community-based fuel wood plantations being utilized by communities & households for use in BET applications by EOP. 	0	 Month 13 50 	 Official announcements Official policy document Reports Statistics 	 Assumptions: Government continues to see biomass as a priority All participating agencies are willing to cooperate and function as a team IA is sufficiently capacitated to implement and coordinate the project



Output 1.1: Long term	• Existence of	1 Draft	Month 25	Official policy document	Assumption:
holistic policy, planning	policies and	RE		• Copy of document	• Close coordination with
and strategies formulated	standards on the	policy		containing the completed	implementing partners
and reflected in a	provision and use			Roadmap	possible
Roadmap for policy	of fuel wood for				
implementation and	energy purposes		• 1 Roadmap		
nromotion of sustainable	put in place by end of Voor 2 month	0	Tionannap		
biomass production and	• Evistance of the	U			
stilization	• Existence of the				
utilization	promotion &				
	implementation of				
	sustainable				
	biomass				
	production &				
	utilization by end				
	of Year 1.				
Output 1.2: Appropriate	• Number of	0	• 5	 Documentation on 	
coordination & linkage	relevant agencies			coordination & linkage	
mechanisms strengthened	and institutions			mechanisms	
and Biomass Energy	involved in			• Database programme	
Resource Information	production and use			with appropriate and	
System established	of BETS and are			sufficient contents	
.	other via a				
	working	0	• Month 6		
	mechanism for				
	coordination by				
	EOP.				
	• Existence of				
	Biomass Energy				
	Resource				
	Information				
	System (BERIS),				



	which contains and disseminates information on biomass resources within Year 1, month.				
Output 1.3: Active participation of community-based organisations and grassroots institutions	 Number of representatives from community- based organizations & grassroots institutions trained and actively involved in promoting & disseminating BETs by EOP. 	0	• 20	 Evidence of involvement by organizations/institutions Progress Reports 	
Output 1.4: Action plan for earmarking areas for sustainable fuel wood plantation & utilization developed and being implemented	 Existence of an action plan & implementation procedures for allocation, utilization & management of fuel wood plantation within Year 1, month. Number of 	0	Month 620	 Action Plan Progress Reports 	
	earmarked areas & supporting measures for fuel wood plantation activities from	~1 woman : 4 men	• > 20% women members		



Component 2: Supporting in and promotion	 beginning of Year 2. Participation of women in CFMG Committees. 	market me	echanisms for loca	l sustainable biomass energ	y technology development
Outcome 2: Widespread adoption & use of appropriate & efficient BET applications and services enhanced through demonstration projects, market mechanisms and increased private sector participation	 Degree of satisfaction by end-users of BETs & furnaces/stoves implemented, % Fuel wood saved through efficient stoves by EOP, tonnes Quantity of sawdust utilized and prevented from decaying through BET applications by EOP, tonnes Number of operating Full Scale Model BETs that show good viability, improved performance, & environmental & economic benefits by EOP. 	0 0 0 0	 80 Up to 183,214 Up to 921 At least 3 	 Users Satisfaction Survey Progress Reports 	 Assumptions: Existing knowledge, experience, skills and sources are adequate to source and access technologies End-users are interested and wiling to accept the promoted technologies Availability of credit facility from financial institutions Risks: Lack of private sector interest and willingness to participate Technology to be introduced not being able to attain social acceptability



Output 2.1: Menu of appropriate & efficient technologies made available	• Availability of technology fact sheets and menu of appropriate & efficient BETs within Year 1, month.	0	• Month 9	• Printed materials	
Output 2.2: Fiscal incentives such as smart subsidies to enable market mechanisms introduced	 Existence of comparative assessments of financing schemes for BET applications and BE-supported projects by Month 7, date. Financing support and incentives provided to end- users of BET applications & services starting from Year 2, month. 	0	Month 7Month 13	 Report Official announcements Documentation on fiscal incentives 	
Output 2.3: Private sector participation & public- private partnerships in activities & investments to produce & deliver energy efficient BETs supported	 Cost sharing & market delivery mechanisms put in place and starting to be utilized by communities & industries within Year 1, month. Number & quality of partnerships 	0	Month 9At least 10	Progress Reports	



	established by EOP.				
Output 2.4: Locally produced energy-efficient stoves in rural households and community-based institutions for space heating and cooking needs implemented and promoted for replication	 EOP. Number of furnaces/stoves installed & being used on a daily basis by households in targeted areas by EOP. Number of men/women trained and participating as technicians in the construction and installation of stoves. Reduction in disease load (respiratory illnesses) among women/men. 	0 0 0	 Up to 20,000 At least 20, at least 1/3 of whom are women 25% reduction 	 Progress Reports User surveys 	Assumption: • New energy-efficient stoves considered to give better value and are affordable
Output 2.5: BET Full Scale Models implemented and operational, including wood briquetting technology for the production of bio-energy fuels, biomass gasification for electricity services and thermal applications, and energy efficient industrial	 Existence & operating performance of BET Full Scale Models in different districts & industries by EOP. Number of wood briquetting plants that are 	0 0 0 0	 At least 3 Districts (<i>Dzongkhag</i>) & 3 industries 1 2 	 Installed hardware List of projects and technology specifications Progress Reports 	Assumption:New BETs considered viable



stavas for incomo	operational by				
stoves for income	EOD				
generating local	EOP.				
enterprises	• Number of		• At least 5		
	biomass	0			
	gasification for				
	electricity services				
	& thermal				
	applications that				
	are operational by				
	EOP.				
	• Number of				
	enterprises that				
	locally produces				
	stoves by EOP.				
Component 3: Capacity build	ling and knowledge m	anagement			
	•	•			
Outcome 3: Improved	• Number of	0	• At least 200	 Training materials 	Assumption:
knowledge, awareness and	participants			• Evaluation of	
capacities of policy makers.	trained in different			participants	• Target groups are willing
financiars suppliars and	aspects of biomass			• Reports	to participate and are
and users on herefits and	energy such as			*	receptive to awareness
ena-users on benefus ana	policy, financing,				campaigns and capacity
market opportunities for	technology &				building activities
modern biomass energy	market	0	• At least 20		
technologies	mechanisms by				
_	EOP.				
	• Number of				
	relevant				
	stakeholders				
	whose skills and				
	knowledge have				
	been increased in				
	assessing,				
	implementing &				



	operating BETs by EOP.				
Output 3.1: Knowledge	Knowledge &	0	• Month 10	Progress Reports	
and Learning Platform for	Learning Platform			• Workshop materials	
Bhutan established and	for Bhutan			• Information packages	
operational	existing within			• News items	
	DUE &	0	• 2		
	Year 1. month.				
	Number of				
	workshops &				
	seminars	0	• 6		
	conducted on				
	BETs & biomass				
	resources each				
	year.				
	• Number, quality &				
	frequency of				
	information				
	e dissominated				
	each year				
Output 3.2: Rural	• Number of	0	• At least 40	• Integrated rural energy	Assumption:
development planners	participants		1101000010	plans	r · · · ·
trained on integrated rural	trained on			• Training materials	Interest of participants to
energy planning and	integrated rural			Progress Reports	receive training
biomage recourse	energy planning				
biomass resource	and biomass				
assessment	resource				
	assessment by				
Orstand 2.2. Delement	EUP.	0	A + 1 + 25		Aggregations
Output 3.3: Relevant	• Number of	U	• At least 25	• Training materials	Assumption:
agencies, project	agencies, project		representatives	• Evaluation of	
developers and micro-	developers and			participants	



entrepreneurs trained on different aspects of BET technologies	 micro- entrepreneurs trained on different aspects of BET applications & services by EOP. Number of micro- entrepreneurs involved in start ups & BET production by EOP. 	0	• At least 10	Progress Reports	Interest of participants to receive training
Output 3.4: Representatives of communities and institutions trained on the installation, operation and maintenance of biomass gasifiers, briquetting machines and energy- efficient furnaces/stoves	 Number of representatives of communities & institutions trained on the installation, operation and maintenance of biomass gasifiers, briquetting machines and energy-efficient furnaces/stoves by EOP. 	0	• At least 50	 Training materials Evaluation of participants Progress Reports 	Assumption:Interest of participants to receive training
Output 3.5: Specialized training of trainers on community forestry and sustainable forest wood energy completed	• Number of trainers trained on community forestry & sustainable forest wood energy by EOP.	0	 100, at least 1/3 of whom are women At least 50 	 Training materials Evaluation of participants Progress Reports 	Assumption: • Interest of participants to receive training



	• Number of trainings carried out by the trainers that received specialized training on community forestry & sustainable forest wood energy by EOP.				
Output 3.6: Capacity of relevant partners and stakeholders enhanced through site visits to successfully operated BET applications and study tours to meet counterparts in countries with more developed RE Policies	 Number of participants to the site visits to successfully operated BET applications in India Thailand & Cambodia by EOP. Number of participants to the study tours to meet counterparts in countries with more developed RE Policies such as India, Thailand & the Philippines by EOP. 	0	• 10 • 10	 Site Visit materials Evaluation of participants Progress Reports 	 Assumptions: Interest of participants to join site visits Willingness of project owners to host site visits



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

GEF Project Information Form (PIF), Project Document, and Log Frame Analysis (LFA)

Project Implementation Plan

Implementing/Executing partner arrangements

List and contact details for project staff, key project stakeholders, including Project Boards, and other partners to be consulted

Project sites, highlighting suggested visits

Mid Term Review (MTR) Report

Annual Project Implementation (APR/PIR) Reports

Project budget and financial data

GEF Focal Rea (Climate Change Mitigation) Project Tracking Tool, at baseline, at mid-term, and at terminal points

UNDP Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF)

UNDP Country Programme Document (CPD)

UNDP Country Programme Action Plan (CPAP)

GEF focal area strategic program objectives

Feasibility study on sawdust briquetting for sawmills in Bhutan

Review of Policies related to Biomass Energy Production, Conversion and Utilisation

Feasibility study on gasification using saw dust in Bhutan

Baseline study on fuelwood consumption



ANNEX C: EVALUATION QUESTIONS

This Evaluation Criteria Matrix must be fully completed/amended by the consultant and included in the TE inception report and as an Annex to the TE report.

Evalı	Jative Criteria Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
Relev natio	vance: How does the project relate to the main objectives of the G anal levels?	GEF focal area, and to the environment and	development priorities at tl	he local, regional and
a.	How does the project support the GEF focal area and strategic priorities?	•	•	•
b.	How does the project support the energy security, environment and sustainable development objectives of the Royal Government of Bhutan?	•	•	•
c.	What was the level of stakeholder participation and ownership in project design and implementation?	•	•	•
d.	How does the project support the needs of relevant stakeholders and has the implementation of the project been inclusive of all relevant stakeholders?	•	•	•
e.	Were local beneficiaries and stakeholders adequately involved in project design and implementation?	•	•	•
f.	Are there logical linkages between expected results of the project (log frame) and the project design (in terms of project components, choice of partners, structure, delivery mechanism, scope, budget, use of resources etc)?	•	•	•
g.	Is the length of the project sufficient to achieve project outcomes?	•	•	•
h.	Does the GEF funding support activities and objectives not addressed by other donors? How do GEF-funds help to fill gaps	•	•	•



	(or give additional stimulus) that are necessary but are not covered by other donors?			
	. Is there coordination and complementarity between donors?	•	•	•
Eff	ectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and object	ives of the project been achieved?		
	 a. Has the project been effective in achieving its expected outcomes? > Outcome 1: Implementation of strengthened support policies and regulatory frameworks and institutional capacity for adoption of sustainable practices production, conversion and use of biomass resources in Bhutan. > Outcome 2: Implementation of BET applications due to improved confidence in their feasibility, performance, environmental and economic benefits through demonstration projects, market mechanisms and increased private sector participation > Outcome 3: Improved knowledge, awareness and capacities of policy makers, financiers, suppliers and end-users on benefits and market opportunities for modern biomass energy technologies 			
-	b. What lessons have been learned from the project regarding achievement of outcomes?		•	•
	c. What changes could have been made (if any) to the design of the project in order to improve the achievement of the project's expected results?		•	•
f	iciency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with interr	national and national norms and standards?		



a.	Did the project logical framework and work plans and any changes made to them use as management tools during implementation?	•	•	•
b.	Were the accounting and financial systems in place adequate for project management and producing accurate and timely financial information?	•	•	•
c.	Were progress reports produced accurately, timely and responded to reporting requirements?	•	•	•
d.	Was project implementation as cost effective as originally proposed (planned vs. actual)	•	•	•
e.	Did the leveraging of funds (co-financing) happen as planned? Were financial resources utilized efficiently? Could financial resources have been used more efficiently?	•	•	•
f.	Was procurement carried out in a manner making efficient use of project resources?	•	•	•
g.	To what extent partnerships/linkages between institutions/organizations were encouraged and supported?	•	•	•
h.	What was the level of efficiency of cooperation and collaboration arrangements?	•	•	•
i.	Was an appropriate balance struck between utilization of international expertise as well as local capacity?	•	•	•
j.	Did the project take into account local capacity in design and implementation of the project?	•	•	•
k.	Was there an effective collaboration between institutions responsible for implementing the project?	•	•	•
Sust	ainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, social	-economic, and/or environmental risks to su	ustaining long-term project	results?



a.	How well are risks, assumptions and impact drivers for financial, institutional, social an d economic being managed?	•	•	•
b.	What was the quality of risk mitigation strategies developed? Were these sufficient?	•	•	•
c.	Are there clear strategies for risk mitigation related with long- term sustainability of the project?	•	•	•
d.	Has the experience of the project provided relevant lessons for other future projects targeted at similar objectives?	•	•	•
e.	What lessons can be learnt from the project regarding efficiency?	•	•	•
f.	How could the project have more efficiently carried out implementation (in terms of management structures and procedures, partnerships arrangements etc)?	•	•	•
g.	What changes could have been made (if any) to the project in order to improve its efficiency?	•	•	•
Impa	act: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or e	nabled progress toward, reduced environm	ental stress and/or improve	ed energy security?
a.	Does the project adequately take into account the national realities, both in terms of institutional and policy framework towards reduces environmental stress and enhanced energy security in the country in its design and its implementation?	•	•	•
b.	Are there any indicators that the project has contributed towards reducing fuelwood consumption?	•	•	•
c.	Are there any indicators that the project has contributed in strengthening the supply side in particular fuelwood plantations?	•	•	•



ANNEX D: RATING SCALES

Ratings for Effectiveness, Efficiency, Overall Project Outcome Rating, M&E,	Sustainability ratings	Relevance ratings		
IA & EA Execution				
6: Highly Satisfactory (HS): no shortcomings	 Likely (L): negligible risks to sustainability 	2. Relevant (R)		
5: Satisfactory (S): minor	3. Moderately Likely (ML):moderate	1. Not relevant		
shortcomings	risks	(NR)		
 4: Moderately Satisfactory (MS): moderate shortcomings 3. Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): significant shortcomings 2. Unsatisfactory (U): major problems 1. Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): severe problems 	 Moderately Unlikely (MU): significant risks Unlikely (U): severe risks 			
Additional ratings where relevant:				
Not Applicable (N/A)				
Unable to Assess (U/A)				



ANNEX E: EVALUATION CONSULTANT CODE OF CONDUCT AND AGREEMENT FORM

Evaluators:

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

Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form ³
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.

³www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct



Signed at *place* on *date*

Signature: _____



ANNEX F: EVALUATION REPORT OUTLINE⁴

i. Opening page:

- Title of UNDP supported GEF financed project
- UNDP and GEF project ID#s
- Evaluation time frame and date of evaluation report
- Region and countries included in the project
- GEF Operational Program/Strategic Program
- Implementing Partner and other project partners
- Evaluation team members
- Acknowledgements
- ii. Executive Summary
 - Project Summary Table
 - Project Description (brief)
 - Evaluation Rating Table
 - Summary of conclusions, recommendations and lessons
- iii. Acronyms and Abbreviations
 - (See: UNDP Editorial Manual⁵)
- **1.** Introduction
 - Purpose of the evaluation
 - Scope & Methodology
 - Structure of the evaluation report
- 2. Project description and development context
 - Project start and duration
 - Problems that the project sought to address
 - Immediate and development objectives of the project
 - Baseline Indicators established
 - Main stakeholders
 - Expected Results
- 3. Findings

(In addition to a descriptive assessment, all criteria marked with (*) must be rated⁶)

- **3.1** Project Design / Formulation
 - Analysis of LFA/Results Framework (Project logic /strategy; Indicators)
 - Assumptions and Risks
 - Lessons from other relevant projects (e.g., same focal area) incorporated into project design
 - Planned stakeholder participation
 - Replication approach
 - UNDP comparative advantage
 - Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector

⁴The Report length should not exceed 40 pages in total (not including annexes).

⁵ UNDP Style Manual, Office of Communications, Partnerships Bureau, updated November 2008

⁶ See ToR Annex D for rating scales. See TE Guidance section 3.5, page 37 for ratings explanations.



• Management arrangements

3.2 Project Implementation

- Adaptive management (changes to the project design and project outputs during implementation)
- Partnership arrangements (with relevant stakeholders involved in the country/region)
- Feedback from M&E activities used for adaptive management
- Project Finance
- Monitoring and evaluation: design at entry (*), implementation (*), and overall assessment (*)
- Implementing Agency (UNDP) execution (*) and Executing Agency execution (*), overall project implementation/ execution (*), coordination, and operational issues

3.3 Project Results

- Overall results (attainment of objectives) (*)
- Relevance(*)
- Effectiveness (*)
- Efficiency (*)
- Country ownership
- Mainstreaming
- Sustainability: financial resources (*), socio-economic (*), institutional framework and governance (*), environmental (*), and overall likelihood (*)
- Impact
- 4. Conclusions, Recommendations & Lessons
 - 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
 - Best and worst practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance and success

5. Annexes

- ToR
- Itinerary
- List of persons interviewed
- Summary of field visits
- List of documents reviewed
- Evaluation Question Matrix
- Questionnaire used and summary of results
- Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form
- Annexed in a separate document: Audit trail
- Annexed in a separate document: GEF Focal Area terminal Tracking Tool



ANNEX G: EVALUATION REPORT CLEARANCE FORM

(to be completed by CO and UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based in the region and included in the final

Evaluation Report Reviewed and Cleared by					
UNDP Country Office					
Name:					
Signature:	Date:				
UNDP GEF RTA					
Name:					
Signature:	Date:				



ANNEX H: TE REPORT AUDIT TRAIL

The following is a template for the evaluator to show how the received comments on the draft TE report have (or have not) been incorporated into the final TE report. This audit trail should be included as an annex in the final TE report.

To the comments received on (*date*) from the Terminal Evaluation of (*project name*) (UNDP *PIMS #*)

The following comments were provided to the draft Terminal Evaluation report during (time period); they are referenced by institution ("Author" column) and comment number ("#" column):

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