

DETAILED TERMINAL EVALUATION NATIONAL CONSULTANT TERMS OF REFERENCE

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 ***“Removal of Barriers to Solar PV Power Generation in Mauritius, Rodrigues and the Outer Islands” (PIMS 4333)***

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

PROJECT SUMMARY TABLE

Project Title:	Removal of Barriers to Solar PV Power Generation in Mauritius, Rodrigues and the Outer Islands			
GEF Project ID:	4099		<u>at endorsement</u> (Million US\$)	<u>at completion</u> (Million US\$)
UNDP Project ID:	4333	GEF financing:	2.005	
Country:	Mauritius	IA/EA own:	0.050	
Region:	Africa	Government:	1.438	
Focal Area:	Climate Change CC-4: promote on-grid electricity from renewable source	Other:	17.500	
FA Objectives, (OP/SP):	SP3: Promoting market approaches to renewable energy	Total co-financing:	18.988	
Executing Agency:	Ministry of Energy and Public Utilities / Central Electricity Board	Total Project Cost:	20.993	
Other Partners involved:	Rodrigues Regional Assembly, Outer Islands Development Corporation	ProDoc Signature (date project began):		October 2011
		(Operational) Closing Date:	Proposed: December 2016	Actual:

OBJECTIVE AND SCOPE

The project was designed to accelerate sustainable on-grid PV electricity generation in Mauritius by leveraging \$17.5 million in private sector investment over its four-year implementation period. This, in turn, was expected to generate direct global benefits of almost 13,295 tons of CO₂ over the same period and almost 5,318 tons CO₂/yr thereafter in avoided greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. The project would do this by introducing a conducive regulatory framework that would facilitate private sector participation in supplying the national grid with PV-generated electricity at market-determined prices and assisting the Government in closing private sector funded PV investments. It was envisaged that this project would enable Mauritius to meet (and maybe even surpass) its target of 2% of electricity generation from on-grid PV by 2025, as established in its “Long Term Energy Strategy 2009-2025”.

The project’s goal was to reduce GHG emissions by creating favourable legal, regulatory and market environment and building institutional, administrative and technical capacities to promote the utilisation of the country’s favourable solar radiation potential for PV grid-connected electricity generation.

The objective was to assist the Government of Mauritius in addressing the various barriers with a view to achieving at least 2% of grid-connected electricity generation from PV by 2025, as outlined in the “Long Term Energy Strategy 2009-2025”. In the business as usual scenario, the share of PV grid-connected electricity generation within the same time-frame might remain negligible, similar to what it was at the time of project initiation. The project would accomplish this by supporting the Government of Mauritius in:

- setting attractive and competitive business terms and conditions for investors, such as incentive-based feed-in tariff agreements, which give developers long-term stability and provide for sufficient investment return
- streamlining and simplifying the administrative procedures for PV-based power producers and assisting the Ministry of Energy and Public Utilities to monitor/enforce regulations;
- upgrading and expanding geographical coverage of solar radiation measurement, technical and cost data of PV systems to make informed investment decisions; and
- facilitating implementation of initial PV grid-connected projects by assisting to put in place a fair and transparent project selection process, supporting subsequent negotiation and signature of licensing and feed-in tariff agreements and providing technical support and oversight throughout the licensing and construction process;

The original components / outcomes are summarised below:

Component / Outcome 1: Component 1 of the project addressed market-oriented energy policy and legal / regulatory framework to promote grid-connected electricity generation. Power Purchase agreements were formulated and signed by selected investors. The targeted activities were:

- Report streamlining market-oriented energy policy and legal/regulatory framework to regulate on-grid PV electricity generation.
- Strategy document aimed at sharpening the focus of the respective roles and responsibilities of MEPU and CEB for on-grid PV.
- Criteria and procedures for the introduction of a transparent process in the selection/award of projects for development.
- One-stop shop for issuance of construction licenses and permits to developers.

- Review of the SSDG scheme including financial model, technical specifications towards improving the scheme and moving to the next phase
- Standardised and signed Power Purchase Agreements with identified developers/investors

Component / Outcome 2: Component 2 addressed the capacity development within MEPU and other key Government/Financial Institutions to evaluate the economic and financial viability of grid-connected PV systems and to formulate incentives to attract investors. The targeted activities were:

- Training program for capacity development within MEPU and other Government institutions
- Implementation of methodology for economic and financial evaluation of an on-grid PV systems
- Implementation of a standard financial evaluation methodology for calculating feed-in tariffs for investors with installed capacities more than 50KW
- Development of financial and other incentives to be provided to project developers and creation of an ownership model and investment scheme
- Training program for capacity development within financial institutions to appraise PV projects for lending. Risk mitigation instruments were developed to protect lenders and developers
- Sensitising project developers in the Carbon Finance potential of their projects, viz. through workshops and seminars to help build their capacity and understanding of the various steps, procedures and methodologies, as well as how to access the necessary expertise

Component / Outcome 3: Component 3 addressed the capacity development in view to upgrade existing solar radiation data, expand geographical coverage for solar resource measurement, formulate solar map technical guidelines and standards for and provide oversight, monitoring and certification of PV systems, and provide installation, operation, maintenance and repair services. Necessary technology transfer models formulated and operationalised. The targeted activities were:

- Planning the upgrade of existing solar radiation data and expand the geographical coverage for solar resource measurement
- Preparation of the guidelines and technical standards for PV system components and grid-connected PV systems
- Training program for capacity development within MEPU / CEB to determine grid absorption capacity and provide oversight, monitoring and certification of on-grid PV systems
- Training program for capacity development of locals for installation, operation, maintenance and repairs services
- Identify technology transfer opportunities, formulate and operationalise delivery model

Component / Outcome 4: Promoters were assisted financially through Feed in Tariffs so as to facilitate PV projects to supply electricity to the CEB grid. The target activities were:

- Construction of 5 nos. 2MW of on-grid PV systems
- Funding part price differential in feed in tariffs for a determined period

Component / Outcome 5: Component 5 addressed the outreach programme and dissemination of project experience / best practices / lessons learned for replication throughout the country. The targeted activities were:

- Implement outreach / promotional activities targeting domestic (and international) investors
- Training program for capacity development within MEPU to monitor and document project experience
- Publish materials on project experience / best practices and lessons learned

Executing Agency/Implementing Partner: Central Electricity Board

Implementing Entity/Responsible Partners: Central Electricity Board

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

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

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 Technical Adviser based in the region and key stakeholders. The evaluator is expected to conduct a field mission to Mauritius and Rodrigues, including installation sites in Mauritius and Rodrigues. Interviews will be held with the following organizations and individuals at a minimum:

- Ministry of Energy and Public Utilities – Executing Agency and Implementing Partner
- Central Electricity Board – Producer and supplier of electrical energy, operating under MEPU and involved in all project components; Executing Agency since February 2014
- UNDP CO – Implementing Agency, provides support services
- UNDP / GEF RCU – Monitoring and Evaluation of the project

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

- Ministry of Environment Sustainable Development, Disaster and Beach Management – Involved in Components 1,4, 5 and provides Quality Assurance
- Ministry of Finance and Economic Development – GEF OFP, involved in Components 1,2, 4
- Rodrigues Regional Assembly – Represents Rodrigues and provides Quality Assurance
- Mauritius Institute of Training and Development – Provide training for solar PV, Component 3
- Mauritius Meteorological Services – Support to prepare solar maps under Component 3
- Project Promoters from Private Sector – To participate in pilot projects under Component 4
- Suppliers of Solar PV equipment – Technical personnel benefit capacity building, Component 3
- External Consultants - For technical studies and reports as required, and evaluation
- University of Mauritius – Identified during MTE for possible collaboration to prepare solar maps

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.

Functions and key results expected:

The International Consultant will be the team leader and will be responsible for the quality of the report and timely submission. The National Consultant will provide supportive roles in terms of professional inputs, knowledge of local policies, local navigation, translation / language support, etc.

A. The review team is expected to prepare an Evaluation Report based on the outline listed in [Annex C](#) while specifically including the following aspects:

1. Adequacy of the overall project concept, design, implementation methodology, institutional structure, timelines, budgetary allocation or any other aspect of the project design that the evaluation team may want to comment upon.
2. Extent of progress achieved against the overall project objective disaggregated by each of the individual Outcomes, Outputs and Activities (including sub-activities); as against the Impact Indicators identified and listed in the project document. Extent of the incremental value added with project implementation.
3. Performance in terms of in-time achievement of individual project activities as well as overall project in terms of adherence to planned timelines.
4. Relevance and adequacy of mid-course changes in implementation strategy with PSC approval, if any and the consequent variations in achievements, if any.
5. Degree of effectiveness of the CEB Project Management Arrangement while identifying gaps, if any with lessons learned and alternative scenarios, if any

6. Extent to which deployment of PV has been mainstreamed in the local context. Identify gaps, if any, and provide alternative scenarios
7. Extent of effectiveness of the project and *avoided greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions* achieved as a consequence of the project and the extent to which the envisaged benefits (have been achieved
8. Estimation of the greenhouse gas emission reduction benefits, direct and indirect, arising from the project. Reference may be made to:
<https://www.thegef.org/gef/pubs/STAP/Methodology-for-Calculating-GHG-Benefits-of-GEF-Energy-Efficiency-Projects-v.1> and accordingly, preparation of the tracking tool.
9. Evaluate the impact of the project activities on the various government institutions
10. Extent of effectiveness of awareness generation activities by way of quality of promotional packages / awareness material, number of Awareness Programmes, Trainings undertaken and level of awareness created. Quality of documentation, if any, produced under the project like, brochure, etc. should also be considered
11. Pattern, in which funds have been leveraged, budgeted, spent and accounted for in the project

B. The team should also focus their assessments on project impacts as listed:

1. Perceptions on the “Situation at the end of the Project” as it seems to the review team at the terminal review stage
2. Nature and scale of the policy impact made by the project, if any, on relevant line departments of the Government or other policy making bodies
3. Extent of effectiveness of capacity building initiatives undertaken under the aegis of the project
4. Assessment of Greenhouse Gases Emission reduction achieved during the life of the project and an estimate of likely emission reductions possible in the future
5. Appropriateness and effectiveness of the institutional arrangement deployed in the project with alternative scenarios, if any
6. Details of co-funding, if any, leveraged by the project and its impact on the project achievements;
7. The effectiveness of monitoring and overseeing systems such as Project Steering Committee and suggestion on improvements if any

C. Terminal Evaluation and Knowledge Management Workshop

1. The national consultant will assist the international consultant in conducting a minimum one-day terminal evaluation and knowledge management workshop (during the evaluation mission) on monitoring and evaluation concepts and methodology for capacity development of local stakeholders. One of the aims of the workshop should be to enable the stakeholders to be capacitated to monitor and document project experiences, draw out lessons learned and envision how to implement the lessons learnt going forward. The program of the workshop must be included in this offer.

EVALUATION CRITERIA & RATINGS

An assessment of project performance will be carried out, based against expectations set out in the Project Logical Framework/Results Framework (see [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 position of financing and co-financing as on 31st March 2015 which was assessed during the Mid Term Review is given in table below:

Project Budget, Financing and Co-financing (Million USD)

Source		Planned	Planned till Mid Term ²	Reallocated Project Budget	Realised Till Dec 2014	Likely Future	Likely Total
GEF	Feed in Tariff Support	1.300	0.260	1.000	0.500	0.500	1.000
	Agalega PV Project	Nil	Nil	0.100	Nil	0.100	0.100
	Rodrigues PV Projects	Nil	Nil	0.045	Nil	0.045	0.045
	Demonstration PV projects at Schools and other institutions	Nil	Nil	Nil	Nil	Nil	Nil
	Other	0.705	0.517	0.860	0.099	0.761	0.860
	Total	2.005	0.777	2.005	0.599	1.406	2.005
UNDP		0.050	0.026	0.050	Nil	0.050	0.050
Co-financing, MID Fund ³ (Cash)	Feed in Tariff Support	1.080	0.216	1.080	Nil	1.080	1.080
	Agalega Green Project	Nil	Nil	0.028 ⁴	Nil	0.028	0.028
	Rodrigues PV Projects	Nil	Nil	0.045	Nil	0.045	0.045
	Demonstration PV projects at Schools and other institutions	Nil	Nil	Nil	0.451 ⁵	Nil	0.451
	Other						
	Total	1.080	0.026	1.405	0.451	1.405	1.856
		0.080	0.040	Nil	Nil	Nil	Nil
Co-financing, Government (Cash)		0.278	0.159	0.278	0.048 ⁶	0.229	0.278
Government (In Kind) ⁷		17.500		17.500	0.150	26.600	26.600
Private Sector		20.993	1.002	21.188	0.797⁸	29.640	30.288

² Considered at the end of 2nd year as per Project Document

³ The MID Fund has been abolished by new government in Dec 2014. This contribution will now come from MOFED(through CEB) for projects in Mauritius, from RRA for project at Rodrigues and from OIIC for projects at Agalega

⁴ Out of 0.028 million USD (about 10 million MUR) 5 million MUR is expected from MID Fund and 5 million MUR is expected from Ministry of Ocean Economy, Marine Resources, Fisheries, Shipping and Outer Island

⁵ Based on figures provided by the MOESD

⁶ Figure provided by project team regarding contribution by CEB towards SSDG scheme

⁷ This in kind contribution is to come from Implementing Agency (earlier MEPU, now CEB) for logistics, salaries of the in-house staff working for the project and other such support activities

⁸ Based on discussion with the private parties which will be provided with Feed in Tariff support, the cost of feasibility studies, project development, bidding etc. have been about MUR 1 million per project

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	0.050		1.438		17.500		18.988	
Loans/Concessions	0		0		0		0	
• In-kind support	0		0		0		0	
• Other	0		0		0		0	
Totals	0.050		1.438		17.5000		18.988	

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.⁹

CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS & LESSONS

The evaluation report must include a chapter providing a set of **conclusions, recommendations and lessons**. The evaluators will also follow and provide response according to the “management response template” at [Annex I](#). Conclusions should build on findings and be based in evidence. Recommendations should be prioritised, specific, relevant, and targeted, with suggested implementers of the recommendations. Lessons should have wider applicability to other initiatives across the region, the area of intervention, and for the future.

⁹ 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](#)

IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS

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

The Consultants shall comply strictly with comments made on any deliverable by the UNDP CO, the UNDP GEF Regional Technical Adviser and the UNDP Independent Evaluation office (IEO).

EVALUATION TIMEFRAME

The total duration of the evaluation will be 12 person days over a period of two months according to the following plan for the national consultant:

Activity	Timing	Completion Date
Preparation	2 days	20 October 2016
Evaluation Mission*	7 days	08 – 16 November 2016
Draft Evaluation Report	2 days	16 November 2016
Final Report	1 day	08 December 2016

* The evaluation mission includes the terminal evaluation and knowledge management workshop and a 1 day return travel to Rodrigues. Tickets will be booked by the UNDP CO.

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

*When submitting the final evaluation report, the evaluator is required also to provide an 'audit trail' (see [annex H](#)), detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final evaluation report.

The International Consultant will be allocated 15 person days and the National Consultant 12 person days input.

TEAM COMPOSITION

The evaluation team will be composed of two independent consultants - one international consultant and one local consultant. The consultants shall have prior experience in evaluating similar projects. Experience with GEF financed projects is an advantage. The evaluators selected should not have participated in the project preparation and/or implementation and should not have conflict of interest with project related activities. The international consultant will serve as the team leader and will be responsible for the final deliverable of the TE inception report, draft report and final report.

The selection of consultant will be aimed at maximizing the overall “team” qualities. The national consultant should have:

Education:

- At least a Honours Degree in Science or Engineering

Work Experience:

- A minimum of 5 years of relevant experience in renewable energy projects at institutional level or related field;
- Demonstrated ability to assess complex situations, succinctly distils critical issues, and draw forward-looking conclusions and recommendations;
- Knowledgeable of GEF and UNDP-GEF monitoring and evaluation policies procedures an advantage;
- Excellent in human relations, coordination, planning and team work.
- Be fully IT literate

Corporate Competencies:

- Demonstrates integrity and ethical standards
- Creative and innovative
- Sound analytic capacities
- Ability to address complex concepts and to gather written materials in a clear, concise and meaningful manner with a high level of accuracy and attention to detail
- Highly organized, able to effectively develop and manage projects, ensuring that deadlines are met

Functional Competencies:

- Excellent writing, analytical and research skills
- Showing strong attention to details
- Excellent interpersonal skills
- Ability to work in a multicultural and international environment
- Ability to work under pressure and to meet tight deadlines

Language:

- Excellent spoken, written English and French required

Criteria for Evaluation of Proposal:

Only those applications which are responsive and compliant will be evaluated. Offers will be evaluated according to the combined scoring method – where the educational background and experience on similar assignments will be weighted at 70% and the price proposal will weigh as 30% of the total scoring. The applicant receiving the Highest Combined Score that has also accepted UNDP's General Terms and Conditions will be awarded the contract.

The evaluation criteria will be as follows:

National Consultant

Criteria (Technical)	Weight (%)
University Degree (Masters or equivalent) in Electrical or Electronic Engineering, Renewable Energy, Science, or other closely related field.	15
At least 5 years of relevant professional experience in Climate Change mitigation and Project Evaluation	15
Knowledgeable of GEF and UNDP-GEF monitoring and evaluation policies procedures an advantage;	10
Excellent in human relations, coordination, planning and team work.	5
Be fully IT literate	5
Brief Technical Proposal	20
Criteria (Financial)	30
Total points obtainable	100

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 submission and approval of work plan
30%	Following submission and approval of the 1ST draft terminal evaluation report & draft GEF Tracking Tool
50%	Following submission and approval (UNDP-CO, UNDP RTA and IEO) of the final terminal evaluation report & GEF Tracking Tool

APPLICATION PROCESS

Applicants are requested to apply online <http://jobs.undp.org> by 02 September 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

This project will contribute to achieving the following Country Programme Outcome as defined in CPD: To improve environmental protection by accessing and utilising environmental funds, carbon markets, payment for ecosystem services (PES) and other financing mechanisms.					
Country Programme Outcome Indicators: Key Indicator (1): 10% improvement reflected in the environmental indicators for Mauritius by 2010 in the various State of Environment Reports prepared as part of the Conventions Obligations and framework for CDM developed and operational by end 2010. Key Indicator (2): National Adaptation Plan implemented. Energy efficiency regulations implemented by end 2011.					
Primary applicable Key Environment and Sustainable Development Key Result Area (same as that on the cover page, circle one): National capacities of key institutions to implement global environmental commitments at national and regional levels through integration of environmental concerns in national policies and programmes improved.					
Applicable GEF Strategic Objective and Program: To promote on-grid electricity from renewable sources – CC4-SP3-RE					
Applicable GEF Expected Outcomes: Total avoided GHG emissions from on-grid PV electricity generation.					
Applicable GEF Outcome Indicators: Avoided GHG emissions from on-grid PV electricity generation (tons CO ₂ /MWh); and \$/t CO ₂ .					
	Indicator	Baseline	Target	Sources of Verification	Assumptions
Objective					
To assist the Government in addressing the barriers with a view to promoting PV grid-connected electricity generation.	Direct investment in at least 3 MW of on-grid PV installations by end of project. Amount of reduced CO ₂ emissions compared to the projected baseline	GHG in the electricity generation sector scheduled to increase from 2.03 million tons/year (2008 figures) to almost 3.3 million tons/year by the year 2020. Negligible investments taking place in on-grid PV electricity generation.	11,662 ² MWh of electricity generated (as a result of the 3 MW capacity brought on-line) by project completion ¹⁰ . Direct reduction of 13,295 tons of CO ₂ over the 4-year FSP project life cycle and 98,400 over the full lifetime of the plants. Estimated cumulative indirect GHG	Project's annual reports, GHG monitoring and verification reports. Project final evaluation report.	Continued commitment of project partners, including Government agencies and investors/developers.

¹⁰ This electricity generation figure reflects the expectation as noted in Section 38 that all new plants specifically targeted for installation as part of the project would be fully operational by January 2013

			emission reduction of at least 350,000 tons of CO _{2eq} by 2025 on the basis of a conservative policy scenario and a GEF causality factor of 80%.		
Outcomes / Output					
Outcome 1: Streamlined and comprehensive market-oriented energy policy and legal/regulatory framework to promote PV grid-connected electricity generation. Power Purchase agreements formulated and signed by selected investors	Framework finalized and available for consultation by potential investors. Standardised PPAs formulated and the SSDG scheme reviewed	None available at the present time.	To be completed within 15 months of project initiation and approved by Government one and a half years after start of project	Published documents. Government decrees/laws.	Commitment of the various Government institutions.
Output 1.1: Report streamlining market-oriented energy policy and legal/regulatory framework to regulate on-grid PV electricity generation.	Report confirming that policy and framework arrangements are in place.	Potentially overlapping responsibilities of various Government institutions make the decision process quite cumbersome and complicated.	To be completed within 15 months of project initiation and approved by the Government 1.5 after start of project	Published documents.	Commitment of the various Government institutions.
Output 1.2: Strategy document aimed at sharpening the focus of the respective roles and responsibilities of MEPU and CEB for on-grid PV.	Document available and procedures in place.	Not available at the present time.	To be completed within 15 months of project initiation and approved by the Government 1.5 after start of project	Published documents.	Commitment of the respective Government institutions.

Output 1.3: Criteria and procedures for the introduction of a transparent process in the selection/award of projects for development.	Guidelines available and put into practice.	Not available at the present time.	To be completed within 15 months of project initiation and approved by the Government 1.5 after start of project Competitive selection/award of projects completed by the end of 1.5 years after project start.	Published documents. Signed agreements.	Commitment of the various Government institutions and project developers.
Output 1.4: One-stop shop for issuance of construction licenses and permits to developers.	One-stop shop is operational. Information brochure and website are available.	Under the business-as-usual scenario, the average time to secure all required construction licenses and permits can take up to 12 months.	All construction licenses and permits are issued following completion of feasibility studies and selection of promoters	Signed documents.	Continued investor interest.
Output 1.5 Review of the SSDG scheme including financial model, technical specifications towards improving the scheme and moving to the next phase	Document available on the results achieved by the scheme and options for improvement suggested for next phase	Not available at the present time. SSDG scheme expected to be over by end of 2011	To be completed within 18 months of project initiation and applied by Government thereafter	Project report	Cooperation of Government entities and staff
Output 1.6: Standardised and signed Power Purchase Agreements with identified developers/investors	Power Purchase agreements signed.	Not presently available.	Completed within 15 months of project start.	Project reports.	Supportive financial regulations and feed-in tariffs in place.
Outcome 2: Capacity available within MEPU and other key Government/Financial Institutions to evaluate the	Number of staff who participated in and successfully completed capacity development programme.	None available at the present time.	At least 2 projects evaluated by the end of year 2. Ten staff trained during first 15 months	Training modules/number of staff trained. Project report.	Concerned institutions willing to release staff for training.

economic and financial viability of grid-connected PV systems and to formulate incentives to attract investors.			of project.		
Output 2.1: Suitable methodology for the economic/financial evaluation of on-grid PV systems.	Methodology applied by entities on large scale PV projects	Not available at the present time.	To be completed within 15 months of project initiation and applied by Government thereafter.	Project report.	Cooperation of concerned entities and staff.
Output 2.2: Standard financial evaluation methodology for calculating feed-in tariffs for investors with installed capacities more than 50 kW.	Methodology applied by MEPU and used in PPAs	No such evaluation methodology available.	To be completed within 15 months of project initiation and applied by Government thereafter.	Project documentation.	Cooperation of Government entities and staff.
Output 2.3: Financial and other incentives to be provided to project developers. Ownership model and investment scheme created	Document available and incentives operationalised. Financially sustainable mechanisms developed to support Feed in Tariffs	No comprehensive document available at the present time.	To be completed within 15 months of project initiation and applied by Government thereafter.	Project documentation.	Cooperation of Government entities.
Output 2.4: Capacity developed within financial institutions to appraise PV projects for lending. Risk mitigation instruments developed to protect lenders and developers.	Number of financial institutions staff successfully trained. Risk mitigation instruments developed and operationalised.	None available at the present time.	Five to six financial institutions staff trained during first 15 months of project. Risk mitigation instruments developed during first 15 months of project.	Number of staff trained. Project report.	Cooperation of financial institutions and developers.
Output 2.5: Carbon finance potential developed regarding future on-grid PV	Options assessed and potential developed to access carbon finance	None available at the present time.	To be completed within 15 months of project initiation.	Project documentation.	Cooperation of Government entities.

investments outside of the project framework.	in future investments.				
Outcome 3: Capacity available to upgrade existing solar radiation data, expand geographical coverage for solar resource measurement, formulate solar map technical guidelines and standards for and provide oversight, monitoring and certification of PV systems, and provide installation, operation, maintenance and repair services. Necessary technology transfer models formulated and operationalized	Teams trained in various categories of activities. Guidelines and technical standards for on-grid PV systems. Technology delivery models put in place	No such activity being implemented.	15 sites targeted for enhanced solar radiation assessment in year 1. Published guidelines and technical standards within 15 months of project start. Manual for installation, operation, maintenance and repair services developed by year 1.5, 40 people trained in the various categories by the end of the project.	Project reports.	Cooperation of concerned Government entities.
Output 3.1: Programme for upgrading existing solar radiation data, expand geographical coverage for solar resource measurement. Publication of a solar Map for Mauritius, Rodrigues and the Outer Islands	Instrumentation to measure solar radiation data installed. Software developed for interpretation of data. Solar map developed and published	Presently available solar radiation data insufficient to accurately design on-grid PV systems..	Upgrade/expand coverage to 15 sites completed by the end of project. Four Meteorological Services staff trained within first 15 months of project.	Project documentation.	Cooperation of concerned Government institutions.
Output 3.2: Guidelines and technical standards for PV system components and grid-connected PV systems.	Guidelines and standards published and operationalised.	Not presently available.	Completed within first 18 months of project. Applied to sites identified for development.	Project reports.	Participation of Government institutions in drafting guidelines and standards.

Output 3.3: Capacity developed within MEPU/CEB to determine grid absorption capacity and provide oversight, monitoring and certification of on-grid PV systems.	Capacity development plan formulated and implemented.	Not presently available.	Six MEPU/CEB staff trained during first 18 months of project.	Project documentation.	Participation of Government entities in training programme.
Output 3.4: Local capacity for installation, operation, maintenance and repair services.	Availability of qualified and certified companies/individuals for installation, operation, maintenance and repair services.	None available now.	30 people trained by the end of the project.	Project reports.	Availability of people with basic technical education.
Output 3.5: Technology transfer opportunities identified, and delivery models formulated and operationalised.	Report confirming that technology delivery models are being implemented.	None at the present time.	Completed within 2 years of project start.	Project reports.	Commitment of equipment suppliers and project developers.
Outcome 4: Promoters assisted financially through Feed in Tariffs and projects implemented and supplying electricity to the CEB grid	Funding used for topping part price differential in Feed in tariffs for a determined time	Not presently available.	Construction of at least 3 MW of on-grid PV systems completed by the end of the project.	Signed Power Purchase agreements and other documents	Government develops a sustainable financing mechanism.
Outcome 5: Outreach programme and dissemination of project experience/best practices/lessons learned for replication throughout the country.	Outreach programme formulated. Project experience compiled, analyzed and disseminated.	Lack of sufficient information to pursue programme.	Increased awareness among stakeholders in place to promote and develop the market for on-grid PV	Project final report and web site.	Growth of programme will be sustained.
Output 5.1: Plan to implement outreach/promotional	Plan available and operationalised.	No such plan available.	Completed within 10 months of project initiation.	Project documentation.	Expected expansion of programme.

activities targeting domestic (and international) investors.					
Output 5.2: Capacity development of MEPU to monitor and document project experience.	Capacity development material prepared.	No capacity development programme.	10 Government staff trained by the end of project.	Project reports.	Designation of staff by Government.
Output 5.3: Published materials on project experience/best practices and lessons learned.	Project experience and best practices compiled, published and available on website.	Lack of information on best practices and lessons learned.	Completed within 3 months of project end.	Project documentation and web site.	Successful completion of project.

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

- Project Document;
- Project implementation reports (PIRs);
- Quarterly progress reports and work plans of the various implementation task teams;
- Audits reports
- Annual Review Reports
- Mid Term Evaluation Report
- M & E Operational Guidelines, all monitoring reports prepared by the project;
- Financial and Administration guidelines;
- GEF Project Information Form (PIF)
- List and contact details for project staff, key project stakeholders, including Project Boards, and other partners to be consulted
- Project budget and financial data
- GEF project Tracking Tools, at baseline, at mid-term, and at terminal
- GEF focal area strategic program objectives

The following documents will also be available:

- The project M&E framework
- Knowledge products from service providers
- Project operational guidelines, manuals and systems;
- Minutes of the Project Board Meetings, task teams and other project management meetings;
- Maps: Project sites, highlighting suggested visits
- The GEF Implementation Completion Report guidelines; and,
- The UNDP Monitoring and Evaluation Frameworks.

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 and national levels?				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is the project objectives conform to agreed priorities in the UNDP Country Programme Document (CPD)? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How does the project support the environment and sustainable development objectives of the Republic of Mauritius? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In line with the national priorities mentioned in the UNDP Country Programme Document 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> UNDP Country Programme Document Project document 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Documents analyses Interviews with UNDP and project team
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is the project relevant to the GEF climate change mitigation area? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How does the project support the GEF climate change mitigation area? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Existence of a clear relationship between the project objectives and GEF climate change mitigation area? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project documents GEF focal areas strategies and documents 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Documents analyses GEF website Interviews with UNDP and project team
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is the project relevant to the Republic of Mauritius's environment and sustainable development objectives? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is the project country-driven? What was the level of stakeholder participation in project design? What was the level of stakeholder ownership in implementation? Does the project adequately take into account the national realities, both in terms of institutional and 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Degree to which the project supports national environmental objectives Degree of coherence between the project and national priorities, policies and strategies Appreciation from national stakeholders with respect to adequacy of project design and 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project documents National policies and strategies Key project partners 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Documents analyses GEF website Interviews with UNDP and project team

	<p>policy framework in its design and its implementation?</p>	<p>implementation to national realities and existing capacities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Level of involvement of government officials and other partners in the project design process ▪ Coherence between needs expressed by national stakeholders and UNDP-GEF criteria 		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Is the project addressing the needs of target beneficiaries at the local level? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ How does the project support the needs of relevant stakeholders? ▪ Has the implementation of the project been inclusive of all relevant stakeholders? ▪ Were local beneficiaries and stakeholders adequately involved in project design and implementation? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Strength of the link between expected results from the project and the needs of relevant stakeholders ▪ Degree of involvement and inclusiveness of stakeholders in project design and implementation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Project partners and stakeholders ▪ Project documents 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Document analysis ▪ Interviews with relevant stakeholders
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Is the project internally coherent in its design? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Are there logical linkages between expected results of the project (log frame) and the project design (in terms of project components, choice of 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Level of coherence between project expected results and project design internal logic ▪ Level of coherence between project design 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Program and project documents ▪ Key project stakeholders 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Document analysis ▪ Key interviews

	<p>partners, structure, delivery mechanism, scope, budget, use of resources etc.)?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Is the length of the project sufficient to achieve Project outcomes? ▪ Whether gender issues had been taken into account in project design and implementation and in what way has the project contributed to greater consideration of gender aspects, (i.e. project team composition, gender-related aspects of pollution impacts, stakeholder outreach to women's groups, etc). If so, indicate how 	<p>and project implementation approach</p>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ How is the project relevant with respect to other donor-supported activities? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Does the GEF funding support activities and objectives not addressed by other donors? ▪ How do GEF-funds help to fill gaps (or give additional stimulus) that are necessary but 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Degree to which program was coherent and complementary to other donor programming nationally and regionally 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Documents from other donor supported activities ▪ Other donor representatives ▪ Project documents 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Documents analyses ▪ Interviews with project partners and relevant stakeholders

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> are not covered by other donors? Is there coordination and complementarity between donors? 			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the project provide relevant lessons and experiences for other similar projects in the future? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has the experience of the project provided relevant lessons for other future projects targeted at similar objectives 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Data collected throughout evaluation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Data analysis
Evaluative Criteria	Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved?				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has the project been effective in achieving the expected outcomes and objectives? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has the project been effective in achieving its expected outcomes? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> See indicators in project document results framework and log frame 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project documents Project team and relevant stakeholders Data reported in project annual and quarterly reports 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Documents analysis Interviews with project team Interviews with relevant stakeholders
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How is risk and risk mitigation being managed? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How well are risks, assumptions and impact drivers being managed? What was the quality of risk mitigation strategies developed? Were these sufficient? Are there clear strategies for risk mitigation related with long-term sustainability of the project? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Completeness of risk identification and assumptions during project planning and design Quality of existing information systems in place to identify emerging risks and other issues 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project documents UNDP, project team, and relevant stakeholders 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Document analysis Interviews

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Quality of risk mitigations strategies developed and followed 		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What lessons can be drawn regarding effectiveness for other similar projects in the future? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What lessons have been learned from the project regarding achievement of outcomes? What changes could have been made (if any) to the design of the project in order to improve the achievement of the project's expected results? 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Data collected Throughout evaluation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Data analysis
Evaluative Criteria	Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards?				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Was project support provided in an efficient way? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Was adaptive management used or needed to ensure efficient resource use? Did the project logical framework and work plans and any changes made to them use as management tools during implementation? Were the accounting and financial systems in place adequate for project management and 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Availability and quality of financial and progress reports Timeliness and adequacy of reporting provided Level of discrepancy between planned and utilized financial expenditures Planned vs. actual funds leveraged Cost in view of results achieved compared to 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project documents And evaluations UNDP Project team 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Document analysis Key interviews

	<p>producing accurate and timely financial information?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Were progress reports produced accurately, timely and responded to reporting requirements including adaptive management changes? ▪ Was project implementation as cost effective as originally proposed (planned vs. actual) ▪ Did the leveraging of funds (cofinancing) happen as planned? ▪ Were financial resources utilized efficiently? Could financial resources have been used more efficiently? ▪ Was procurement carried out in a manner making efficient use of project resources? ▪ How was results-based management used during project implementation? 	<p>costs of similar projects from other organizations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Adequacy of project choices in view of existing context, infrastructure and cost ▪ Quality of results-based management reporting (progress reporting, monitoring and evaluation) ▪ Occurrence of change in project design/ implementation approach (i.e. restructuring) when needed to improve project efficiency ▪ Cost associated with delivery mechanism and management structure compare to alternatives 		
--	---	---	--	--

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ How efficient are partnership arrangements for the project? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ To what extent partnerships/ linkages between institutions/ organizations were encouraged and supported? ▪ Which partnerships/linkages were facilitated? Which ones can be considered sustainable? ▪ What was the level of efficiency of cooperation and collaboration arrangements? ▪ Which methods were successful or not and why? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Specific activities conducted to support the development of cooperative arrangements between partners, ▪ Examples of supported partnerships ▪ Evidence that particular partnerships/linkages will be sustained ▪ Types/quality of partnership cooperation methods utilized 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Project documents and evaluations ▪ Project partners and relevant stakeholders 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Document analysis ▪ Interviews
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Did the project efficiently utilize local capacity in implementation? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Was an appropriate balance struck between utilization of international expertise as well as local capacity? ▪ Did the project take into account local capacity in design and implementation of the project? ▪ Was there an effective collaboration between institutions responsible 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Proportion of expertise utilized from international experts compared to national experts ▪ Number/quality of analyses done to assess local capacity potential and absorptive capacity 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Project documents and evaluations ▪ UNDP ▪ Beneficiaries 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Document analysis ▪ Interviews

	for implementing the project?			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What lessons can be drawn regarding efficiency for other similar projects in the future? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What lessons can be learnt from the project regarding efficiency? How could the project have more efficiently carried out implementation (in terms of management structures and procedures, partnerships arrangements etc...)? What changes could have been made (if any) to the project in order to improve its efficiency? 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Data collected throughout evaluation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Data analysis
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has the project been effective in achieving the expected outcomes and objectives? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has the project been effective in achieving its expected outcomes? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> See indicators in project document results framework and log frame 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project documents Project team and relevant stakeholders Data reported in project annual and quarterly reports 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Documents analysis Interviews with project team Interviews with relevant stakeholders
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How is risk and risk mitigation being managed? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How well are risks, assumptions and impact drivers being managed? What was the quality of risk mitigation strategies developed? Were these sufficient? Are there clear strategies for risk mitigation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Completeness of risk identification and assumptions during project planning and design Quality of existing information systems in place to identify 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project documents UNDP, project team, and relevant stakeholders 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Document analysis Interviews

	related with long-term sustainability of the project	emerging risks and other issues <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Quality of risk mitigations strategies developed and followed 		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ What lessons can be drawn regarding effectiveness for other similar projects in the future? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ What lessons have been learned from the project regarding achievement of outcomes? ▪ What changes could have been made (if any) to the design of the project in order to improve the achievement of the project's expected results? 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Data collected throughout evaluation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Data analysis
Evaluative Criteria	Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
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"> ▪ Is the Project financially sustainable? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Are there financial risks that may jeopardize the sustainability of project outcomes? ▪ What is the likelihood of financial and economic resources not being available once GEF grant assistance ends? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The likely ability of an intervention to continue to deliver benefits for an extended period of time after completion. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ UNDP, project team, and relevant stakeholders 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Document analysis ▪ Interviews

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is the Project environmentally and socially sustainable? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are there ongoing activities that may pose an environmental threat to the sustainability of project outcomes? 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> UNDP, project team, and relevant stakeholders 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Document analysis Interviews
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To what extent the stakeholders will sustain the project? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are there social or political risks that may threaten the sustainability of project outcomes? What is the risk for instance that the level of stakeholder ownership (including ownership by governments and other key stakeholders) will be insufficient to allow for the project outcomes/benefits to be sustained? Do the various key stakeholders see that it is in their interest that project benefits continue to flow? Is there sufficient public/stakeholder awareness in support of the project's long-term objectives? 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> UNDP, project team, and relevant stakeholders 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Document analysis Interviews

Evaluative Criteria	Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward, reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status?				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assess the likely permanence (long lasting nature) of the impacts 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clarify based on extent: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) verifiable improvement in energy intensity; and/or b) through specified indicators that progress is being made towards achievement of project objectives c) regulatory and policy changes at regional, national and/or local levels 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The positive and negative, foreseen and unforeseen changes to and effects produced by a development intervention 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project documents UNDP, project team, and relevant stakeholders 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Document analysis Interviews

ANNEX D: RATING SCALES

<p><i>Ratings for Outcomes, Effectiveness, Efficiency, M&E, I&E Execution</i></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><i>Sustainability ratings:</i></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><i>Relevance ratings</i></p> <p>2. Relevant (R) 1.. Not relevant (NR)</p> <p><i>Impact Ratings:</i></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 Form¹¹

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: _____

¹¹www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct

ANNEX F: EVALUATION REPORT OUTLINE¹²

- 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 Manual¹³)
- 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 rated¹⁴)
- 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

¹²The Report length should not exceed 40 pages in total (not including annexes).

¹³ UNDP Style Manual, Office of Communications, Partnerships Bureau, updated November 2008

¹⁴ 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.

- 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
 - 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
 - Report Clearance Form
 - *Annexed in a separate file:* TE audit trail
 - *Annexed in a separate file:* Terminal GEF Tracking Tool

ANNEX G: EVALUATION REPORT CLEARANCE FORM

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

Evaluation Report Reviewed and Cleared by

UNDP Country Office

Name: _____

Signature: _____ Date: _____

UNDP GEF RTA

Name: _____

Signature: _____ Date: _____

ANNEX H: TE REPORT AUDIT TRAIL

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

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

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

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

ANNEX I: MANAGEMENT RESPONSE TEMPLATE

UNDP-GEF TE MANAGEMENT RESPONSE TEMPLATE

Management response to the Terminal Evaluation of *(title of the Project)*¹⁵

Project Title:

UNDP Project ID (PIMS) #:

GEF Project ID (PMIS) #:

Terminal Evaluation Mission Completion Date:

Date of Issue of Management Response:

Prepared by: *This will most likely be the Consultants and Commissioning Unit*

Contributors: *For example, the UNDP-GEF RTA, the TE team, the Project Board*

Cleared by: *The Commissioning Unit, UNDP-GEF RTA, Project Board*

Context, background and findings

1. *Insert here up to several paragraphs on context and background and UNDP's response to the validity and relevance of the findings, conclusions and recommendations.*
2. *Second paragraph.*
3. *Third paragraph, etc.*

¹⁵ This template is in alignment with the [Management Response Template](#) for UNDP project-level evaluations in the Evaluation Resource Centre.

Recommendations and management response

Terminal Evaluation recommendation 1.				
Management response:				
Key action(s)	Time frame	Responsible unit(s)	Tracking ¹⁶	
			Comments	Status ¹⁷
1.1				
1.2				
1.3				

Terminal Evaluation recommendation 2.				
Management response:				
Key action(s)	Time frame	Responsible unit(s)	Tracking	
			Comments	Status
2.1				
2.2				
2.3				

Terminal Evaluation recommendation 3.				
Management response:				
Key action(s)	Time frame	Responsible unit(s)	Tracking	
			Comments	Status
3.1				
3.2				
3.3				

¹⁶ If the TE is uploaded to the ERC, the status of implementation is tracked electronically in the Evaluation Resource Centre database (ERC).

¹⁷ Status of Implementation: Completed, Partially Completed, Pending.