



Government of Haiti



United Nations Development Program



Small Scale Hydro Power Development in Haiti

PID 73248/ PIMS 2820

TERMINAL EVALUATION

TERMS OF REFERENCE

Position: International consultant

Objective: Terminal evaluation of the GEF project “Small Scale Hydro Power Development in Haiti”.

Duration: 31 days of work, 15 days in Haiti

Period: July-October 2016

INTRODUCTION

In accordance with UNDP and GEF M&E policies and procedures, all full and medium-sized UNDP support GEF financed 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” *Small Scale Hydro Power Development in Haiti*” (PIMS #2820.)

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

PROJECT SUMMARY TABLE

Project Title:	Small Scale Hydro Power development in Haiti			
GEF Project ID:	2822		<i>at endorsement (Million US\$)</i>	<i>at completion (Million US\$)</i>
UNDP Project ID:	PID: 73248 PIMS: 2820	GEF financing:	1,000,000	N/A
Country:	Haiti	Implementing agency (UNDP) own::	200,000	N/A
Region:	Latin America and caribbean	Government (MTPTC, EDH):	1,800,000	N/A
Focal Area:	Cimate-change Mitigation	others:		N/A
FA Objectives, (OP/SP):		Total co-financing:	3,660,000.00	N/A
Executing Agency:	Ministry of public works, Transports and communications (MTPTC)	Total Project Cost:	3,660,000.00	N/A
Other Partners involved:	MTPTC/ Cellule Energie, Electricite d'Haiti (EDH)	ProDoc Signature (date project began):		December 28, 2011
		(Operational) Closing Date:	Proposed: April 2016	Actual:

OBJECTIVE AND SCOPE

The proposed project follows from the findings and recommendations of Haiti's Energy Sector Development Plan 2005-2015, which has set a goal to increase the level of access to electricity for its population from 10% now to 50% by the year 2015. The plan lays out a programme involving over US\$ 400M in needed funding and includes management support for EdH, major investments in rehabilitation of existing power plants and new generation capacity, a far-reaching electrification programme (both urban and rural) and the creation of a regulatory entity. All feasible technologies would be encouraged, including hydro-electricity and other renewable energy sources and the promotion of energy efficiency at the supply and demand sides with substantial donor contributions provided by the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA), the Inter-American Development Bank (IADB), the World Bank (WB), and USAID.

The UNDP/GEF project strategy is to collaborate closely with these initiatives in order to support the development of small hydro plants (SHPs). Electricity generation with SHPs is an attractive option to supply electricity to regional distribution grids. Small hydropower assists in reducing Haiti's dependence on imported fossil fuels. Moreover, unit energy costs over the lifetime of the investment are lower for small hydro than for diesel generators. By promoting the use of small hydro-electricity, the Government of Haiti wants to develop a long-term, sustainable option to meet energy demands and reduce greenhouse gas emissions. SHPs can provide a much more sustainable and manageable generation solution for Haiti, especially in the context where electricity is distributed in regional grids. However, due

to a number of barriers and the higher upfront investment compared to fossil-based generation, SHP development has not taken place over the past 20 years. The main barriers presently impeding the introduction of grid-connected SHP in Haiti are as follows:

- policy barrier;
- business skills and models;
- information, and;
- finance.

Given the extent of the problems the Haitian energy sector faces, it is not feasible to address all the necessary actions through one single project. However, The UNDP/GEF intervention is embedded in this broader framework and focuses explicitly on SHP development within this context.

The UNDP/GEF “Small Scale Hydro Power” initiative will create important enabling conditions necessary for the subsequent implementation of SHP programs by the international donor community and the Government of Haiti, as well as by private investors. It will focus on addressing the policy/regulatory barriers, strengthening EdH’s capacity, and generating updated hydro-meteorological and project information to accelerate new SHP developments in the country. The SSHP project will create an improved institutional and regulatory framework to promote small-scale hydropower development in Haiti and create the necessary human technical and managerial capacity for the sustainable management of SHPs. Furthermore, the project will focus on small hydropower development embedded in regional grids, collaborating with CIDA in the south east region to promote small hydro investment in the regional grids supported by their intervention. The Project will be implemented in close collaboration with other donor organizations in operating in Haiti. Under the Project, three small hydro plant projects will be prepared for investment by project partners.

The transfer of technical and managerial skills to local operators – as well as improving national regulation – is a key element in the project design. The SSHP initiative will result in the direct reduction of approximately 62,000 tons of CO₂e and an indirect emissions reduction of 788,000 tons of CO₂.

Project Goal: To reduce greenhouse gas emissions from fossil-based electricity generation in Haiti by promoting the development of small hydropower plants.

Project Objective: To create an enabling environment for private and public investment in small hydro plants in Haiti.

Project Outcomes

- Outcome 1: An effective, market-oriented policy and regulatory framework to enable small hydropower development in the country has been established.
- Outcome 2: Technical and managerial capacities within EdH and other national stakeholders have been created to evaluate, prepare and operate small hydropower developments in Haiti.
- Outcome 3: Small hydropower generation facilities are incorporated in regional distribution constructed and are providing electricity to end-users.
- Outcome 4: A project monitoring and evaluation plan implemented, and lessons learnt are disseminated.

The terminal evaluation 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.

The main stakeholders of this terminal evaluation are: evaluation users, partners, donors and staff of executing and other relevant agencies, beneficiaries...

Institution	Affiliation	Activities concerning
Ministry of Public Works, Transports and communication (MTPTC)	State	Issues related to the regulation and policies framework.
Ministry of Public Works (MTPTC) covering: Cellule Energie	State	Issues related to the regulation and policies framework
Ministry of Agriculture and Natural Resources and Rural Development (MARNDR) covering: SNRE	State	Issues related to information management, water resources data management
Electricity of Haiti (EDH)	State	Issues related to capacity building, strengthen technical and managerial capacities
Ministry of Economy and Finances	State	Issues related to private public partnership
Ministry of Public Works (MTPTC) covering: BME Training	State	Issues related to development of key stakeholders technical, managerial and business skills for SHP development and operation
NGO, Private Commercial Enterprises, & Universities	Local Government	Issues related to facilitate private sector investment in SHP development

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 ([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

¹ For additional information on methods, see the [Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results](#), Chapter 7, pg. 163

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 Haiti including the following project sites: South-East and South departments. Interviews will be held with the following organizations and individuals at a minimum:

- Project manager and project team, UNDP Haiti;
- Ministry of Public Works,
- Ministry of Agriculture, Natural Resources Department,
- GEF focal point in Haiti,
- SNRE, EDH, BME
- EDH offices in South-east and South
- Soleo Energies
- Norwegian Development Bank (Norfund)

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 [Annex B](#) 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 ([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	<i>rating</i>	2. IA& EA Execution	<i>rating</i>
M&E design at entry		Quality of UNDP Implementation	
M&E Plan Implementation		Quality of Execution - Executing Agency	
Overall quality of M&E		Overall quality of Implementation / Execution	
3. Assessment of Outcomes	<i>rating</i>	4. Sustainability	<i>rating</i>
Relevance		Financial resources:	
Effectiveness		Socio-political:	
Efficiency		Institutional framework and governance:	
Overall Project Outcome Rating		Environmental :	
		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 (type/source)	UNDP own financing (mill. US\$)		Government (mill. US\$)		Partner Agency (mill. US\$)		Total (mill. US\$)	
	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Actual	Actual
Grants								
Loans/Concessions								
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In-kind support 								
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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.

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**.

IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS

The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation resides with the UNDP CO in Haiti. 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

² A 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](#)

The total duration of the evaluation will be 31 days according to the following plan:

Activity	Timing	Completion Date
Preparation	3 days	<i>Final date of completion will be determined based on signature date of the contract which should take place in the period of July 2016.</i>
Evaluation Mission	15 days	
Draft Evaluation Report	10 days	
Final Report	3 days	

EVALUATION DELIVERABLES

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

*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.

TEAM COMPOSITION

The evaluation team will be composed of 1 international evaluators. 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 Team members must present the following qualifications:

- Advanced university degree (Master's or PhD) in natural sciences, environmental management, Energy regulations, development studies, Renewables energies or related discipline.
- Minimum 10 years of relevant professional experience in Environmental sciences, public policies, mitigation and adaptation, disaster risk management or related field.
- Knowledge of UNDP and GEF.
- Previous experience with results-based monitoring and evaluation methodologies,
- Substantive and demonstrated experience with terminal evaluation/review of GEF funded projects,
- Highly knowledgeable of participatory monitoring and evaluation processes.
- Previous experience in Haiti or in the Caribbean region,

- Proficiency in English and French. Strong abilities to write evaluation reports, good oral and written communication skills in both French and English.
- Strong abilities to analysis and attention to detail,
- Capable of planning, organizing, initiative and autonomy,
- Capacity to work in a multicultural environment and several languages
- 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 [UNEG 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluations'](#)

PAYMENT MODALITIES AND SPECIFICATIONS

%	Milestone
20%	At contract signing
40%	Following submission and approval of the 1ST draft terminal evaluation report
40%	Following submission and approval (UNDP-CO and UNDP RTA) of the final terminal evaluation report

APPLICATION PROCESS

Applicants are requested to apply online <http://jobs.undp.org> by July 4, 2016. Individual consultants are invited to submit applications together with their CV for these positions. The application should contain a current and complete C.V. in English (with indication of the e-mail and phone contact. Shortlisted candidates will be requested to submit a price offer indicating the total cost of the assignment (including daily fee, per diem and travel costs).

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

<p>This project will contribute to achieving the following Country Programme Outcomes as defined in CPAP or CPD: Outcome 4.: Capacity development and governance reform related to sustainable management of the environment and natural resources</p>					
<p>Country Programme Outcome Indicators: Capacity development and governance reform related to sustainable management of the environment and natural resources. Promotion of inclusive growth, based on the MDGs Indicator 1: Adoption/Creation/Enactment/ of Policy for On-grid Renewables; Indicator 2: Electricity production during the project period from grid-connected renewable energy installations installed under the influence of the project (MWh / year)</p>					
<p>Primary applicable Key Environment and Sustainable Development Key Result Area: 4. Expanding access to environmental and energy services for the poor.</p>					
<p>Applicable GEF Strategic Objective and Program: Objective CC-4 “To promote on-grid renewable energy”, Strategic Program “Promoting market approaches for renewable energy”</p>					
<p>Applicable GEF Expected Outcomes: “Growth in markets for renewable power in participating program countries”</p>					
<p>Applicable GEF Outcome Indicators: “tons CO2eq avoided; adoption of policy frameworks allowing renewable generators equitable access to the grid; kWh generated from renewable sources”</p>					
	Indicator	Baseline	Targets End of Project	Source of verification	Risks and Assumptions
<p>Project Objective³ To create an enabling environment for private and public investment in small hydro plants in Haiti.</p>	<p>(A) Number of new SHP projects under construction; (B) Capital secured for SHP investment. (C) SHP Project Pipeline (D) SHP Policy</p>	<p>(A) No SHP currently under development; (B) Private sector and donors demonstrate interest in investing in SHPs (C) Outdated and unreliable project pipeline; (D) No appropriate energy policy framework</p>	<p>(A) Three (3) SHP projects under construction; (B) US\$ 3.2 mln leveraged for SHP construction; (C) Updated project pipeline; at least 8 new SHPs under consideration for development; (D) Energy regulation in place, including support for SHP development.</p>	<p>Project evaluation, visual inspection</p>	<p>Risks (1) Political instability in Haiti worsens; (2) Natural disasters impact project implementation; Assumption: Government of Haiti continues to be aligned with international community’s (WB, IADB, USAID, CIDA, and UNDP) energy policy recommendations and reform projects.</p>

³ Objective (Atlas output) monitored quarterly ERBM and annually in APR/PIR

Outcome 1⁴ An effective, market-oriented policy and regulatory framework to enable small hydropower development in the country has been established.	(A) Methodology to define reference cost and tariff SHP approved; (B) Proposal approved legal/commercial status of SHP operator; (C) Resolutions approved defining (i) quality of service; (ii) land tenure, (iii) water rights and environmental issues.	(A) No SHP reference cost and tariff defined; (B) No proposal SHP approved; (C) No resolutions (a) drafted nor (b) approved.	(A) SHP reference cost and tariff defined; (B) Proposal status SHP operator approved; (C) Resolutions (a) drafted and (b) approved	Proposals and official publications	Risks (1) Political instability in Haiti worsens; Assumption: Government of Haiti continues to be aligned with international community's (WB, IADB, USAID, CIDA, UNDP) energy, policy recommendations and reform projects.
Outcome 2 Technical and managerial capacities within EdH and other national stakeholders have been created to evaluate, prepare and operate small hydropower developments in Haiti.	(A) Measuring equipment procured and installed; (B) Mapping of relevant regions carried out; (C) Creation of SHP business unit in EdH; (D) Internal capacities in EDH enhanced. (E) Project Pipeline generated	(A) No measuring equipment identified; (B) Data from 1979, no mapping using modern technologies; (C) No SHP business unit in EdH; (D) Low EdH Capacity for SHP management, no training material in place. (E) No SHP project pipeline in place training material in place. (E) No SHP project pipeline in place	(A) Measuring equipment procured and installed; (B) Mapping hydro potential relevant regions carried out; (C) SHP business unit established; (D) At least 30 EDH staff members are fully trained on SHP development, operation and maintenance; training material in place. (E) At least 8 SHPs included in EDH's project pipeline and with preliminary financing agreements in place	Reports, evaluation, audits	Risks (1) Political instability in Haiti worsens; Assumption: Government of Haiti continues to be aligned with international community's (WB, IADB, USAID, CIDA, UNDP) energy policy recommendations and reform projects.
Outcome 3 Small hydropower generation	(A) Feasibility studies for SHP projects; (B) Financing secured for SHPs	(A) No feasibility studies; (B) Private sector and donors	(A) 3 Feasibility studies completed; (B) Financing secured for construction of 3 SHPs	Reports, technical studies and drawings, visual inspection	Risks (1) Political instability in Haiti worsens; (2) Natural disasters impact project implementation;

⁴ All outcomes monitored annually in the APR/PIR. It is highly recommended not to have more than 4 outcomes.

facilities are incorporated in regional distribution constructed and are providing electricity to end-users.	(C) SHP plants procured and under construction; (D) Regional grids upgraded and fully operational (E) Business plans	demonstrate interest in investing in SHPs (C) No new SHP plants constructed in past 20 years; (D) Jacmel grid restored, Les Cayes grid in poor conditions; (E) No SHP business plans defined.	(C) 3 SHP plants in construction; (D) Jacmel and Les Cayes grids fully restored and SHP interconnection underway. (E) 3 business plans approved.		Assumption: Government of Haiti continues to be aligned with international community's (WB, IADB, USAID, CIDA, UNDP) energy policy recommendations and reform projects.
Outcome 4 A project monitoring and evaluation plan implemented, and lessons learnt are disseminated.	(A) Mid-term Evaluation Report; (B) Final Evaluation Report; (C) Documentation of project Experiences; (D) Sharing of project results	(A) No MTE; (B) No FEV; (C) No systematization of SHP experience in Haiti; (D) No sharing of SHP development experience in Haiti.	(A) MTE completed; (B) FEV completed; (C) Lessons learnt publication; (D) Seminar to present project results.	Evaluation reports	

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

- Project Document (ProDoc),
- Inception Workshop Report,
- Assessment of Co-Financing Contributions and Strategic Orientation of Outcome 3
- Financial reports and actual co-finance contributions
- Annual Work Plans,
- Annual Project Report (APR)/Project Implementation Report (PIR),
- project budget revisions,
- progress reports, field visit reports,
- Consultancy reports (policy and regulatory framework to enable small hydropower development in Haiti)
- audit reports,
- GEF focal area tracking tools,
- Technical reports, knowledge products, communications material, if available
- Steering Committee Meeting minutes,
- Government of Haiti national development strategy and legal documents (Plan Stratégique de Développement d’Haiti, PSDH),
- UNDP Haiti strategic documents (UNDAF, ISF, CPD, CPAP, Results Oriented Annual Report ROAR),
- GEF strategic documents,
- Projects outputs (studies, surveys, investigations, frameworks developed and presidential orders) and communication documents,
- UNDP Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-supported, GEF-financed Projects,
- UNDP Standards, Norms and Code of conduct for evaluation,
- Any other materials that the evaluator considers useful for this evidence-based assessment.

ANNEX C: EVALUATION QUESTIONS

Evaluative 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?			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How does the project activities, outputs and outcomes participate in the GEF-4 Climate Change Strategic Objective <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - To promote on-grid renewable energy - To assure Strategic Program Promoting Market Approaches for Renewable Energy - And especially, : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Transformation towards renewable energy (hydropower) outside the urban areas in Haiti; b) contributes significantly to the GEF indicators under CC, specifically avoided GHG emission (tons CO2e), renewable-energy based electricity production (kWh/year) and number of households connected; c) Generate direct and verifiable impact concerning the conservation of watershed areas and indirect benefits, including reduced technical and commercial losses through improved customer approach methods. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Indicators in the Project Logical Framework • Outputs and outcomes described in the ProDoc 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GEF strategic documents • UNDP strategic documents • Haiti national development plan • Project Document • Reports • Team and key stakeholders 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documents analysis • Interviews • Field visits
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How does the project participate in achieving the national energy policy reform? • Regarding the Haitian Regulation program, to which program and sub-program will the project participate? 			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How will the project participate in achieving UNDP Haiti strategic objectives describe in UNDP strategic documents? 			
Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved?			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Did the project implement the planned activities for the past period? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Indicators in the Project Logical Framework 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project Document 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documents analysis

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Were expected outcomes and objectives for the past period achieved? • What progress toward the planned outcomes has been made? 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reports • Team and key stakeholders 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interviews
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How were the risks managed? • How efficient were the strategies developed to mitigate them? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quality and completeness of the risks and assumptions identified in the ProDoc? • Quality of the mitigation measures described in the ProDoc? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project Document • Reports • Team and key stakeholders 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documents analysis • Interviews
Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards?			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Were the logical framework and the work plans followed and used as an implementation tool? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Availability and quality of the narrative and financial reports 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project documents, reports (including administrative and financial documents) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documents analysis
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Were the financial and administrative procedures followed to implement the project and produce the accurate financial and administrative data on time? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consistency of the reports and respect of the deadlines • Discrepancy between planned budget and actual expenditures 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Team • UNDP 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interviews
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Were the reporting and monitoring procedures followed? Were the correct and complete reports produced within the deadlines? • Were the funds available and disbursed as planned? • Were the co-financing and in kind contributions as planned? • Were financial resources efficiently used? Could it have been improved? How? • Were the procurement processes done following procedures and contributing to an efficient use of the project resources? • Was the use of the "Result based management" method efficient? • How was adaptive management used? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comparison between planned co-financing and actual • Quality and consistency of the data entered in the Integrated Work Plan and in Atlas • Quantity and quality of changes made between the ProDoc and the actual implementation • 		
Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, social-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are issues of sustainability integrated in the project design? • Are they adequately addressed? • Have they evolved since the project design? Was the implementation design adapted consequently? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project sustainability strategy and actions : availability, adequacy and completion 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project documents, reports (including administrative and financial documents) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documents analysis • Interviews
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Have new risks to sustainability arisen? Were they mitigation measures implemented? were the sustainability plan adapted • Are the main stakeholders willing and able to use, enforce, follow the project outputs (tools, laws, recommendations) after its completion? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • involvement, actions taken by the key stakeholders especially the implementing partner Ministry 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Team • UNDP • Key stakeholders 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •

- Is there a political will to continue the projects activities?
What are the main issues and difficulties that can affect the project's outcomes sustainability? Have they been addressed?
- How can the project's outcomes sustainability be improved?
- Is there an exit strategy in place? What is the project's sustainability plan?

- Changes in the institutional, financial and socioeconomic context

Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward, reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status?

-

-

-

-

ANNEX D: RATING SCALES

<p>Ratings for Outcomes, Effectiveness, Efficiency, M&E, I&E Execution</p> <p>6: Highly Satisfactory (HS): no shortcomings 5: Satisfactory (S): minor shortcomings 4: Moderately Satisfactory (MS) 3. Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): significant shortcomings 2. Unsatisfactory (U): major problems 1. Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): severe problems</p>	<p>Sustainability ratings:</p> <p>4. Likely (L): negligible risks to sustainability 3. Moderately Likely (ML): moderate risks 2. Moderately Unlikely (MU): significant risks 1. Unlikely (U): severe risks</p>	<p>Relevance ratings</p> <p>2. Relevant (R) 1.. Not relevant (NR)</p> <p>Impact Ratings:</p> <p>3. Significant (S) 2. Minimal (M) 1. Negligible (N)</p>
<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 Form⁵

Agreement to abide by the Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN System

Name of Consultant: _____

Name of Consultancy Organization (where relevant): _____

I confirm that I have received and understood and will abide by the United Nations Code of Conduct for Evaluation.

Signed at *place* on *date*

Signature: _____

⁵www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct

ANNEX F: EVALUATION REPORT OUTLINE⁶

- 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 Manual⁷)
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 rated⁸)
- 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)

⁶The Report length should not exceed 40 pages in total (not including annexes).

⁷ UNDP Style Manual, Office of Communications, Partnerships Bureau, updated November 2008

⁸ Using a six-point rating scale: 6: Highly Satisfactory, 5: Satisfactory, 4: Marginally Satisfactory, 3: Marginally Unsatisfactory, 2: Unsatisfactory and 1: Highly Unsatisfactory, see section 3.5, page 37 for ratings explanations.

- Feedback from M&E activities used for adaptive management
- Project Finance:
- Monitoring and evaluation: design at entry and implementation (*)
- UNDP and Implementing Partner implementation / execution (*) coordination, and operational issues

3.3 Project Results

- Overall results (attainment of objectives) (*)
- Relevance(*)
- Effectiveness & Efficiency (*)
- Country ownership
- Mainstreaming
- Sustainability (*)
- 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

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 document)

Evaluation Report Reviewed and Cleared by

UNDP Country Office

Name: _____

Signature: _____ Date: _____

UNDP GEF RTA

Name: _____

Signature: _____ Date: _____