

REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL FOR TERMINAL EVALUATION FOR THE PACIFIC ISLANDS GREENHOUSE GAS ABATEMENT THROUGH RENEWABLE ENERGY PROJECT

A. Project Title:

Pacific Islands Greenhouse Gas Abatement through Renewable Energy Project (PIGGAREP)

B. Introduction

In accordance with the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and Global Environmental Facility (GEF) monitoring and evaluation (M&E) policies and procedures, all UNDP-GEF financed full and medium-sized projects are required to undergo a terminal evaluation upon completion of project implementation. These terms of reference (TOR) set out the expectations for a Terminal Evaluation (TE) of the Pacific Islands Greenhouse Gas Abatement through Renewable Energy Project (PIGGAREP) (PIMS 3462.)

C. Project Description or Context and Background:

The PIGGAREP is a UNDP-GEF regional climate change mitigation (CCM) project implemented in 14 Pacific Island Countries (PICs). The GEF funding for this project is US\$5.225 million and it is in line with the GEF-4 CCM Strategic Priority 4 (Productive Use of Renewable Energy). While the UNDP is the implementing agency (on behalf of the GEF), the executing agency for PIGGAREP is the Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environment Program (SPREP). The global environment and development goal of the project is the reduction of the growth rate of greenhouse gas (GHG) emission from fossil fuel use in the PICs through the removal of the barriers to the widespread and cost effective use of feasible renewable energy technologies.

The project is expected to attain the following outcomes in the PICs: i) increased number of successful commercial renewable energy applications; ii) expanded market for renewable energy applications; iii) enhanced institutional capacity to design, implement and monitor renewable energy projects; iv) availability and accessibility of financing to existing and new renewable energy projects; v) strengthened legal and regulatory structures in the energy and environmental sectors; and, vi) increased awareness and knowledge on renewable energy and renewable energy technologies among key stakeholders. retrospect

This regional project, while developed and designed in 2005, supports the PICs 2013 - 2017 UNDAF outcome: Improved resilience of PICs, with particular focus on communities, through integrated implementation of sustainable environment management, climate change adaptation/mitigation and disaster risk management.

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

PROJECT SUMMARY TABLE

Project Title:	Pacific Islands Greenhouse Gas Abatement through Renewable Energy Project			
GEF Project ID:	2699 (GEF PMIS)		<i>at endorsement (Million US\$)</i>	<i>at completion (Million US\$)</i>

UNDP Project ID:	00044633 (Atlas ID) 3462 (UNDP PIMS)	GEF financing:	USD 5,225,000	USD 5,225,000
Country:	14 Countries	IA/EA own:	SPREP & UNDP (1,000,000)	USD800,000
Region:	Pacific	Government:	USD 26,470,000	USD 9,778,000
Focal Area:	Climate change mitigation	Other:	USD 513,000 (Parallel co-financing from other donors)	USD 3,000,000 (Parallel co-financing from other donors)
Focal Area Objectives, (OP/SP):	Climate change mitigation	Total co-financing:	USD 27,983,000	USD 13,578,000
Executing Agency:	SPREP	Total Project Cost:	USD 33,208,000	USD 18,803,000
Other Partners involved:	Cook Islands Federated States of Micronesia Fiji Kiribati Marshall Islands Nauru Niue Palau Papua New Guinea Samoa Solomon Islands Tonga Tuvalu Vanuatu, European Union (EU) DANIDA SPC IRENA Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade (MFAT) of New Zealand Government of Finland	ProDoc Signature (date project began):		22 December 2006
		(Operational) Closing Date:	Proposed: 31 January 2016	Actual: 30 June 2016

D. Objective & Scope:

The objective of this consultancy assignment is to conduct the TE of PIGGAREP.

To have clarity in the periods and scope under Evaluation, it is important to point out that the PIGGAREP implementation period was extended by three years. Moreover, the PIGGAREP was expanded in 2014 with a SIDS DOCK support program, which is a joint initiative of the UNDP and the World Bank, developed in close consultation with the Alliance of Small Island States (AOSIS) and funded by the Government of Denmark (through the Danish International Development Agency or DANIDA) with US\$ 3 million. With this additional funding, three new countries (Federated States of Micronesia, Marshall Islands and Palau) and nine projects were added. The additional project activities are referred to as PIGGAREP “Plus”. The terminal evaluation will focus on all issues related to all activities, including the additional nine projects whose implementation period will end by June 2016.

The Evaluation will review achievements made during the period January 2008 to December 2015. The last project board (Multipartite review meeting) was held in July 2014.

The objectives of the evaluation are to: (1) assess the achievement of the project through the outputs that were deliver; (2) assess the impacts of the project results/outputs; and, (c) draw lessons that can both improve the sustainability of benefits from this project, and aid in the overall enhancement of UNDP programming.

The Evaluation will also collate and analyze specific lessons and best practices pertaining to the strategies employed, and implementation arrangements, which may be of relevance to other similar projects in the country and elsewhere in the world. The evaluation will also evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of project design, implementation, monitoring and adaptive management and sustainability of project outcomes, including the project exit strategy.

A mid-term review was conducted for the project in November 2009. The report will be made available for evaluator. The program management office has worked to address the main issues and implement the recommendations as indicated in the management response.

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

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 evaluator is expected to frame the evaluation effort using the criteria of **relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and impact**, as defined and explained in the [UNDP Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-supported, GEF-financed Projects](#). A set of questions covering each of these criteria have been drafted and are included with this TOR (see [Annex C](#)) The evaluator is 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

¹ For additional information on methods, see the [Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results](#), Chapter 7, pg. 163, and norms and standards for UN evaluations: http://www.unevaluation.org/papersandpubs/documentdetail.jsp?doc_id=21 and http://www.unevaluation.org/papersandpubs/documentdetail.jsp?doc_id=22.

Technical Adviser based in the region and key stakeholders. The evaluator is expected to conduct a field mission to Cook Islands, Palau, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Tonga and Tuvalu for stakeholder consultations and evidence-based information gathering, including visits to and evaluation of project sites such as the following:

Country	Site	RE System Installed	No. of Days~
Cook Island	Rakahanga	Wind/solar hybrid power generation	2
	Pukapuka	Solar PV power systems	2
Palau*	Kayangel	Solar PV water pumping and supply system	2
Samoa	Apia	Wind resource monitoring	2
	Falesaaseela, Tafitoala, Faleata, Fale ole Fe'e, Alaola, Samasoni	Micro-hydropower systems	2
Solomon	Managikiki Community in Bahomea, Central Guadalcanal	Tina hydropower generation system	2
Tonga	Ha'apai District, 13 villages	Solar PV water pumping and supply system	2
Tuvalu	Funafuti	Demonstration Energy Efficient Fale	1

~Please note that the stated number of workdays in each PIC does not take into account the travel time to and from sites nor do they include transit time. The number of days for anticipated site inspections, field data gathering, and discussions with project implementers and stakeholders.

**Please note that the site visit to the project site in Palau is not yet confirmed. Confirmation will be made once the successful bidder has been engaged. As such, all tenders are to clearly reflect separate costing for a field mission including Palau.*

The evaluator will review all relevant sources of information, such as the project document, project reports – including Annual monitoring reports (APR/PIR), project budget revisions, midterm review, progress reports, Midterm Review (MTR) 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 [Annex B](#) of this Terms of Reference.

The project evaluation shall be carried out in accordance with UN evaluation norms and policies and should embody a strong results-based orientation. It should be made clear that the evaluation team is responsible for revising the approach as necessary and present its methodological proposal as part of the inception report. Evaluation methods should be selected for their rigor in producing empirically based evidence to address the evaluation criteria, to respond to the evaluation questions, and to meet the objectives of the evaluation.

Evaluation Criteria's & Ratings

An assessment of project performance will be carried out, based against expectations set out in the Project Logical Framework/Results Framework (see [Annex A](#)), 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 [Annex D](#)

Evaluation Ratings:			
1. Monitoring and Evaluation	rating	2. IA & EA Execution	rating
M&E design at entry		Quality of Implementation – Implementing Agency (IA, UNDP)	
M&E Plan Implementation		Quality of Execution - Executing Agency (EA, Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment)	
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 Rating		Environmental	
		Overall likelihood of sustainability	

The project will use a capacity development monitoring and evaluation scorecard to monitor the project capacity development progress. It will monitor **the all fifteen indicators in the five categories of capacity development** for this project, (see table below). Although this scorecard was used at the time of project inception, it was incomplete.

The TE will rate the capacity development indicators at the end of project implementation.

Project Finance/ Co Finance

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 will receive assistance from the Multi-Country Office (MCO) 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 (type/source)	UNDP own financing (mill. US\$)		Government & Executing Agency (mill. US\$)		Partner Agency (mill. US\$)		Total (mill. US\$)	
	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual
Grants	500,000	300,000	24,004,000	8,299,000	513,000	3,000,000	25,017	11,599
Loans/Concessions								
• In-kind support			2,966,000	1,979,000			2,966,000	1,979,000
• Other								

Totals							27,983,00	13,578,00
							0	00

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.

Impact:

The evaluator 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 for future multi-country programmes on mitigation in the Pacific**. To the extent that recommendations and lessons can be applied in other similar political, geographic, socio-economic contexts, these should also be highlighted.

E. Implementation Arrangement:

The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation resides with the UNDP MCO in Samoa. The UNDP MCO will contract the evaluator and connect them with the focal point at SPREP. The evaluator is expected to organize their own travel arrangements to the countries they will evaluate, with the support of the UNDP Samoa MCO’s operations unit. The SPREP project team will be responsible for liaising between country coordinators and the evaluators team to set up stakeholder interviews, arrange field visits, and coordinate between the government and national coordinators. UNDP-GEF staff will provide support to the Samoa MCO throughout the conduct of the terminal evaluation.

F. Evaluation Timeframe

The consultant should propose a time schedule in line with the suggested timeframe below, where the total working days for the evaluation will be 35 days*, and should be according to the following plan:

Activity	Timing	Completion Date
Preparation and submission of inception report	5 working days	4 April 2016
Project country missions	15 working days	11 April – 29 April 2016

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

Debrief after missions	1 working day	2 May 2016
1 st draft evaluation report due	5 working days	9 May 2016
Final draft report due, with feedback incorporated	5 working days	20 May 2016
Final Report due, with feedback incorporated	4 working days	4 June 2016
Total	35 days	

** This does not take travel time into consideration nor does it take into account consultant's initial desk review, quality check of the final report from UNDP MCO, nor potential delays due to unforeseen circumstances, not included as deliverables in the table above.*

G. Evaluation Deliverables

The evaluator is expected to deliver the following:

Deliverable	Content	Timing	Responsibilities
Inception Report	Evaluator provides clarifications on timing and method	No later than 2 weeks before the evaluation mission.	Evaluator submits to UNDP Multi-country office
Presentation	Initial Findings	End of evaluation mission	To project management, UNDP Multi-country office
Draft Final Report	Full report, (per annexed template) with annexes	Within 3 weeks of the evaluation mission	Sent to UNDP Multi-country office, reviewed by Regional technical advisor, PCU, GEF OFPs
Final Report*	Revised report	Within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft	Sent to UNDP multi-country office for uploading to UNDP Evaluation Resource Centre.

*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

H. Duty Station:

Home-based with travel to Cook Islands, Palau, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Tonga and Tuvalu. It is expected that the consultant will spend 15 days on mission. When in Samoa the consultant will be based at the UNDP or SPREP office.

I. Competencies:

Corporate Competencies

- The independent consultant:
 - Demonstrates integrity by complying with the UN’s values and ethical standards;
 - Promotes the vision, mission, and strategic goals of UNDP;
 - Displays cultural, gender, religion, race, nationality and age sensitivity and adaptability.

Functional

- The independent consultant should possess proven and strong analytical and communication skills, including the ability to produce high quality reports.

Project & Resource Management

- The independent consultant should have strong organizational skills;
- The independent consultant should be able to work independently and collectively to produce individual high quality inputs and collectively high quality and TOR-compliant outputs;
- The independent consultant should possess sound judgment, strategic thinking and the ability to manage competing priorities.

Team Work

- Demonstrated ability of the consultant to work in a multi-cultural environment.

J. Qualifications and Experience of the Successful Contractor:

The evaluation team will be composed of 1 international evaluator and the PIGGAREP Country Coordinators. The consultant shall have prior experience in evaluating similar projects. Experience with GEF financed projects is an advantage. The evaluator selected should not have participated in the project preparation and/or implementation and should not have conflict of interest with project related activities.

The consultant must present the following qualifications:

- Post-graduate degree in environmental science or climate change, renewable energy, or other energy related technical field; (20%)
- Minimum 8 years of relevant professional experience in Climate Change Mitigation/Renewable Energy Technologies (RET) development; (25%)
- Must have extensive experience in evaluation of GEF projects and UNDP evaluation procedures; (15%)
- Previous experience with results-based monitoring and evaluation methodologies; (20%)
- Technical knowledge in the targeted focal areas: Climate Change Mitigation/ renewable energy (10%)
- Experience working in the Pacific region (5%)
- Fluency in English (oral and written) is a requirement (5%)

Offers will be evaluated according to the Combined Scoring method – where the technical criteria will be weighted at 70% and the financial offer will be weighted at 30%.

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 [UNEG 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluations'](#).

K. Payment Modalities & Specifications:

UNDP makes payment upon certification of satisfactory performance deliverables.

DELIVERABLES	DUE DATE (%)	AMOUNT IN USD TO BE PAID AFTER CERTIFICATION BY UNDP OF SATISFACTORY PERFORMANCE OF DELIVERABLES
1. Upon approval of TE Inception Report by UNDP & SPREP	4 April 2016, (10%)	\$XXX
2. Upon submission of draft TE Report to UNDP & SPREP	20 May 2016, (40%)	\$XXX
3. Upon finalization and approval (by UNDP & SPREP) of TE Report	4 June 2016, (50%)	\$XXX

L. Recommended presentation of proposal:

Given below is the recommended format for submitting your proposal. The following headings with the required details are important. Please use the template available (Letter of Offer to complete financial proposal)

CVs with a proposed methodology addressing the elements mentioned under deliverables must be submitted by **Friday, 25 March 2016**, electronically via email: procurement.ws@undp.org or apply online attaching all the required documents on <https://jobs.undp.org/>. Incomplete applications will not be considered and only candidates for whom there is further interest will be contacted. Proposals must include:

- **P11 form – template attached**
- **3 professional references (most recent)**
- **Brief Methodology** on how you will approach and conduct the work (no more than 1 page)
- **Financial Proposal** – Professional daily fee (inclusive of per diem and travel costs) or alternatively lump sum amount
- **Letter of interest and availability** summarizing all details required – template attached

Queries about the consultancy are to be directed to the UNDP Procurement Unit on procurement.ws@undp.org with the responsible Programme Officer - tessa.tafua@undp.org copied.

UNDP applies a fair and transparent selection process that will take into account the competencies/skills of the applicants as well as their financial proposals. Qualified women and members of social minorities are encouraged to apply.

ANNEX A: PROJECT LOGICAL FRAMEWORK

Table 1.0 PIGGAREP Logframe

Strategy	Objectively Verifiable Indicators (OVI)	Means of Verification (MoV)	Critical Assumptions & Risks
I. DEVELOPMENT OBJECTIVE/GOAL			
Reduction of the growth rate of GHG emissions from fossil fuel use in the PICs through the widespread and cost effective use of RE resources and application of feasible RE technologies	GHG emissions in PICs reduced by at least 2 million tons by 2015. The potentials of available and feasible RE resources in the PICs are assessed, developed and used effectively for both electricity and non-electricity applications	Monitoring and evaluation report on avoided GHG emissions with respect to baseline Project follow-up report, statistical reports and official publications	Support from the PIC Governments throughout project life Political stability in the region Effective and efficient country teams and the backstopping support and cooperation of regional and international experts.
II. IMMEDIATE OBJECTIVES/OUTCOMES			
A. Improved knowledge about RE resources potential and increase the number of successful commercial RE applications on the ground	A1. At least 10 resource monitoring studies completed at 10 sites by 2010 A2. At least 10 RE projects commercially sustainable in 10 PICs by 2010	A1. Resources monitoring reports A2. Monitoring & Evaluation based on data from the project sites	Support from the projects sites, the landowners and the meteorology offices
B. Expansion of the market for RET applications	B1. At least one RET company in each PIC by 2010 B2. At least 100 MW of additional RE installed in PICs by 2015	B1. Registry of companies, files from responsible ministry B2. Power Utilities statistics	Feasible RE-based energy projects will be identified. Productive use projects are identified and are commercially viable.
C. Enhancement of institutional capacity to design and implement RE	C1. At least one RE project designed and implemented by local experts in each PIC by 2010 C2. At least ten energy offices have established national energy coordination committees, have clear mandates, strategies and action plans	C1. Annual Reports of the Energy Offices	Energy gets a higher profile in the PIC governments
D. Improvement of the	D1. At least US\$100	D1. Bank records,	Successful projects on the

availability of funding for existing and new RE projects	million of new investments in RE by 2015	project files at responsible ministry or agency national surveys	ground are convincing to banks, investors and the private sector
E. Strengthened legal and regulatory structures in the energy and environmental sectors	E1. All PICs have a relevant Act / provisions (Energy and Environment) in place by 2010 that supports RE development and utilization and the formulations of RE regulations and policies	E1. Government gazettes E2. Legal records and parliamentary records	PICs governments are supportive of the new Act to promote RE
F. Increased awareness and knowledge about RE among key stakeholders	F1. Majority of energy sector professionals, politicians, investors, senior government officials and the general public are aware of the benefits of RE and local success stories by 2010. F2. Technical, economic, social and environmental characteristic of 10 RE projects comprehensively documented and accessible via internet based information system by 2010 F3. At least 75 % approval rating for RE technologies and projects in PICs by 2010	F1. National surveys within project M&E F2. Number of hits recorded at the sites F3. Independent survey in the framework of the project Monitoring & Evaluation	F1. Effective outreach methods are employed. F2. Access to the internet continues to increase in the PICs F3. There are more convincing success stories on the ground
III. OUTPUTS			
A1. Better understanding of RE resources potential A2. Quality of delivery of RE services improved A3. RE projects made more sustainable A4. Design of RE systems improved A5. Socially and environmentally sound application of RET established	A1. At least 10 resource monitoring studies completed at 10 sites by 2010 A2. Collection efficiency (>90%) for each of the identified demonstration project by 2008 A3. At least 8 existing RE projects are assessed and technical assistance provided A4. At least 2 training courses on RE system designs conducted annually A5. Technical standards for RE systems components and their installations are adopted by 8 PICs in 2009.	A1. Resources monitoring reports A2. Monitoring and evaluation reports A3. Assessment reports and project records A4. Reports of the training courses A5. Legal and Parliamentary records	A1. Landowners support A2. Improved service delivery is matched with improved fee payment A3. Technical assistance provided is effective A4. Trained staff are retained A5. Governments are supportive of the standards
B1. Increased demand for RETs stimulated B2. Private sector	B1. 20 new 'bankable RE projects' / 100 MW new projects identified and	B1. Feasibility study reports B2. Register of	B1. No significant decrease in fossil fuel prices B2. Governments provide

<p>participation in RET supply and operation mobilized</p> <p>B3. Improved access of RET in rural areas</p> <p>B4. Technical capacity and expertise for O & M made available in rural areas</p>	<p>funded by 2015</p> <p>B2. 5 new manufacturers of RE systems and 3 'one-stop-shops' established in the PICs by 2008.</p> <p>B3. 5 new RESCOs and 5 rural RE suppliers established in the PICs by 2008</p> <p>B4. 5 new RESCOs established in the PICs by 2008 and at least 300 rural residents receiving basic O & M training</p>	<p>Companies and Businesses and the Annual Reports of the energy offices.</p> <p>B3. Register of Companies and Businesses</p> <p>B4. Register of Companies and Businesses and Training Reports</p>	<p>incentives for the private sector</p> <p>B3. Governments provide incentives to the private sector</p> <p>B4. Governments provide incentives to the private sector and training is in the local language.</p>
<p>C1. Good governance and better management accountability established at national level</p> <p>C2. Private sector involvement facilitated</p> <p>C3. Appropriate staff levels and sufficient resources for effective RE programs established</p>	<p>C1. All new RE projects are components of an adopted national energy / climate change mitigation plan by 2010</p> <p>C2. National coordinating mechanisms, including the private sector, established in all PICs by 2008</p> <p>C3. All Energy Offices are staffed with at least 3 graduates, have clear mandates, have reliable databases for planning and policy works and have adopted energy plans by 2010.</p>	<p>C1. Adopted national energy and/or climate change mitigation plans</p> <p>C2. Minutes of the meeting of the coordination committees.</p> <p>C3. Annual Reports of the Energy Offices.</p>	<p>C1. National energy offices are effective and proactive</p> <p>C2. There are continuous interest by the private sector</p> <p>C3. Government support.</p>
<p>D1. Improved access to financing for small rehabilitation and failing projects</p> <p>D2. Improved access to and availability of financing for new RE projects</p>	<p>D1. At least US\$5 million is invested on rehabilitating existing projects by 2010.</p> <p>D2. Feasibility of a regional/national RE fund is studied and capital fund of US\$10 million is available for new RE projects by 2010</p>	<p>D1. Bank and energy office records</p> <p>D2. Bank and energy office records</p>	<p>D1. Investors have confidence on RE</p> <p>D2. Investors have confidence on RE</p>
<p>E1. National Energy / Climate Change policies and guidelines are assessed, re)formulated and adopted</p> <p>E2. Appropriate incentives to encourage RE-based livelihood and productivity projects are in place</p> <p>E3. Real economic costs of energy sources, electricity and other forms of energy are known</p> <p>E4. Legislation of RE system equipment/component standards developed and</p>	<p>E1. At least 8 PICs adopt RE/CC policies and guidelines by 2008</p> <p>E2. Specific policies and incentives for RE- based livelihood and productivity projects are in place in 8 PICs by 2008</p> <p>E3. Outcome of energy pricing studies available to all PICs for planning and policy formulations by 2008</p> <p>E4. Technical standards for RE systems components and their installations are adopted by 8 PICs in 2009</p>	<p>E1. Cabinet decisions</p> <p>E2. Cabinet decisions</p> <p>E3. Energy Pricing study reports</p> <p>E4. Legal and Parliamentary Records</p> <p>E5. Government plans and reports</p>	<p>E1. Cabinet approves RE/CC policies and guidelines</p> <p>E2. Cabinet approves incentives and policies</p> <p>E3. Cooperation of energy suppliers / service providers</p> <p>E4. Effective consultation between public and private sector agencies</p> <p>E5. Effective local coordination</p>

implemented E5. Effective coordination of RE and other national sustainable development effort	E5. RE features prominently in national plans and strategies as well as in submissions to regional and international for a		
F1. Awareness of best practices of RE projects created amongst key stakeholders F2. Effective promotion and recognition of innovative and successful RE initiatives F3. RE training programs designed and implemented	F1. Each PIC has a regular RE public awareness program and a RE website, by 2007 F2. Each PIC has an annual RE award program operational by 2007 F3. Training programs designed and 2 national training workshops conducted annually in each PICs with a total roll of 2000 trainees by 2010	F1. Project monitoring and evaluation reports F2. Energy Office reports F3. Training reports	F1. No government restrictions on the free flow of information F2. There is active local participation by all stakeholders F3. Training contents are practical and easily understood

Table 2.0 PIGGAREP+ Logframe

Strategy	Objectively Verifiable Indicators			Means of Verification	Critical Assumptions
	Indicator	Baseline	Target		
Objective: Low carbon development for Pacific SIDS through the deployment of renewable energy (RE) resources and promotion of energy efficiency (EE).	% share of RE in the energy mix in the PIGGAREP+ countries by end 2014, % No. of RE & EE projects implemented in the Pacific SIDS that replicated, or were designed based on, the PIGGAREP+ pilot projects by end 2014 Average specific fuel consumption of the national	1.24 ³ 0 EE 0 RE 0.265 0	3.1 5 EE 8 RE 0.252 30	Project activity and progress reports; Project monitoring reports; Survey of PIC RE projects; Project M&E reports; North-REP project reports Power utility performance reports; Project	Current RE policy of PICs improves or at least remain the same PICs can secure own and supplementary funding for their EE/RE projects Power plant testing & load dispatch optimization is regularly practiced Established financing

³ Baseline 2009 figure for the 9 PIGGAREP+ countries (Ref: Regional Indicators 2009 – Economic Development Division, SPC – Suva Regional Office).

Strategy	Objectively Verifiable Indicators			Means of Verification	Critical Assumptions
	Indicator	Baseline	Target		
	power utilities in the PIGGAREP+ countries by end 2014, lit diesel/kWh No. of implemented residential EE projects that were supported by EE financing schemes in PIGGAREP+ countries by end 2014			activity and progress reports; PPA reports Survey of PIC RE projects; Project M&E reports	schemes are funded by development banks
Component 1: Renewable Energy Technology Applications					
Outcome 1.1: Reduced energy costs for telecommunication systems equipment, and reduced reliance on fossil fuels to operate rural telecommunication systems in the Solomon Islands	Average monthly energy cost of the operation of telecom systems in the pilot rural health centers and hospitals by mid-2014, US\$	9,200	0	Project activity and progress reports; Project monitoring reports; PGSP & PACRICS reports Project activity and progress reports; Project monitoring reports; PGSP & PACRICS reports Project activity and progress reports; Project monitoring reports; PGSP & PACRICS reports	PACRICS install the required telecom peripheral equipment
	Average monthly electricity usage of telecom systems in the pilot rural health centers and hospitals by mid-2014, kWh	11,400	0		Actual daily solar hours =at least equal to the assumed 5 hrs. in the solar PV sizing Telecom system operation permits are secured
	Average monthly no. of hours of operation of telecom systems in all pilot rural health centers and hospitals by	0	7,200		

Strategy	Objectively Verifiable Indicators			Means of Verification	Critical Assumptions
	Indicator	Baseline	Target		
	mid-2014, hrs.			reports	
Outcome 1.2: Sustainable, environment friendly and energy cost saving operation of well water pumping systems in rural areas in Tonga	Average monthly energy cost of the operation of well water pumping systems in the pilot rural villages by mid-2014, US\$	1,220	780	Project activity and monitoring reports; Water Management Committee reports Project activity and monitoring reports; Water Management Committee reports Project activity and monitoring reports; Water Management Committee reports	Water Management Committees charge reasonable water tariffs Water Management Committees manage the operation of installed systems Actual daily solar hours =at least equal to the assumed 5 hrs. in the solar PV sizing
	Average monthly energy consumption of well water pumping systems in the pilot rural villages by mid-2014, kWh	2,175	1,080		
	Average monthly no. of hours of operation of RE powered well water pumping systems in pilot rural villages by mid-2014, hrs.	90	150		
Outcome 1.3: Sustainable, environment friendly and energy cost saving operation of well water pumping systems in rural areas in Palau	Average monthly energy cost of the operation of the Kayangel water supply system by mid-2014, US\$.	278	26	Project activity and monitoring reports; PWSC water service reports Project activity and monitoring reports; PWSC water service reports Project activity and monitoring	PWSC charge reasonable water tariffs PWSC monitors energy consumption Actual daily solar hours =at least equal to the assumed 5 hrs. in the solar PV sizing
	Average monthly energy consumption of the Kayangel water supply system by mid-2014, kWh	2780	255		
	Average monthly no. of	0	150		

Strategy	Objectively Verifiable Indicators			Means of Verification	Critical Assumptions
	Indicator	Baseline	Target		
	hours of operation of RE powered water supply system in Kayangel by mid-2014, hrs.			reports; PWSC water service reports	
Outcome 1.4: Reduced reliance on fossil fuels, reduced and operational costs for electricity generation and distribution in the Cook Islands	Average annual cost of the Palmerston Island power generation system by mid-2015, US\$/kWh. Average annual DFO savings of the Palmerston Island power generation system by mid-2015, lits	1.05 0	0.15 15,030	Project activity and monitoring reports; PI power supply service reports Project activity and monitoring reports; PI power supply service reports	PI entity in-charge of power supply charge reasonable electricity tariffs; and monitors and records power generation system operating parameters Actual daily solar hours are at least equal value used in solar PV sizing
Outcome 1.5: Reduced reliance on fossil fuels for the supply of electricity through commercial biofuel power generation in Kiribati	Average monthly CNO consumption of the power generation facilities in Abemama Island by mid-2015, lits Maximum %CNO content of biofuel blend used in the power generation facilities in Abemama Island by mid-2015, %	0 0	3,761 90	Project activity reports; Island Council power supply service reports Project activity reports; Island Council power supply service reports	Island Council charge reasonable electricity tariffs Power generation facilities monitor specific fuel consumption Electricity demand will increase
Outcome 1.6: Reduced reliance	Average specific biogas	0	0.6	Project activity and	EPC buys biogas-

Strategy	Objectively Verifiable Indicators			Means of Verification	Critical Assumptions
	Indicator	Baseline	Target		
on fossil fuels for the supply of electricity through commercial biogas-based power generation in Samoa	consumption of the demonstration power generation systems by mid-2015, m ³ /kWh	0	70,000	monitoring reports	generated electricity and grants favorable PPA price to Piu Village Piu Village and SLC monitor and record biogas-based power generation system operating parameters <i>Merremia tuberosa</i> vine generates substantial biogas
	Average annual diesel fuel savings from the demonstration power generation systems by mid-2015	0	5	Project activity and monitoring reports	
	% of grid power is supplied by biogas-fired power generation systems by end 2015, %			Project activity and monitoring reports	
Component 2: Energy Efficiency Technology Applications					
Outcome 2.1: Increased application of EE technologies and energy savings in the residential sector of Tuvalu	No. of planned EE improvement projects based on EE concepts featured in the Demo Fale by end 2013	0	1	Project activity and progress reports;	TEC provide technical assistance to interested clients
	No. of implemented EE improvement projects based on EE concepts featured in the Demo Fale by mid-2014.	0	3	Project monitoring reports	
	Cumulative energy savings from implemented	0	100,000	DBT EERF financing reports;	EERF of the DBT is operational
		0	200,000	Project monitoring reports	
			Project activity and progress reports;	EERF of the DBT is operational	
			Project monitoring		

Strategy	Objectively Verifiable Indicators			Means of Verification	Critical Assumptions
	Indicator	Baseline	Target		
	new EE improvement projects by mid-2014, kWh Cumulative energy financing provided by DBT EERF and other commercial banks for EE improvement projects by mid-2014, US\$			reports Project activity and progress reports; Project monitoring reports	
Outcome 2.2.A: Improved energy use performance in power generation and reduced power generation cost in the national power utility in RMI	Average specific fuel consumption of the power generation units of MEC by mid-2014, liters diesel oil/kWh	0.265	0.251	Power utility performance reports; Project activity and progress reports; PPA reports	MEC approves and implements the plan for EE improvements in their power plants MEC-PRP activities are implemented
Outcome 2.2.B: Improved energy use performance in power generation and reduced power generation cost in the 4 state power utilities in FSM	Average specific fuel consumption of the power generation units of the state power utilities by mid-2014, liters diesel oil/kWh CPUC KUA PUC YSPSC	0.263 0.270 0.268 0.274	0.250 0.253 0.252 0.255	Project activity and progress reports; Power utility production reports CPUC Reports KUA Reports PUC Reports YSPSC Report	4 state power utilities approve and implement the formulated plan for EE improvements in their respective power plants
Outcome 2.3: Operational, effective and widely accepted energy efficiency	No. of EE financing schemes established and operational by	0 0	3 10	Project activity and progress reports; Project	IUCN Study endorsed EE financing schemes for FSM, RMI &

Strategy	Objectively Verifiable Indicators			Means of Verification	Critical Assumptions
	Indicator	Baseline	Target		
lending schemes in FSM, RMI and Tuvalu	mid-2014. No. of EE financing applications approved by mid-2014			monitoring reports Project activity reports; FSMDB, MIDB and DBT reports	TUV Funds for the financing schemes are made available by FSMDB, MIDB and DBT

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

1. PIF – Project Identification Form;
2. PIGGAREP – Project Document;
3. PIGGAREP - Project Brief;
4. Project inception report;
5. All AWP (annual work plans);
6. All annual financial project reports (CDRs);
7. Consultancy products (report, technical studies, etc.);
8. Pacific Islands Greenhouse Gas Abatement through Renewable Energy “PLUS” Project - ADDENDUM
9. Annual Project Report (APR)/Project Implementation Review (API/PIR) for 2007/2008; 2008/2009; 2009/2010; 2010/2011; 2011/2012; 2012/2013 and 2013/2014 (2014/2025?)
10. Quarterly Progress Reports (QPRs) and quarterly Financial Reports (FRs)
11. Mid-term Review report of PIGGAREP;
12. Midterm Review Management Responses
13. Tripartite Report
14. Terminal Report
15. Minutes of PIGGAREP meetings/Project board meeting minutes
16. Financial auditing;
17. All communication products;
18. Community consultations minutes, if available;
19. UNDP Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF); and
20. Any other project relevant documents.

ANNEX C: EVALUATION QUESTIONS

The evaluator is expected to amend, complete and submit this matrix as part of the TE inception report, and shall include it as an annex to the final report.

Evaluation Criteria Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
Relevance: How does the Project relate to the main objectives of the GEF focal area, and to the environment and development priorities at the local, regional and national levels?			
To what extent is the principle of the project in line with national priorities?	Level of participation of the concerned agencies in project activities. Consistency with relevant strategies and policies.	Minutes of meetings, Project progress reports, national and regional strategy and policy documents	Desk review, interviews
To what extent is the Project aligned to the main objectives of the GEF focal area?	Consistency with GEF strategic objectives	GEF Strategy documents, PIRs, Tracking Tools	Desk review, interview with UNDP-GEF RTA
Do the outcomes developed during the project formulation still represent the best project strategy for achieving the project objectives?	Consistency with relevant strategies and policies	Lessons learned, evaluations, progress reports	Desk review, interviews
Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the Project been achieved?			
To what extent have the project objectives and outcomes, as set out in the Project Document, project's Logical Framework and other related documents, have been achieved?	Effectiveness	PIRs, evaluation reports, lessons learned	Desk review, interviews

Evaluation Criteria Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
Were the project budget and duration planned in a cost-effective way?	Cost-effectiveness	Financial expenditure reports, cofinancing records, PIRs	Desk review, interviews
How and to what extent have implementing agencies contributed and national counterparts (public, private) assisted the project?	Execution of implementing partner and other responsible partners	Progress reports, evaluation reports	Desk review, interviews
Efficiency: Was the Project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards?			
Was the Project efficient with respect to incremental cost criteria?	Activities supported by the Project not commonly included among “business as usual” planning and development priorities	National strategies and plans	Desk review, interviews
Were the risks identified in the project document and PIRs the most important and the risk ratings applied appropriately?	Risks mitigated	Risk logs, progress reports, lessons learned	Desk review, interviews
The extent of achievement of Project objective and outcomes according to the proposed budget	Percentage of expenditures in proportion with the results	Progress reports, Project Implementation Reviews	Desk review, interviews
How useful was the logical framework as a management tool during implementation and any changes made to it?	Appropriateness of results framework	Progress reports, evaluation reports, Project Implementation Reviews	Desk review, interviews
Country Ownership:			
Are project outcomes contributing to national and regional development plans and priorities?	Plans and policies incorporating initiatives	Government approved plans and policies	Desk review, interviews
Have the relevant country representatives from government and civil society been involved in the Project?	Effective stakeholder involvement	Meeting minutes, reports	Desk review, interviews, field visits
Have the recipient governments and co-financers maintained their financial commitment to the Project?	Committed co-financing realized	Audit reports, project accounting records, PIRs	Desk review, interviews
Have governments approved policies or regulatory frameworks in line with the Project objective?	Plans and policies incorporating initiatives	Government approved plans and policies	Desk review, interviews
Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, social-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?			
Was project sustainability strategy developed during the project design?	Sustainability	Sustainability strategy	Desk review, interviews
How relevant was the project sustainability strategy?	Sustainability	Sustainability strategy	Desk review, interviews
Are there any financial risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project outcomes? What is the likelihood of financial and economic resources not being available once the GEF assistance ends (resources can be from multiple sources, such as the public and private sectors, income generating activities, and trends that may indicate that it is likely that in future there will be adequate financial resources for sustaining project’s outcomes)?	Financial risks	Progress reports, PIRs, testimonial evidence	Desk review, interviews
Has institutional capacity for supporting PCB management been strengthened, and are governance structures capacitated and in place?	Institutional and individual capacities	Progress reports, PIRs, testimonial evidence, training records	Desk review, interviews

Evaluation Criteria Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
Are there any social or political risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project outcomes? What is the risk that the level of stakeholder ownership will be insufficient to allow for the project outcomes/benefits be sustained? Do the various key stakeholders see that it is in their interest that the project benefits continue to flow? Is there a sufficient public/ stakeholder awareness in support of the long term objectives of the project?	Socio-economic risks	Socio-economic studies, macroeconomic information	Desk review, interviews
Are there ongoing activities that pose an environmental threat to the sustainability of project outcomes?	Environmental threats	State of environment reports	Desk review, interviews, field visits
Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward, reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status?			
Has the project made verifiable environmental improvements	Impact	Progress reports, PIRs	Desk review, interviews
Has the project made verifiable reductions in stress on environmental systems	Impact	Progress reports, PIRs	Desk review, interviews
Has the project demonstrated progress towards these impact achievements?	Impact	Progress reports, PIRs	Desk review, interviews
Are the project outcomes contributing to national development priorities and plans?	Impact	National development strategies and plans, approved legislation	Desk review, interviews
Stakeholder Involvement:			
Has the Project consulted with and made use of the skills, experience, and knowledge of the appropriate government entities, NGOs, community groups, private sector entities, local governments, and academic institutions?	Active stakeholder involvement	Meeting minutes, reports, interview records	Desk review, interviews, field visits
Have relevant vulnerable groups and powerful supporters and opponents of the processes been properly involved?	Active stakeholder involvement	Meeting minutes, reports, interview records	Desk review, interviews, field visits
Has the Project sought participation from stakeholders in (1) project design, (2) implementation, and (3) monitoring & evaluation?	Records of stakeholder consultations	Plans, reports	Desk review, interviews, field visits
Catalytic Role:			
Explain how the Project has had a catalytic or replication effect in the country and/or region.	Reference by other projects, programs	Interview records, project fact sheets	Desk review, interviews
Synergy with Other Projects/Programs			
Explain how synergies with other projects/programs have been incorporated in the design and/or implementation of the project.	Reference to other projects/programs	Plans, reports, meeting minutes	Desk review, interviews
Preparation and Readiness			
Were project objective and components clear, practicable, and feasible within its time frame?	Project efficiency, stakeholder involvement	Logical results framework	Desk review, interviews
Were the capacities of the executing institution(s) and its counterparts properly considered when the Project was designed?	Project efficiency and effectiveness	Progress reports, audit results	Desk review, interviews
Were partnership arrangements properly identified and roles and responsibilities negotiated prior to Project approval?	Project effectiveness	Memorandums of understanding, agreements	Desk review, interviews

Evaluation Criteria Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
Were counterpart resources, enabling legislation, and adequate project management arrangements in place at Project entry?	Project efficiency and effectiveness	Interview records, progress reports	Desk review, interviews, field visits
Financial Planning			
Does the project have the appropriate financial controls, including reporting and planning, that allowed management to make informed decisions regarding the budget and allowed for timely flow of funds?	Project efficiency	Audit reports, project accounting records	Desk review, interviews
Has there been due diligence in the management of funds and financial audits?	Project efficiency	Audit reports, project accounting records	Desk review, interviews, field visits
Has promised co-financing materialized?	Project efficiency	Audit reports, project accounting records	Desk review, interviews
Supervision and Backstopping			
Has GEF Agency staff identified problems in a timely fashion and accurately estimate their seriousness?	Project effectiveness	Progress reports	Desk review, interviews
Has GEF Agency staff provided quality support and advice to the project, approved modifications in time, and restructured the Project when needed?	Project effectiveness	Progress reports	Desk review, interviews
Has the GEF Agency provided the right staffing levels, continuity, skill mix, and frequency of field visits for the Project?	Project effectiveness	Progress reports, back-to-office reports, internal appraisals	Desk review, interviews, field visits
Delays and Project Outcomes and Sustainability			
If there have been delays in project implementation and completion, what were the reasons?	Sustainability of Project outcomes	Progress reports	Desk review, interviews
Have the delays affected project outcomes and/or sustainability, and, if so, in what ways and through what causal linkages?	Sustainability of Project outcomes	Progress reports	Desk review, interviews
Monitoring & Evaluation			
Has the Project M&E plan been implemented according to plan?	Project effectiveness	PIRs, M&E reports	Desk review, interviews
Has there been sufficient focus on results-based management?	Project effectiveness	PIRs, M&E reports	Desk review, interviews
Mainstreaming			
Were gender issues had been taken into account in project design and implementation?	Were gender issues had been taken into account in project design and implementation?	Were gender issues had been taken into account in project design and implementation?	Were gender issues had been taken into account in project design and implementation?
Were effects on local populations taken into account in project design and implementation?	Were effects on local populations taken into account in project design and implementation?	Were effects on local populations taken into account in project design and implementation?	Were effects on local populations taken into account in project design and implementation?

ANNEX D: RATING SCALES

<i>Ratings for Effectiveness, Efficiency, Overall Project Outcome Rating, M&E, IA &EA Execution</i>	<i>Sustainability ratings</i>	<i>Relevance ratings</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 6: Highly Satisfactory (HS): no shortcomings 5: Satisfactory (S): minor shortcomings 4: Moderately Satisfactory (MS): moderate shortcomings 3: Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): significant shortcomings 2: Unsatisfactory (U): major shortcomings 1: Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): severe shortcomings 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 4. Likely (L): negligible risks to sustainability 3. Moderately Likely (ML): moderate risks 2. Moderately Unlikely (MU): significant risks 1. Unlikely (U): severe risks 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Relevant (R) 1. Not relevant (NR)
<p><i>Additional ratings where relevant:</i> Not Applicable (N/A) Unable to Assess (U/A)</p>		

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 Form⁴

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.

⁴www.unevaluation.org/uneqcodeofconduct

Signed at *place* on *date*

Signature: _____

ANNEX F: EVALUATION REPORT OUTLINE⁵

- 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 Manual⁶)
 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 rated⁷)
 - 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
 - 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

⁵The Report length should not exceed 40 pages in total (not including annexes).

⁶ UNDP Style Manual, Office of Communications, Partnerships Bureau, updated November 2008

⁷See Annex D for rating scales.

- 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 file:* TE audit trail

ANNEX G: EVALUATION REPORT CLEARANCE FORM

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

Evaluation Report Reviewed and Cleared by	
UNDP Multi-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 during (month,year) from the Terminal Evaluation of Pacific Islands Greenhouse Gas Abatement through Renewable Energy Project (PIMS 3462)

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

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



*Empowered lives.
Resilient nations.*